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This dissertation examines syntactic constructions involving English impersonal verbs from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. The constructions in question are impersonal, causative and personal constructions which are further subdivided into nine types. In addition, the construction with the dummy pronoun *it* and the Subject Equi-NP Deletion and Subject Raising constructions involving these impersonal verbs are examined. The basic method of this investigation is a particularistic approach by which each verb is separately examined, for only such an approach can provide us with the actual syntactic facts of these constructions in each synchronic stage, and these facts in turn allow for a true explanation of the diachronic changes involved. Eleven (in Old English) to thirteen (in Middle English) impersonal verbs in five semantic groups which have survived until Modern English are examined.

I find that the syntactic types of impersonal verbs are heterogeneous across the verbs in each synchronic stage. From this fact, it can be said that each verb has a different history and the relevant syntactic changes are gradual. These findings cause problems for some generative accounts which pursue overarching cross-lexical generalizations.

Yet, some main tendencies are also observed. Between Old English and Middle English there is little change with the causative construction; but more varieties of personal subtypes are observed over time. By contrast, the impersonal construction becomes lost and dies out by the sixteenth century. The Prototypical Subject Requirement constraint is proposed as a trigger for such changes.
Even though many previous works have treated a dative Experiencer as an object, the dative Experiencer in the impersonal construction with two noun phrases is found to have syntactic properties typical of subjects. Such subjecthood of the Experiencer, though not prototypical, is a forerunner of the subsequent change toward personal constructions. When a verb takes a dative Experiencer and a clausal complement, the patterns for the introduction of a Dummy-Construction are explored, since such an introduction is not cross-lexical. This study proposes two syntactic conditions as requirements for a verb to develop a Dummy-Construction. The development of Subject Equi and Subject Raising constructions are also investigated, as well as an apparently idiosyncratic construction involving seem. All these individual changes are explained by reference to the same underlying causation, namely the Prototypical Subject Requirement constraint. To support the claim that this language-specific constraint is a well-motivated underlying force for English, independent evidence is provided. Moreover, this study shows that the mechanism of Reanalysis also played an important role in the development of the constructions involving English impersonal verbs by introducing an innovative construction that rivals the old one, which had the potential for multiple analyses, and eventually leads to the demise of the old structure in competition.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the study

Impersonal constructions, viewed from either a synchronic or a diachronic perspective, have constituted one of the subjects most frequently dealt with in English historical syntax. One of the reasons for this interest is probably that they stand out more than other constructions, since such impersonal constructions had been widely used in early English but completely disappeared at the threshold of the Modern English (henceforth ModE) period and are no longer found in Present-day English (henceforth PDE). For this same reason, these constructions may give insights into some aspects of how language changes.

The purpose of this study is to provide diachronic perspectives on the constructions involving IMPERSONAL VERBS in the history of English. Although the focus of this investigation of the relevant data covers OE to Middle English (henceforth ME), we also take into consideration data in ModE whenever relevant. Since a diachronic study cannot be accomplished without a thorough study of each synchronic stage, however, this work necessarily contains both diachronic and synchronic studies.
1.2 Delimitation of the subject

In OE and ME, a sentence could occur without any clear nominative case subject, a construction which can be called IMPERSONAL in a broad sense. When we define this term IMPERSONAL simply as subjectless or nominativeless, the examples corresponding to this definition which may be collected from OE to ME constitute a large amount of material. These can be categorized as follows, according to Wahlén (1925: 11-12).

(1) Three categories of impersonal constructions:

   a. Impersonal constructions containing verbs in the active voice:
      hit gelamp  bæt  bine  mætte
      it happened that  him(ACC)  dream(SUBJUNCTIVE)
      ‘it happened that he dreamt’  (ÆC Gen 37. 5)

   b. Impersonal constructions containing verbs in the passive voice:
      Him  wearð  gebeddod  mid  hnescre  beddinge
      him(DAT)  became  made-a-bed  with  softer  bedding
      ‘he was provided with more tender bed-covering’  (Wahlén: Saints II 438: 191)

   c. Impersonal constructions containing copula + predicative element:
      wel  bīp  þæm  þe  mot  æfter  deaðdage
      well is  that(DAT)  who is-allowed-to  after  deathday
      drihten  secan
      lord  seek
      ‘[it] is good to him who is allowed to seek the Lord after death’  (Beo 186)

Here, (1b) and (1c) are syntactically somewhat similar. Because a passivized verb takes a copula beon or weorðan, as in (1b), the outcome of passivization is syntactically similar

---

1 Traditionally a sentence containing a dummy element it, e.g. hit gelamp ‘it happened’, has been also called an impersonal construction, although such sentences have a grammatical subject it. As discussed later, I do not consider such a sentence as an impersonal and instead call an it-construction or a dummy-construction.

2 There are many studies of impersonal passives, including a recent publication by Allen (1995). See Denison (1993) for the references.

to copula + predicative adjective, as in (1c). The sentence (1b) is called IMPERSONAL PASSIVE because a passivized verb does not occur with a nominative subject even though the active verb itself is not an impersonal verb. This phenomenon occurs when the corresponding active verb takes a dative (or genitive) case as its (indirect) object instead of an accusative. Thus, this phenomenon is different from that of (1a) in which the impersonal construction is a direct characteristic of the verb itself, and thus a member of a group of verbs distinguished from other groups of verbs which do not show such impersonal usage in the active voice.

The verbs which occur in the impersonal construction can be divided into two classes by their inherent properties. One is the class of WEATHER VERBS which van der Gaaf (1904) called TRUE IMPERSONALS, as in (2a) below. Different from this is the class of so-called QUASI-IMPERSONALS, to use van der Gaaf's term, as in (2b) below.

(2) Two subcategories of the verb in the active voice:

a. Weather verb:
   norhan snewde
   from-north snowed(3-SG)
   'it snowed from the north'  
   (Sea 31)

b. quasi-impersonal verb (= impersonal verb in others' terminology):
   gyt me tweonað
   yet ME(DAT/ACC) doubts(3-SG)
   'I am still in doubt'  
   (ÆCHom i. 72.30)

---

4 Denison's study (1993: 108) shows that while the impersonal passive, i.e. the dative object in the corresponding active voice sentence not occurring as a nominative subject in the passive voice, is commonly found, it is rare that the accusative case (Theme) of the active voice form does not occur as a nominative in the passive voice, except the phrase lætan blod 'let blood; bleed'.

5 Denison (1993: 93) argues against this two-class division. He notes that rignan 'to rain' at least shares with ofþreowan 'to rue', of the quasi-impersonal class, the noteworthy property of often occurring in a subjectless construction or with a hit 'it' subject. In addition, it can also have a cognate object (or maybe subject), and in glosses the verb may be used with a lexical subject and even a dative recipient:

(i) & he rinde heom pane heofonican mete to etanne
   and he rained them(DAT) the heavenly food to eat
   Lat. et pluit illis manna ad manducandum  
   (PsGlI 77.24)
The main features of quasi-impersonal constructions are as follows: (i) absence of an overt nominative case, (ii) only the third person singular verb inflection is used, (iii) almost invariably a human noun or pronoun in the accusative or dative occurs before the verb, (iv) these constructions are restricted to a list of impersonal verbs belonging to a restricted semantic field — physical and mental affection (Bancila 1979: 133). It has been also claimed that the dative human is UNVOLITIONALLY/UNSELF-CONTROLLABLY involved in the situation (McCawley 1976: 195-195).

Because of the large amount of the material available, this study will focus on syntactic phenomena with quasi-impersonal constructions within the category (1a). The traditional term IMPERSONAL will be used throughout to refer just to these constructions.

1.3 Definition of terms

1.3.1 Impersonal construction vs. impersonal verb

It has been noted that the term impersonal itself is notoriously misused (Denison 1993: 62). Some have used this term for constructions lacking a personal subject. By this definition, a construction with non-referential dummy it, as in (3), is also called an impersonal construction although it occurs as a grammatical subject:

(3) Non-referential it:

\[ \text{Hyt gelamp } \text{þa on } \text{þære tide } \text{þæt } \text{ða cyningas wunnon} \]

\[ \text{it happened then in that time that the kings fought} \]

\[ \text{him betwyan} \]

\[ \text{them among} \]

‘Then it happened in that time that the kings were fighting among them’(C: Gen 14.1)

However, our definition of impersonal construction will refer to those sentences which do not have any clear nominative case. This definition then does not include an example such as (3). The strictest syntactic definition of impersonalness would apply only to
nominativeless clauses whose verbs have no personal argument at all. However, we will extend the term to nominativeless clauses whose verbs can have personal oblique (or non-nominative) arguments.

It is important to distinguish IMPERSONAL VERBS from IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS. Impersonal verbs refer to the verbs which have the potential to occur in impersonal constructions such as those mentioned above. Impersonal verbs can also occur in other types of constructions, e.g. in sentences with nominative arguments. By contrast, the term impersonal construction as used here solely designates nominativeless constructions.

1.3.2 Semantic roles

The number of arguments of an OE impersonal verb can be one or two. It will be convenient to call these arguments by semantic (or theta) roles. Impersonal verbs have a common semantic core in that they all express a physical or mental experience which involves a GOAL and a SOURCE. The former argument is often called an EXPERIENCER, i.e. the one on which the experience is effected, the latter a CAUSE, i.e. something from which the experience emanates (e.g. Fischer and van der Leek 1983, Allen 1986). Although the term Experiencer has been commonly employed, the term THEME has been sometimes used instead of Cause (e.g. Lightfoot 1991, Harris and Campbell 1995).

An Experiencer argument is always (pro-)nominal (NP); a Cause argument may be a (pro-)nominal or a clausal element. Although these names of semantic roles may not be always appropriate for all impersonal verbs involved here, unless we really need other names, we will use Experiencer and Cause for all verbs.

---

Denison (1993: 67) shows zero-place impersonal verbs which do not take any argument at all. All his examples, however, are weather verbs, which are excluded from the subject of our present study.
The following example shows an impersonal verb occurring with only a single argument:

(4) One-place impersonal verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ne pêrst pone nêfre ðe on me gelyfð} \\
\text{not thirsts the-one(ACC) never who in me believes} \\
\text{'he who believes in me will never thirst'} \quad \text{(Denison 1993: Jn (WSCp) 6.35)}
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, the only argument taken by the verb is \textit{pone} 'the one'. It is an entity on which the experience 'thirsting' is effected, therefore an Experiencer. An Experiencer in impersonal (i.e. nominativeless) construction appears in either a dative or accusative case.

The following examples shows an impersonal verb occurring with two arguments:

(5) Two-place impersonal verb:

a. \[
\begin{align*}
\text{me on minum hyge hreowep pæt hie} \\
\text{I(DAT/ACC) in my mind rues(3-SG) that they} \\
\text{heofonrice agan} \\
\text{heaven possess} \\
\text{I regret in my mind that they should possess heaven} \quad \text{(Gen i 426)}
\end{align*}
\]

b. \[
\begin{align*}
\text{him ofhreow pæs mannes} \\
\text{he(DAT) rued(3-SG) the man(GEN)} \\
\text{‘he was sorry for the man’} \quad \text{(BT)}
\end{align*}
\]

In (5b) an accusative noun phrase or a prepositional phrase may occur instead of a genitive one:

(i) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{him gelicade hire ðeawas} \\
\text{he(DAT) liked(3-SG) her virtues (ACC/NOM-PL)} \\
\text{‘he liked her virtues: her virtues please him’} \quad \text{(Fischer & van der Leek 1983, 347: Chron. 201)}
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{menn ... scamap nu for godde-dan} \\
\text{man (DAT) cause/shame now for good-deeds} \\
\text{‘man is now ashamed of good deeds’} \quad \text{(Elmer 1981, 60: W.Sermo 62.153)}
\end{align*}
\]

It is not certain that the accusative shares exactly the same distributional attributes and the same semantics as the genitive. And the occurrence of the accusative case is very limited, compared to the genitive case. In general, however, those three kinds have been classified into one as type N in Elmer (1981).

Allen (1986: 388, 395 & 1995: 76-77) sees example (i) differently. She claims that since \textit{hire ðeawas} could be either accusative or nominative, this is simply an example in which a postposed nominative Cause fails to trigger verbal agreement. By contrast, Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 347) treat this example as taking an accusative Cause based on the verbal agreement. I will have a further discussion in chapter 2 about the controversial status of the accusative Cause in the impersonal construction.
In these examples, me and him are Experiencers. A Cause can be a finite or infinitival (e.g. to-infinitive or bare-infinitive) S’, or a genitive noun phrase (NP[GEN]). The example (5a) shows a finite clause as a Cause, and (5b) shows a genitive NP.

Since an impersonal construction lacks an explicit subject on the surface, it is hard to translate the examples literally according to PDE syntax, which requires the presence of subject NPs. It is not difficult though to give a paraphrase. For example, (of-)hreowan in (5b) is glossed as ‘rue’ according to its PDE descendent but it can be rendered as either ‘be depressed; regret; be sorry’ etc., making the oblique Experiencer a subject or ‘depress, oppress’ etc. making the genitive Cause a subject.

1.4 Overview of the syntactic change in impersonal verbs

In general it is claimed that the major diachronic syntactic change affecting impersonal verbs involves a shift from a human oblique to subject function which is traditionally expressed in terms of a change (reanalysis) from IMPERSONAL to PERSONAL.

In ME, the impersonal constructions are still found. The following example shows that ME hungren 'to hunger', descendant of OE hyngrian, occurs in impersonal constructions just like OE:

(6) Impersonal constructions in both OE and ME:

a. OE hyngrian:

bonne him hingrap, he yt grædilice
when he(DAT) hungers he eats greedily
‘when he hungers, he eats greedily’ (C: ÆHex 528)

b. ME hungren:

Mine men schulen eoten, & ow schal
my men shall(PL) eat you(DAT/ACC) shall(3-SG)
eauer hungrin
ever hunger
‘my people shall eat and you shall ever hunger’ (AW 111.19)
It is within the ModE period that this verb is restricted to the construction with a subject.

The first attempt to account for the changes involving OE impersonal constructions was Jespersen (1894). Later Jespersen (1909-49, III) provided a more detailed analysis for the explanation of the disappearance of impersonal constructions. Jespersen (1909-49, III) presents the following hypothetical examples with the OE verb *lician* 'like' as a typical sentence in its various stages:

(7) Jespersen’s (1909-49, III) scenario for the change:

a. ham cynge licodon peran
   the king(DAT) pleased(PL) pears(NOM-PL)

b. the king liceden peares

c. the king liked pears

d. he liked pears

In the stage (7a), the verb is plural and thus in agreement with *peran*. Thus, *peran* is interpreted as subject. In (7b) the dative case on the initial NP is lost, but *peares* is still subject because the verb is still recognizably plural. (7c) is ambiguous: either *the king* or *pears* can be interpreted as subject in view of coding properties, i.e., marking of case or plurality. Stage (7c) shows that the loss of inflectional markers made (7c) analyzable as either Object-Verb-Subject or Subject-Verb-Object. In the same context Lightfoot (1979) explains that the Transparency Principle forced a reanalysis of this structurally ambiguous sentence. (7d) exhibits the nominative *he*, apparently as a subject.

This syntactic change happened along with a semantic change. Jespersen states that in most cases the verb began by meaning 'give an impression' and came to mean 'receive an impression'. A suitable PDE rendering of (7a) and (7b) is 'pears pleased the king'. In (7d) the verb has undergone a change of meaning from 'cause pleasure to' to 'receive pleasure from'.
Jespersen’s choice of data has been generally assumed as correct, as Tripp (1978: 177) remarks, ‘The discussion of the loss of impersonal constructions has reached a point where additional data seem unlikely to alter competing explanations of their disappearance’. But later problems with this analysis have been noted. Allen (1986: 396-7) finds no evidence that the stage (7b) actually existed with *like*. Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 339) note that although Jespersen regards the OVS type as the original construction, unambiguous OVS cases like example (7a) occur only rarely in OE. A significant contribution of Fischer and van der Leek’s study is their observation that (7a) is in fact only one of three syntactic types possible in OE. Thus, regarding the personal construction as originating from (7a), thereby treating (7a) as typical with OE impersonal verbs, does not create an accurate account of historical change.

As implied before, the impersonal construction is not the only type associated with the impersonal verb even in OE. As the following three examples from Anderson (1986: 170) show, the same verb could already take a nominative Cause, as in (8b), or a nominative Experiencer, as in (8c):

(8) Three constructions in OE with *ofhreowan*:

a. him ofhreow þæs mannes
   he(DAT) rued the man(GEN)
   ‘he pitied the man’  (ÆCHom i. 192.16)

b. þa ofhreow ðam munece þæs hreoflian mægenleast
   then rued the monk(DAT) the leper’s feebleness(NOM)
   ‘then the monk pitied the leper’s feebleness’  (ÆCHom i. 336.10)

c. Se mæssepreost ðæs monnes ofhreow
   the priest(NOM) the man(GEN) rued
   ‘the priest pitied the man’  (ÆLS ii. 26.262)

---

8 I find, however, that an OVS order does occur in OE, as we will see in chapter 2. But it occurs in general when the post-verbal subject is HEAVIER element than the putative object (Experiencer). The correct paraphrase of the example (7a) according to OE syntax would be, then, *peran licodon pam cynge*, an SVO order.
Because of this fact, Ogura (1990: 32) says that the syntactic change involved here is not a change from impersonal to personal but an increasing tendency towards a construction with a person in the nominative in contrast with a decreasing tendency of a construction with a person in the dative.

In the following section let us survey how these data are treated in different studies.

1.5 Overview of Previous Studies

There are a number of studies of impersonal constructions or impersonal verbs. Most of those studies are an interweaving of synchronic and diachronic accounts. This is probably because diachronic research is impossible without a thorough explication of the phenomena in several synchronic stages. Denison (1993) provides a very detailed summary of earlier studies. According to Denison (1993: 73), most scholarly treatments of impersonals center on the idea of REANALYSIS that originated in Jespersen (1909-49) and van der Gaaf (1904). The idea is that non-subject NPs, i.e. Dative/Accusative Experiencers, were reanalysed as subjects in the ME period, as seen in Jespersen’s scenario in (7). This explanation is accepted in whole or in part by Elmer (1981), Lightfoot (1979, 1981b), and Fischer and van der Leek (1987).

Reanalysis has been the single most important mechanism for most attempts to explain syntactic change throughout the history of linguistics. Reanalysis depends on surface ambiguity or the possibility of more than one analysis. We can see examples of change through reanalysis of (i) constituency, (ii) hierarchical structure, (iii) category labels, (iv) grammatical relations, and other aspects of underlying structure (Harris and Campbell 1995: 3).

Most diachronic accounts of impersonals claim that reanalysis occurred due to the loss of case marking with concomitant fixing of word order in English. In chapter 7, I
show the problems with such explanations and propose an alternative account of the trigger (or cause) of the changes in concern.

In the following, I select a few most frequently cited studies in both generative frameworks and descriptive methods and review them more in detail.

1.5.1 Generative studies
1.5.1.1 Fischer and van der Leek (1983)

Rather than assuming that impersonal verbs had one meaning in OE and another meaning in PDE, Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 337) contend that in OE both meanings existed side by side, systematically associable with different syntactic constructions. They note that synchronically the three constructions must be distinguished in OE: (i) Impersonal construction, as in (8a) above, with the verb of NEUTRAL MEANING, (ii) Cause-subject construction, as in (8b), with the verb of CAUSATIVE MEANING and (iii) Experiencer-subject construction, as in (8c), with the verb of RECEPTIVE MEANING.

One possible solution would be that each of these is represented by separate entries in the lexicon:

(9) Three entries of impersonal verbs in Fischer and van der Leek (1983):

i. \( \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP: DATIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Experiencer} \\
\text{subject NP: GENITIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Cause} \\
S' \\
\end{array} \)

ii. \( \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP: DATIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Experiencer} \\
\text{subject NP: GENITIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Cause} \\
S' \\
\end{array} \)

iii. \( \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP: DATIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Experiencer} \\
\text{subject NP: GENITIVE; } \theta\text{-role: Cause} \\
S' \\
\end{array} \)
The Cases in (i) are clearly Lexical since which Cases are chosen depends on the verb.9 The THREE-ENTRY approach admits lexical redundancy rules to account for the fact that once one entry for impersonal verb X has been acquired by the language learner, the other entries are acquired with less effort. But they claim (p. 357), 'Even so the 'three entries' approach implies that the data the language learner must needs be exposed to includes, for every single impersonal verb, at least one instance of each of the three construction types. Since we assume, on the basis of the data we have been able to collect, that the variety of constructions represents a fully productive system, it follows that the above-sketched analysis does not make optimal assumptions.'

As an alternative analysis, Fischer and van der Leek propose the SINGLE ENTRY approach. The entry type (i) is the obvious candidate because it specifies the Lexical Cases peculiar to the verb. They propose (p. 357) that the members of impersonal verb class OPTIONALLY assign the Lexical Cases specified in their entries, whereas non-impersonal verbs OBLIGATORILY assign the Lexical Cases for which their entries are

9 In Government and Binding (GB) Theory, developed from Chomsky (1981), two types of cases are distinguished: Lexical (or Inherent) Case vs. Structural Case. The Structural Case is determined by configuration (i.e. the structure of the sentence); Nominative and Accusative cases are Structural. Those cases are assigned by Government: only a Governor assigns a Structural Case to its Governee: e.g. V governs (and thus assigns Accusative Case to) its (object) NP; P governs (and thus assigns Accusative Case to) its (object) NP; tensed I (INFL) governs the external argument (i.e. subject) and assigns Nominative Case. The following is a definition of Government (from Haegeman 1994: 160):

(i) Government:
   A governs B if and only if
   (i) A is governor;
   (ii) A m-commands B;
   (iii) no barrier intervenes between A and B.
   where
   (a) governors are the lexical b-c's (V, N, P, A) and tensed I;
   (b) maximal projections are barriers.

By contrast, Lexical case depends on theta-role assignment and Government. Dative and Genitive cases are Lexical. In German, for example, helfen, 'help' lexically assigns a Dative case in the Lexicon; In English, envy, belief and proud assign Genitive case to an NP when they theta-mark the NP: so, proud assigns a Genitive case to his kid in John is proud of his kid.
marked. Under this assumption, construction types (ii) and (iii) are no longer analyzed as base-generated constructions. In type (ii), the Cause NP does not receive Lexical Case from the verb and thus the NP undergoes NP movement into subject position and nominative Case is assigned at surface level. Similarly for (iii), the Experiencer NP does not receive Lexical Case and thus undergoes NP movement to subject position.

Fischer and van der Leek present some advantages of the single entry analysis over the other. It makes different predictions with respect to the data that the language learner needs to be exposed to. Once the language learner has been exposed to enough data to be able to recognize impersonal verbs as a class and to fill in the parameter of Lexical Case assignment with the marked value OPTIONAL with respect to members of this class, exposure to data type (i) alone, the commonest type for OE impersonal verbs, suffices for impersonal verbs yet to be acquired.

Fischer and van der Leek's account has been very influential in many ways. However it encounters some problems. First, as a theory-internal problem, their statement that the Lexical Cases are optionally assigned in (i) may predict the possibility that neither NP receives Lexical Case. In that event, one NP would have to move to subject position and receive nominative case at the S-structure, the other receiving structural objective (i.e. accusative) case. As noted by Lightfoot (1991: 134), however, this would violate Burzio's generalization, the restriction that a verb assigns Structural (accusative) Case only when it has an external argument at deep structure.

---

10 If their term 'non-impersonal verbs' refers to the potentially impersonal verbs which have non-impersonal usage, this statement is a construction-particular and lexically-particular rule. This method of account is far from the level of generalization or explanatory adequacy that GB-ists generally advocate.

11 Burzio's (1986) generalization is summarized as follows:

(i) A verb which lacks an external argument fails to assign Accusative case (Burzio 1986: 178-9).
(ii) A verb which fails to assign Accusative case fails to theta-mark an external argument (Burzio 1986: 184).
Second, they propose an NP-movement to the subject position in order to account for the derivations of (ii) and (iii) from (i). In GB theory, any movement should be motivated. For example, $\alpha$ must move when it cannot get a Case. To motivate move-$\alpha$, however, Fischer and van der Leek must allow for optional assignment of Lexical Cases so that the NP which has not been assigned a Lexical Case will move to get a nominative case. As for the historical development, they claim that due to the breakdown of the morphological case system in LME, English lost its ability to assign Lexical Case in the base (p. 362). However, it seems that introducing the concept of Lexical Case as opposed to Structural Case and thus claiming that the loss of Lexical Case resulted in the loss of the impersonal construction does not in fact 'explain' why such a loss occurred. I am not suggesting here that there is no such thing as Lexical as opposed to Structural Case. When we assumed the general assumption of GB that nominative and accusative cases were always structural and the other cases were lexical (see note 9), the dative and genitive cases occurring in the impersonal construction would be unquestionably Lexical Cases. However, it seems that the term Lexical Case is exactly equivalent to the traditional observation of the idiosyncratic case assignment as the properties of the verb itself and the loss of impersonal constructions as the change of the verb's properties. Thus, the idea of Lexical Case is tautological, using a different terminology, to the already observed phenomena, rather than explaining why such a change occurred.

1.5.1.2 Lightfoot (1991)

From a universalist point of view, Lightfoot (1991) introduces the analysis of Belletti and Rizzi (1988) on Italian psych-verbs into the account of OE. Belletti and Rizzi argue for an analysis along these lines by showing that D-structures like (10) permit a
straightforward account of otherwise mysterious binding properties found with psych-verbs (here, the semantic role Theme corresponds to the Cause):

(10) Belletti and Rizzi's (1988) D-structure with Italian psych-verbs:

\[ S[NP \text{INFL} \ VP[ V' [\text{Theme} \ verb] \ Experiencer ]]\]

Lightfoot himself recognizes that this argumentation depends on negative data, on the interpretability of empty subjects, on relatively exotic data about the behavior of psych-verbs in the complements of causative verbs, and on the distribution of long-distance anaphors. Such data are typically are not available to children or to investigators of dead languages. This means that it is probably impossible to argue for the appropriateness of D-structures like (10) for early stages of English, except in the most speculative and incomplete fashion (p.130). Although he concedes this fact, he still considers that it might be productive to assume the most fundamental aspects of their analysis also for OE. The verbs would be subcategorized to occur with Experiencer and Theme (or Cause) NPs, like the comparable verb in Italian and this would yield D-structures like (11a) with the Experiencer NP higher than the Theme. The lexical entries may specify a D-structure case, i.e., Lexical Case, and an externalization option:


a. D-structure with impersonal verb in OE:

\[ S[NP \text{INFL} \ VP[ \text{Experiencer} \ V' [\text{Theme} \ verb]]] \]

b. Lexical entries:

i. hreowan: Experiencer-dative; (Theme-genitive)
ii. lician: Experiencer-dative; Theme

With the lexical entry (11b.ii), the Theme does not have an Inherent Case at D-structure nor could it receive the objective Structural Case because Vs assign Structural Case only
if they have external arguments (due to Burzio’s generalization, as explained above). Thus, the Theme could receive nominative case at S-structure.

Lightfoot (1991)’s account is very similar to that of Fischer and van der Leek (1983) in that he relies on the idea of Lexical Cases. According to Lightfoot’s prediction, it would be impossible to find the occurrences of [NP[DAT] — NP[ACC]] unless the accusative is lexically assigned at D-structure, because the structural objective case may be assigned only by a verb with nominative subject. Remember that the GB-ists generally see the accusative case (as well as the nominative) as Structural. However, we can find such examples even for lician in OE, as our survey shows in chapter 2. To avoid this problem, Lightfoot might have to stipulate NP[ACC] as Lexical Case for lician, in addition to (11b.ii), although in GB the accusative cannot be specified in the base.

Criticizing Fischer and van der Leek’s (1983) account as putting too much information into individual lexical entries and thus sacrificing any kind of explanation (p. 136), Lightfoot treats the coexistence of the nominative Experiencer and the dative Experiencer to a diglossic situation (p. 129. 136-138), rather than building the option of dative or no case into various lexical entries in a given grammar. He claims (p.136), ‘two grammars coexisted in the speech community, one with lexical entries with dative and other cases and the other with no such inherent case specifications for the verbs under discussion. Together two simple grammars account for the range of data generated by the single grammar with built-in variation.’ This idea loses the merit of the generative approach because it does not capture the fact that the nominative Experiencer is related in thematic role to the dative/accusative Experiencer at the D-structure. Thus his account of diachrony is not achieved by means of any theory-internal motivations, and it is no different from a descriptive statement that two (in fact, three) different syntactic types were possible side by side in OE and ME (diglossic in his term).
1.5.2 Descriptive studies

1.5.2.1 Elmer (1981)

Elmer's (1981) study is descriptive. He divides the verbs into five subclasses according to their meaning: RUE, PLEASE/DISEASE, BEHOOVE, HAPPEN, SEEM. He shows that these verbs may occur in four different syntactic types: Type N (impersonal with two NPs); Type S (with sentential complement); Type I (with the non-animate NP in the nominative; causative meaning of the verb; type ii in Fischer and van der Leek (1983)); and Type II (with the animate NP in the nominative; receptive meaning of the verb; type iii in Fischer and van der Leek (1983)).

Compared to Fischer & van der Leek, Lightfoot, or others, Elmer provides a very detailed description about the syntactic behavior of each verb individually. Thus it is empirically very useful. But it is not free of flaws. There exist some constructions which Elmer's classifications do not capture. For example, his survey charts for rewen (p. 88) and listen (p. 116) show no occurrence of personal usage in OE. However, as we will see later, there are some instances of this usage. Another fault lies in his considering S'[FIN] and S'[INF] to belong to the same type (type S), as does Denison (1990). For example, he regards hreowan as taking a clause. However, none of his examples (and of ours later studied) regarding hreowan includes S'[INF]. This incorporation of S'[FIN] and S'[INF] misses many important aspects of the behavior of the impersonal verb. Therefore, it is necessary to subdivide his categories for more detailed and precise empirical results.

---

12 Even Allen's recent publication (1995), otherwise a very extensive, verb-by-verb study of impersonal verbs, also fails in this distinction, saying 'All the PROP constructions [i.e. constructions with a clausal Cause -HK] discussed here are found with both tensed and infinitival complements, but due to limitations of space I will not exemplify both types of complements for each of these types.' (p. 88, fn. 24)
Denison denies the homogeneity of impersonal verbs. For example he notes that
lician is very rare in type (i) and occurs in type (iii) only in the Latinate syntax of glosses. He further argues that there is no clear demarcation between impersonals and other verbs. He draws attention to the sometimes very similar syntax of impersonal and non-impersonal verbs, allowing them to share arguments by verb conjunction. In the following, sceamian is an impersonal verb and fægnian is not, but they share the same arguments, hi (nominative) and hiora (genitive):

(12) oðde forhwy hi ne mægen hiora ma scamian
     or why they not may them(GEN) more feel-shame
     þonne fægnian
     than rejoice
     'or why they may not be more ashamed of them/themselves than glad’ (Bo 68.15)

However, the sharing of the same arguments by two verbs is possible because scamian in this case is not used in type (i) impersonal construction but in type (iii) nominative-recipient (or personal) construction. Thus the usage of scamian here is same as that of ordinary verbs which take clear nominative subjects.

The impossibility of classifying impersonals satisfactorily either in one or several classes, despite the evident family resemblance, led Denison to suggest a serial relationship plotting them individually in a matrix which could represent degrees of similarities. Denison (1990) provides three examples of matrices. The following is one of them:
(13) Denison’s (1990)’s serial relationship of verbs:

1 = NOM Experiencer, PP/GEN Cause - type (iii)
2 = DAT Experiencer, PP/GEN Cause - type (i)
3 = DAT Experiencer, ACC Cause - ?type (i)
4 = DAT Experiencer, clausal Cause - type (i/ii)
5 = DAT Experiencer/patient, NOM Cause/Agent - type (ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>befeolan ‘apply (o/s) to’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWEMAN ‘please’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELPAN ‘help’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÆPAN ‘loathe’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MÆETAN ‘dream’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GE) LICIAN ‘like, please’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREOWAN ‘rue’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This matrix ranges from the non-impersonal verb befeolan to the impersonals (ge-)lician and hreowan. The matrix shows that (ge-)lician is much like helpan in syntax but overlaps sufficiently with hreowan to allow the sporadic analogical use of impersonal-like syntax. Emphasizing that variation is the prerequisite for change, Denison (1990:134) alleges that a mapping of serial relationship is a snapshot of potential lexical diffusion in progress.13

1.6 Goals of the present study

Syntactic change is the area of historical linguistics which has been least thoroughly researched. An important generalization that has emerged, though, is that syntactic change typically seems to start in a relatively limited domain. And the sweeping generalization which we can so often notice by comparing different chronological stages of a given language seems to result from a sometimes a very long and complex series of

---

13 As B. Joseph (p.c.) has pointed out to me, although lexical diffusion is not an incorrect term in terms of its effects, it is best reserved as a term for sound change because anything analogical will almost by definition be lexically diffuse. The use of lexical diffusion is common enough now in reference to the spread of syntactic and morpho-syntactic changes, but it is really an issue ONLY with respect to sound change, due to the regularity hypothesis and the hypothesis of phonetic-only conditioning.
extensions, none of which, taken by itself, is really 'sweeping' [Hock (1991: 378)]. While it is customary in synchronic linguistics to look for broad overarching generalizations that cover and account for as much data as possible, such generalizations are not always available in the examination of language change. Historical linguistic research has often ended up — necessarily, it can be argued — focusing on particularities, especially on the properties of particular lexical items and on particular lexical instantiations of a given construction, rather than on general principles that are valid for large classes of data (Joseph 1992b: 197). This situation arises because historical linguistic research requires an inductive method: first begin with given attested data then derive a generalization based on the available material.

To capture general principles, constraints, and motivations underlying the syntactic changes involving impersonal verbs, therefore, the first step is to examine impersonal verbs item by item with regard to those changes. Without such an investigation, we always run the risk of a simplification and overgeneralization of the phenomenon, distorting the fact away from what has really happened with those verbs. Many previous studies (especially in the framework of generative syntax) encounter this problem, because many of them randomly choose the data supporting their arguments without a thorough survey of all available possibilities involving impersonal verbs. In the study of a corpus language for which we do not have native-speaker-like intuitions to draw on, a thorough examination of the available data should always precede any claims concerning the changes.

One example of simplification is shown in Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and Lightfoot (1991). Fischer and van der Leek's approach seems to imply that all the verbs categorized as impersonal could occur in three syntactic types (i), (ii) and (iii). This is reflected in their use of the data: they make a random use of verbs for examples representing each type. Lightfoot (1991: 134), following Anderson (1986), assumes that
*hreowan*, in showing all three possibilities, represents the typical case, and that many verbs manifesting only one or two of these possibilities in fact are revealing only accidental gaps in the texts.

For generativists, interest in OE as a synchronic entity lay mainly in finding a generalization, as simple as possible, to explain the syntactic alternations among types (i), (ii), and (iii), simply ignoring that there are notable internal variations in the occurrences of each paradigm for each lexical entry. We cannot ascertain whether the nonexistence of data is due to purely accidental gaps, or whether it is actually because those examples were ungrammatical. The worst situation comes in treating those gaps inconsistently considering some as accidental gaps but others as systematic gaps (i.e. ungrammatical).

The ultimate goal of recent generative theories is to make the grammar(s) of a set of languages as constrained as possible in pursuit of universal grammar. Although there are indirect indications of ungrammaticality from statements of grammarians or the like, there are yet no negative data in the study of an earlier language giving clear-cut boundaries between grammaticality and ungrammaticality. Thus, historical syntacticians do not usually make strong claims about what deep structure the divergent surface structures have come from and whether or not the constraints regarding the move-α from the hypothesized deep structure are actually correct. In other words, generative frameworks do not prove the legitimacy of their constrained theory language-internally.

The same is especially true for the diachronic approach. A reasonable approach, therefore, is to attempt to find the truth (what was going on in that language?) rather than to attempt to find a more economical account which cannot be defended convincingly. Joseph’s (1992a) comment on this matter is thus insightful: ‘It is reasonable to suppose, for instance, that they [synchronic and diachronic accounts -- HK] are subject to different types of evaluation metrics: a synchronic account should aim for economy and typically, for example, avoids positing the same rule or constraint at two different points in a
grammar or derivation ... while a diachronic account, being interested in determining what actually happened over some time interval, should aim for the truth, even if it is messy and even if it might entail positing the operation of, for instance, the same sound change at two different adjacent time periods ...' (p.126).

Therefore, a particularistic approach will provide empirically correct descriptions of the available data as a starting point of the whole research. This is our first goal on this dissertation. We will see in chapters 2 and 3 that the possible syntactic constructions of particular impersonal verbs are so heterogeneous that they cannot be nicely fitted into a single syntactic frame. This synchronic diversity in the syntactic frames of different verbs thus leads to different diachronic outcomes from OE to ME for different verbs.

However, the descriptivists' perspective which emphasizes the non-homogeneity of impersonals is not free of problems either. Denison, for example, argues that there is no clear demarcation between impersonals and other verbs. However, we find that at least one feature is shared among the impersonal verbs as distinguished from non-impersonal verbs: impersonal verbs can all occur in the nominativeless construction, a fact which is not due to a simple pro-drop phenomenon. Even if our study should be based on the detailed examination of particular lexical instantiations of a given construction, we are not justified in ignoring an underlying generalization, if available, although it need not be formally constrained or simplistic. For we must offer an EXPLANATION of the mechanisms of a change (see section 1.7 below).

In this respect, the ultimate question is what motivates this change. Is there a rule or a constraint behind such a change? If there is, what is it? When a certain change has run its course, the trigger of the change, which is extended or generalized over a long period of time, is made known only by means of the retrospective generalization of the change from the standpoint of the present. In this sense, the trigger of the change is equal to the retrospective generalization (Joseph 1992b: 198). This is our second goal of this thesis.
1.7 On explanation

Many approaches of language change have attempted in their own way to explain why a certain language change has occurred. Before we go on, we need to discuss what is explanation in linguistic change. What needs to be explained in a study of language change and what is the limit of such an attempt? As Harris and Campbell (1995: 7) states, Many studies have been criticized as not offering true explanations. Some have claimed that prediction is required for explanation. However, Harris and Campbell (1995: 5) offer a different view:

It is sometimes objected that prediction is necessary for explanation, and that theories of linguistic change which do not predict are therefore inadequate. ... The quick but accurate answer to this objection is that prediction is not necessary for valid explanation. Evolution by natural selection is recognized as a scientifically legitimate explanation, in spite of the fact that it permits no prediction of the evolutionary changes it is almost universally acknowledged to explain.

I agree with this view. As for language change, we may not predict whether or when a change will take place or what exact form it may take, or when it may fail to take place even though the appropriate condition of multiple possible analyses holds. Yet, it seems

---

14 Harris and Campbell (1995: 6) notes that the view that a theory should predict change perhaps stems from the belief that change takes place 'only when necessary' (Lightfoot 1979: 124). Romaine (1981: 287) points out that the view that change takes place 'only when necessary' is falsified by the existence of any two closely related languages which differ syntactically. If two languages or dialects exist, they differ. One or both must have changed with respect to the pattern(s) wherein they differ. According to the claims in Lightfoot (1979), this change must have been triggered by specific conditions, which made the shift 'necessary'. But if the dialects differ only with respect to a single syntactic pattern, the conditions which are seen as triggering the change existed in both dialects. The change was thus 'necessary' for both, but only one underwent it. In his later publications, Lightfoot concedes that syntactic change does not occur solely when 'necessary' (see Lightfoot 1991: 169-170).
that explanations of various syntactic changes do allow certain predictions within some limits. While a theory of language change cannot predict that a particular change will occur, it can be predictive to the extent that we can state what the course of a particular change will be if it does occur, according to acknowledged language universals. We may characterize the mechanism(s) possible in a change by looking at the changes that do occur and those that do not (Harris and Campbell 1995: 5-6).

In the present study, I will try to offer explanations in this (limited) sense. I will address some predictions, if available, in the form of conditions/constraints underlying a particular language change.

### 1.8 The database for the present study

Visser (1963: 20-35) provides a thoroughly researched listing of impersonal verbs in both OE and ME. Since there is a huge number of impersonal verbs in OE and ME, it is beyond the ability of this study to research all these verbs item by item. We need to limit the domain of the database of the present study. However, the domain should be characterized by the assumption that lexically a small number of verbs studied can illustrate the characteristics of the subject as exhaustively as possible. One way to select those verbs in sampling is on the basis of their semantic groupings. Elmer (1981: 6) and Denison (1993: 66-67) provide lists of roughly divided semantic groupings as follows:

(14) Semantic groupings of impersonal verbs:

a. Elmer (1981):
   I. The class RUE: *hreowan, sceamian, eglian, ofpyncan*
   II. The class PLEASE/DESIRE: *(ge-)lician, (ge-)lystan, langian, (ge-)lustfullian*
   III. The class BEHOOVE: *(ge-)byrian, gerisan, gedafenian, behofian*
   IV. The class HAPPEN: *(ge-)limpan, (ge)weorpæn*
   V. The class SEEM: *pyncan*
b. Denison (1993):
1. The HUNGER verbs
2. The BEHOOVE verbs
3. The RUE verbs
4. The HAPPEN verbs
5. The SEEM verbs
6. The DREAM verbs
7. The AVAIL verbs
8. The PLEASE verbs

In Denison’s listings, none of the verbs belonging to the DREAM and AVAIL groups in OE survive into ME. Thus we lose a chance to see how a particular verb changes through time at least for the verbs in these groups. For the other groups, some verbs died out but still there are one or more verbs surviving until ME and even up to ModE. These verbs surviving until Early ModE (henceforth EModE) will be our database in the present study. So we have one to three verbs in each of six groups. These are listed as follows:¹⁵

(15) The impersonal verbs in OE to be studied:

a. The RUE verbs:  
   hreowan ‘RUE, to depress; repent’,
   sceamian ‘SHAME, to make ashamed; be ashamed’,
   eglian ‘AIL, to trouble; to be troubled’

b. The PLEASE verbs:  
   lician ‘LIKE, to please; be pleased’,
   lysstan ‘LIST, to please; desire’,
   langian ‘LONG, to long for’

c. The HAPPEN verbs:  
   (ge-)limpan ‘to happen’

d. The SEEM verbs:  
   pyncan ‘THINK; to seem’

e. The BEHOOVE verbs:  
   behofian ‘BEHOOVE; to befit; need’

f. The HUNGER verbs:  
   hyngrian ‘HUNGER; to be hungry’,
   pyrstan ‘THIRST; to be thirsty’

Among these, (ge-)limpan ‘happen’ and pyncan ‘seem’ are used in Early ME (henceforth EME) but are beginning to disappear and instead happen and seem are used in Late ME (henceforth LME). All the other verbs survived up to EModE. Thus the ME verbs that we study are as follows:

¹⁵ Among these, the syntactic frames of RUE and PLEASE verbs were examined in Kim (1995a).
The impersonal verbs in ME to be studied:

   a. The RUE verbs: reuen, shamen, eilen
   b. The PLEASE verbs: likien, listen, longen
   c. The HAPPEN verbs: limpen, happen (happenen)
   d. The SEEM verbs: thinken, semen
   e. The BEHOOVE verbs: bihoven
   f. The HUNGER verbs: hungren, thirsten

Note that there is no clear-cut demarcation between these semantic groups. For example, limpen, classified as a HAPPEN verb, is sometimes found with the meaning 'befit' and thus shares some similar syntactic patterns with the BEHOOVE verbs. In this sense, we may treat limpen as another member of the BEHOOVE verbs.

1.9 List of texts

The survey of OE data will be mainly based on the OE Concordance (C), Bosworth-Toller dictionary (BT) and its supplement (BTs) as well as primary and secondary sources. The OE Concordance is an especially good source because it contains most of the OE extant data. When the cited text is from the Concordance, it will be marked 'C' followed by the primary source of the text. When the cited text is from the Bosworth-Toller dictionary and the supplement, it will be marked simply BT and BTs respectively. When the citation is from another article, it will be marked by the author of the article followed by the primary source of the text.


Here it must be emphasized that the chronological limit of OE is by no means easy to determine. The usual linguistic division between OE and ME is the twelfth century. In this case, the text from the twelfth century, e.g. the Peterborough Chronicle, lies in between the two large historical periods. Allen (1995), for example, treats the Peterborough Chronicle as not belonging to OE. Explaining King Alfred's translation of St. Augustine's *Soliloquies* as an example, Allen (1992: 5) states, 'Since King Alfred lived in the late ninth century, it might be supposed that this text would furnish a good example of early West Saxon. However, it turns out that this text is now found in its entirety only in MS Cotton Vitellius A.XV, which belongs to the middle part of the twelfth century (Ker, 1957: item 215, article 1). Such a long gap means that this text cannot be assumed to be representative of the language of any particular period.' However, considering the fact that the twelfth century itself is a transitional stage, and thus can be treated as a part of OE stage, it does not seem necessary to reject the *Soliloquies* from consideration in discussing OE.

In this study, therefore, I assume the early twelfth century texts, such as the Peterborough Chronicle,\(^\text{16}\) as belonging to OE. This assumption is shared by not only the OE Concordance but also many previous studies (e.g. Fischer and van der Leek 1983, 1987, Koopman 1992\(^\text{17}\), Denison 1993).

---

\(^\text{16}\) The Peterborough Chronicle falls into three sections: (i) the entries up to 1121, (ii) from 1121 to 1131, (iii) 1132 to 1154. The first section ending on the leaf f. 81 are all in a homogeneous hand and ink. For the second section there are frequent changes both in the ink and also in the appearance of the writing. But Ker's opinion is that the whole of this section was written by the same scribe. The last section is in a hand completely different from the preceding one and the alphabets used are very different (Clark 1958: xii-xiii). Obviously the last section is harder to treat as an OE text than the first two. This study does not include the text from the last section in the discussion of OE.

\(^\text{17}\) In the study of OE clitic pronouns, Koopman (1992: 76) especially reexamines van Kemenade's (1987: 188ff) remarks about the Peterborough Chronicle (ChronE) that the OE part of this text (certainly from 1070 onwards) already shows a number of cases where pronouns are used in positions which they do not normally occupy in OE. Koopman's examination shows that the Peterborough Chronicle is not really different from the other and earlier OE texts investigated, with the possible exception of clitic objects of P.
For ME data, I study texts from the thirteenth century onwards. The primary sources of EME texts are as follows:

\[ AW = \text{Ancrene Wisse: edited from Ms. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 402. Tolkien, J. R. R., ed. 1962. EETS, 249.} \]


The primary source of LME texts (14c.-15c.) is as follows:


Also ME data will be based on the Middle English dictionary (M), as well as various concordances and secondary sources.

\[ M = \text{Kurath, H., S. M. Kuhn, J. Reidy, R. E. Lewis et al., eds. 1952-. Middle English Dictionary. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.} \]

1.10 Organization of the present study

All the chapters in this thesis deal with the interesting syntactic phenomena involving impersonal verbs. Chapters 2 and 3 are basically corpus studies, and examine in detail the syntactic frames occurring with a particular verb in OE and ME respectively. One of the purposes of this examination is to provide a database of each syntactic type for each verb. The main idea is that the syntactic types of impersonal verbs are so heterogeneous in both stages that those verbs cannot considered to share the same syntactic frames. Thus, the diachronic change of those verbs will show various patterns of development. This fact
causes several problems with some previous accounts. An examination of particular instantiations of each verb, however, will also lead to finding an overall tendency in the changes in concern.

Chapter 4 deals with subjecthood of the impersonal construction with two nominal arguments. In impersonal constructions which contain two semantic arguments, it has been questioned what the real subject is. It is not clear whether the subject is the (human/animate) dative/accusative case having an Experiencer theta role or the genitive/accusative having a Cause theta role. Some researchers have called impersonal constructions SUBJECTLESS simply because they contain no nominative case. Others argue that subjecthood is not always equal to the nominative case (e.g. Zaenen et al. 1985, Allen 1986). To determine whether a certain argument is a subject, we must consider legitimate syntactic properties exclusively shared by indisputable subjects, and then study which argument of the two in impersonal constructions has those properties. I claim that the oblique Experiencer argument has these subject properties more than the oblique Cause argument.

Chapter 5 deals with the history of the dummy it with impersonal verbs. Since not all the verbs we examine have clausal elements as a Cause role, naturally some verbs will not occur with the dummy. I examine the verbs which can have a clausal element and thus have the potential to develop the dummy. We observe that among these verbs, different verbs have a different history with respect to the dummy. I further investigate why there is such a difference and claim that the difference is predictable, based on other syntactic characteristics of the particular verb. I propose two constraints triggering the acquisition of the dummy. I also discuss the underlying motivation for the acquisition of the dummy and propose an alternative account over previous ones.

In chapter 6, I examine the development of impersonal verbs which once occurred or now occur in Subject Equi-NP Deletion (or Control) constructions (e.g. John likes to
leave) or Subject Raising constructions (e.g. John seems to have left). Some impersonal verbs are irrelevant but others occur in one or both of these constructions. I account for the relationship between these two constructions and between these and their counterparts with the oblique (mostly dative) Experiencer. In addition, I attempt to account for a very idiosyncratic Raising construction, e.g. him seems to have left, meaning 'he seems to have left', which occurred in ME and disappeared in EModE.

In chapter 7, I attempt to explain the underlying trigger (or cause) of all the changes involved. I first argue against the most dominant theory claiming the loss of case marking distinctions (with concomitant fixing of word order, in most cases) as the cause of the changes in concern. Then I propose an alternative explanation, namely the Prototypical Subject Requirement, which does not crucially count on the loss of case marking. This new constraint (or parameter) will be proven to be well-motivated by other independent supporting evidence.
CHAPTER 2

A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY OF IMPERSONAL VERBS IN OE

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the syntactic frames of each individual impersonal verb in OE. In chapter 1, we saw that an impersonal verb can occur basically in three types of constructions: Impersonal construction (= type (i)), Nominative-Cause construction (= type (ii)), Nominative-Experiencer construction (= type (iii)). Each construction may potentially have the following possible syntactic frames: ¹

¹ I do not further classify verbs according to whether the Experiencer occurs in the dative or accusative or both. In general, the dative case is prevalent: e.g. gelimpan, pyncan, behofian. But there is a verb like langian 'to long' where the accusative is mostly found (thus, hine (ACC) instead of him (DAT)). For the verb hyngrian 'to hunger' both cases are found, as in the following examples:

(i) þa hyne hingrede
when him(ACC) hungered
'when he hungered' (C: Mt(WSCp) 12.3)

(ii) ne him hingrian ne mæg
nor him(DAT) hunger(INF) not can
'nor can he hunger' (C: ÆHom 2.109)

By contrast, lician 'to like', for example, occurs mostly with the dative case except for the following ambiguous example:

(iii) we a worhton, þa hwele þe we mihtan, georne þæt
we ever worked while we could, eagerly that(NOM/ACC)
God(ACC/NOM) licode
God pleased
'we always have done earnestly, while we were able to, what pleased God' (C: WHom 13.77)

cf.
(1) Possible syntactic frames of impersonal verbs:

In the syntactic frame of \([\text{NP}_1 (\text{Experiencer}) - \text{V} - \text{X} (\text{Cause})]\) in which the order of these constituents is not specified,

a. Impersonal construction (= type (i)):
   - (i-1). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{OBL}] - \text{V} - \text{NP}_2 [\text{GEN}]\]
   - (i-2). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{OBL}] - \text{V} - \text{NP}_2 [\text{ACC}]\]
   - (i-3). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{OBL}] - \text{V} - \text{S}'[\text{FIN}]\]
   - (i-4). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{OBL}] - \text{V} - \text{S}'[\text{INF}]\]

b. Nominative-Cause construction (= type (ii)):
   - (ii). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{OBL}] - \text{V} - \text{NP}[\text{NOM}]\]

c. Nominative-Experiencer construction (= type (iii)):
   - (iii-1). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{NOM}] - \text{V} - \text{NP}_2 [\text{GEN}]\]
   - (iii-2). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{NOM}] - \text{V} - \text{NP}_2 [\text{ACC}]\]
   - (iii-3). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{NOM}] - \text{V} - \text{S}' [\text{FIN}]\]
   - (iii-4). \([\text{NP}_1 [\text{NOM}] - \text{V} - \text{S}' [\text{INF}]\]

An argument — especially the Cause argument in the place of \(X\) — may not occur in the case of some verbs. In these cases, I will simply describe these instances in terms of broader types, i.e. types (i), (ii), and (iii). Also, for the types (i-3) and (i-4), although Fischer and van der Leek (1983) classified them as impersonal (or subjectless), it is difficult to determine at this moment whether they are truly subjectless or whether the embedded clauses (i.e. \(S'[\text{FIN}], S'[\text{INF}]\)) function as subjects. For this reason, Denison (1993) calls them type \(i/ii\), which means that they are indeterminate between types (i) and

\[\text{(iv)}\]

he Goode anum licide
he God(DAT) only pleased
"he pleased the only God" (GDPref. 2(C) 95.25)

In (iii), accepting the general assumption that the verb lician was not used with a nominative Experiencer, we end up with the accusative Experiencer. Allen (p.c.) comments that the example is found in two texts, both of which stem from the same exemplar and both of which are at least two removes from the original text and thus there is a possibility here that an error crept into the exemplar and was copied into these two texts.

However, for any verbs not attested with genuine accusative, it would be hard to say that those verbs would not have accusative Experiencer, because impersonal verbs typically have the Experiencers like \(me, us, pe, eow\), etc., indistinguishable between the accusative and the dative. Therefore, it will be more plausible to collapse dative and accusative Experiencers as one type. The dative/accusative Experiencer is thus often mentioned as oblique Experiencer throughout this study.
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Thus, here we use these types (i-3) and (i-4) as interchangeable with type (i/ii), and theory-neutrally call them non-nominative constructions (= type (i/ii)). A prepositional phrase (or PP) may be considered a Cause argument alternatively with a genitive NP, as in:

(2) þu eart sunu min leof, on þe ic wel licade you are son my beloved, in you I(NOM) well liked(1/3-SG) 'you are my beloved son, whom I liked well' (C: MkGl(Ru) 1.11)

However, as Denison (1990: 115) has pointed out, it is questionable whether a PP can consistently be a Cause argument, because in some sentences, a PP is found along with another Cause argument:

(3) has hing ic on þam foresrecenan bisceope swiþe lufie these things I in the aforementioned bishop very-much love 'these things I love very much in the aforementioned bishop’ (C: Bede 206.18)

In this survey, therefore, I do not include a prepositional phrase as a Cause argument. But when notable uses of a PP are found with specific verbs, those instances are cited in appropriate places. In (1) above, the broad classifications of types (i), (ii), and (iii) in Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and of types N, S, I, and II in Elmer (1981) are subdivided in more detail. The following is a rough correspondence between the features in (1) and classes of Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and Elmer (1981) respectively.

(i-1). type i type N
(i-2). type i type N
(i-3) (=i/ii). type i type S
(i-4) (=i/ii). type i type S
(ii). type ii type I
(iii-1). type iii type II
(iii-2). type iii transitive
(iii-3). type iii Personal
(iii-4). type iii Personal
By treating four categories as one category type (i), for example, Fischer and van der Leek (1983) fail to recognize the variation across the type with regard to a lexical item. Similarly Elmer (1981) also overlooks, for example, the variation across different types of clauses, namely finite and infinitival clauses, treating them as one. Nine classes in (1) are a further elaboration of Denison (1990) where five classes were studied. In the following sections, we study individual verbs with respect to their syntactic frames.

2.2 Syntactic frames of OE impersonal verbs

Before further discussion, presenting the paradigms of nouns, pronouns and determiners will be helpful, in order for the reader to understand OE case systems. The OE nominal inflectional system has five grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, and instrumental) and three genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter). Among these, the instrumental case is not relevant for the discussion in this study. Table 2.1 in the following is the paradigms for personal pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG 'I'</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ic</td>
<td>wit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>uncer</td>
<td>ure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>unc</td>
<td>us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>me, mec</td>
<td>unc</td>
<td>us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG 'thou'</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>git</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>pin</td>
<td>incer</td>
<td>eower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>inc</td>
<td>eow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>pe, pec</td>
<td>inc</td>
<td>eow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Paradigms of personal pronouns in OE
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Nouns show more syncretism, i.e. different cases sharing the same inflectional endings. The following Table 2.2 shows typical paradigms of STRONG NOUNS of each gender, e.g. engel ‘angel’ (MASC), scip ‘ship’ (NEUT), giefu ‘gift’ (FEM), as well as those of weak nouns, e.g. nama ‘name’ (MASC):^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong MASC</th>
<th>Strong NEUT</th>
<th>Strong FEM</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG</td>
<td>engel</td>
<td>scip</td>
<td>giefu</td>
<td>nama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>engles</td>
<td>scipes</td>
<td>giefe</td>
<td>naman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>engle</td>
<td>scipe</td>
<td>giefe</td>
<td>naman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>engel</td>
<td>scip</td>
<td>giefe</td>
<td>naman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Paradigms of strong and weak nouns in OE

Syncretism of nouns makes it difficult to determine in numerous examples the exact grammatical case of a given NP. In such instances, a determiner (or demonstrative), if any, tells which case the NP belongs to, because determiners show less syncretism than nouns.

The following Table 2.3 is the paradigm for determiner se ‘the, that’ in OE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>þæs</td>
<td>þara, þæra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>þæm, þam</td>
<td>þæm, þam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>þæne</td>
<td>þæm, þam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Paradigm of the determiner se ‘the, that’ in OE

---

^2 These paradigms are from Mitchell and Robinson (1990: 18-27).
In chapter 1, we divided the impersonal verbs into six classes. Now we describe the behavior of each class verb-by-verb.

2.2.1 The RUE verbs

In the following we study the syntactic frames of *hreowan* 'to rue', *sceamian* 'to shame', and *eglian* 'to ail', which we have classified together semantically. These verbs are all two-place predicates.

**Hreowan**

The surface forms surveyed are: *hreaw, hreow, hreowan, hreowen, hreowep, hreowp, gehreaw, gehreow, gehreowan, gehreowap, gehreowe, gehreowep, ofhreaw, ofhreow, ofhreowep, ofhreowp, ofhryw, ofhrywp*. Altogether, there are 68 occurrences in our corpus, i.e. the Concordance.

This verb occurs in type (i), impersonal construction. Type (i-1) with a genitive NP is found, as in:

(5) Type (i-1)

```plaintext
Ne þe hreowan þearf ealles swa micles swa
not thee(DAT/ACC) rue need all(GEN) as much as
þu me sealdest.
thou me gave
'You need not regret having given me as much as you did.' (BTs: Seel 150)
```

Obvious occurrences of NP[ACC] Cause exist but are rare. However, the number will increase if numerous sentences indeterminate between nominative and accusative are
considered. Admittedly, there are potential problems in the interpretation of each case, but at the same time there are some indications that allow a decision between nominative and accusative. In the following the Cause NP should be interpreted as accusative rather than nominative because the finite verb *hreowede* is not in agreement with it:

(6) Type (i-2):

a. *ponne hreowede hyre swiðe þa yfelan dæda*
   
   Then rues(SG) her(DAT) very-much the evil deeds(NOM/ACC-PL)
   
   ‘Then she rules the evil deeds very much.’ (C: HomS 4 (FörstVercHom 9) 80)

b. *hælend þa tosomne cliopade leomeras his cwaep mec*
   
   lord then together called learners his said me(ACC)
   
   *hreowep pas mengu*
   
   rues(SG) these people(NOM/ACC-PL)
   
   ‘Then the Lord called his disciples to him and said, “I feel sorry for these people.”’
   
   (C: MtGl(Ru) 15.32)

   cf. Lat. Jesus autem convocatis discipulis suis dixit miseror huic turbae

---

3 Allen (p.c.) suggests that (6a) may be seen as the case that the postverbal nominative is failing to trigger subject-verb agreement, which happens occasionally even with indisputable subjects. From the apparent exceptional examples in which lack of subject-verb agreement has been detected, Schrader (1887: 16) suggests that ‘bei vorstehendem Prädicate ist dem Gedanken das Subject oft nicht so präsent, wie bei nachstehendem, und es steht daher zuweilen im Singuar trotz pluralem Subjecte’ ['with a preceding predicate the idea of the subject is often not as present in the mind as when the predicate follows, and it is thus sometimes in the singular despite the plural subject'] (cited from Mitchell 1985: 637). However, suggesting alternative analyses, Mitchell himself does not entirely agree to Schrader’s suggestion, saying ‘I am unwilling to accept the notion that the combination singular verb + plural subject was as common as is suggested by Bethurum (see § 1520) [Bethurum 1957 -- HK] and Brook (p.84) [Brook 1955 -- HK]: “when plural subject follows its verb, the verb is often, but not invariably, in the singular”.’ Moreover, it seems unreasonable to be unduly sceptical about the subject-verb agreement. If we did not trust given morphological information such as grammatical case and subject-verb agreement, it would be very difficult to perform a nice and productive linguistic study in the topic that involves many indeterminate examples.

4 Since example (6b) is a translation from Latin, one might say that this example should not be considered. Admittedly the first clause follows the Latin phrase fairly closely. However, the second clause that we are actually concerned with does not. The Latin *miseror* (a variant of *misereor* (1-SG passive) as found in a different edition given below) is not an impersonal predicate taking an accusative Experiencer:

(i) Lat. Jesus autem, convocatis discipulis suis dixit: Misereor turbae,...
   
   (Biblia Sacra 1732, Evang. Sec. Matth. 15.32)

Moreover, *huic turbae* ‘this crowd’ is a dative, different from OE phrase. *Misereor*, as found in the above eighteenth century edition, usually takes a genitive case form. Thus, on either reading, it is hard to see OE phrase *mec hreoweth* as following the Latin syntax, whatever it may be. In addition, I choose to accept (6b) as reflecting real OE possibilities with *hroewan* because there are other sentences which evince this pattern (note that with *lician* in (2) (also in (24)), I reject the evidenced type (iii) because that the Latinate sentence is the only such example with *lician*. 
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A finite clause is very frequently found in non-nominative constructions, as in (7):

(7) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

Hreaw hine swide hët he folcmægha fruman aweahite
rued him(ACC) much that he nations first-born aroused
‘He repented much that he had stirred to life the first-born of the nations.’ (Gen 12:76)

By contrast, an infinitival clause does not occur with *hreowan* in a non-nominative construction. This contrast tells us that considering both finite and infinitival clauses as one general class fails to capture an important fact about this impersonal verb.

The causative meaning of the verb *hreowan* ‘to cause sorrow, depress’, i.e. the Nominative-Cause construction (type (ii)), is found, as in (8):

(8) Type (ii):

Gif dú ongite ðæt him his synna hreowen
if thou understand that him(DAT) his sin(NOM-PL) rue(PL)
‘if you understand that his sins cause him sorrow.’ (BT: L.de Cf 2)

For a Nominative-Experiencer construction (= type (iii)), a genitive Cause is attested:

(9) Type (iii-1):

Hie ne magon ealneg ealla on ane tid
they(NOM) not can(PL) always all(GEN) at one time
emnsare hreowan
equal-sore rue
‘They cannot always repent at the same time for everything with equal contrition.’

(UP 413.29)

However, an accusative Cause is not found with a nominative Experiencer in our corpus. Elmer (1981) explicitly states that there is no genuine evidence in OE of transitive use as in a putative *he hreowep pa āeda* ‘he repents the deeds’. 
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Although a finite clause is very frequently found in non-nominative constructions, it is not found with a nominative Experiencer in our corpus. Elmer also finds no occurrences of these. As in type (i), an infinitival clause is not found in type (iii), either.

In sum, *hreowan* is apparently found in all types (i), (ii), and (iii) of Fischer and van der Leek (1983). Further inspection, however, shows that when the verb occurs in impersonal constructions, it selects more varieties of categories as a Cause argument (i.e. NP[GEN], NP[ACC], and S[FIN], but not S[INF]) than when it occurs in personal constructions (i.e. only NP[GEN]). It is also interesting that both type (iii) with the receptive meaning 'to regret, repent' of the verb like (9) and type (ii) with causative meaning 'depress' like (8) are found in the same stage.

**Sceamian**

The surface forms surveyed are: *sceamap, sceamian, sceamiap, sceamie, sceamien, sceamode, scamap, scamian, scamia, scamie, scamien, scamode, scamodon*.

Altogether there are 109 occurrences in our corpus.

In an impersonal construction, a genitive NP is frequently found with *sceamian*, as in (10):

(10) Type (i-1):

a. Martiri ne sceamode de min ofer eordan, ne
   Martyrius, not shamed(1/3-SG) thee I(GEN) on earth, nor
   me ne sceamanð pin on heofonum
   me not shames(3-SG) thou(GEN) in heaven

   'Martyrius, you were not ashamed of me on earth, nor will I be ashamed of you in heaven.'   (ÆCHom i. 336.20)

b. Oft done geþyldegestan scamap ðæs siges
   often the most-patient(ACC) shames the victory(GEN)
   'Often the most patient man is ashamed of the victory'   (CP 227.19)
But no genuine accusative Cause is found other than some indeterminate cases. A finite clause occurs in non-nominative constructions, as in:

(11) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. hy scemad dæt hy betan heora
   them(ACC) shames(3-SG) that they compensate-for their
   misdæda
   misdeeds

   ‘They are ashamed to make up for their misdeeds.’ (BT)

b. ðæt mænigne mon sceamad ðæt he wiorðe wyrsæ
   that many(ACC) man shames(3-SG) that he become worse
   ‘that many a man is ashamed to become worse’ (C: Bo 30.69.11)

An infinitival clause is also found in non-nominative constructions, as in (12):

(12) Type (i-4) (i/ii):

a. Ac me sceamað nu to gereccenne hu...
   but me(DAT/ACC) shames(3-SG) now to recount how
   ‘but it shames me now to recount how...’ (LS (MaryofEgypt) 2.327)

b. Us sceamað to secgenne ealle ða sceandlican
   us(DAT/ACC) shames(3-SG) to say all the disgraceful
   wigluna
   witchcraft
   ‘it shames me to say all the disgraceful witchcraft.’ (LS (Auguries) 1.100)

For type (ii), Elmer’s survey shows no instances of causative meaning of sceamian, but we find the following ambiguous example, indeterminate between types (ii) and (iii-2):

---

5 The following example might be a candidate for type (i):

(i) eal ðæt hwæne sceamode scylwa on worulde...
   all that one(ACC) shamed(SG) fault(ACC/GEN-PL) in world
   ‘all of the guilty acts in the world which one was ashamed of...’ (C: JDay ii. 141)

Because this example may be interpreted as type (i-1) which is commonly found with sceamian, it will be safer to interpret this as type (i-1).
(13) Indeterminate type (ii):

\[
\text{And heora æfstu eac ealle sceamien and their hatreds(NOM/ACC-PL) also all(NOM/ACC-PL) shame(PL)}
\]

‘And their hatreds would also cause all to feel shame’  (PPs 69.4)

This example is indeterminate because both æfstu and ealle can be nominative or accusative. Since neither of these types are found with genuine examples in our corpus, it would appear to be impossible to classify this example conclusively. However, type (iii-2) personal usage was very limited in OE in general and, with this verb, type (ii) is used in a later stage. Moreover, the relative order of subject and object in OE is subject-first in unmarked order. In this example heora æfstu ‘their hatreds’ comes first, even though it is HEAVIER than the possible object ealle ‘all’, a bare pronominal. All these facts lead us to conclude that (13) is more likely to be a type (ii).

For type (iii), a genitive Cause is found but an accusative Cause is not:

(14) Type (iii-1):

a. Ic ðæs næfre ne sceamige l(NOM) that(GEN) never not shame(SG)

‘I am not ashamed of that.’  (BT: Ps.Th. 24.1)

b. dios sæ cwïð ðæt ðu ðin scamige Sidon this sea says that thou(NOM) thyself(GEN) be-ashamed Sidon

‘This sea tells you to be ashamed of yourself, Sidon.’  (CP 409.33)

---

6 It has been claimed that the unmarked word order in OE is SOV, S-X-prt-V (Koopman 1985). V-F (Pintzuk & Kroch, 1985) based on the order in the non-root clause. It has been also claimed that in the root clause the word order is SVO: e.g. Venneman (1974). In both unmarked orders, however, subject precedes object.

7 The following indeterminate example may be considered:

(i) hi ne scamodon spræca his ofer ele they(NOM/ACC) not shamed(PL) speech(NOM/ACC/GEN-PL) their over oil ‘they were not ashamed of their words over oil (?)’ (PsGU(Oess) 54.22)

cf. Lat. Molliti sunt sermones eius super oleum (His words are milder than oil.)

Since the OE glosses do not exactly match those of Latin, it is probably the mistake of the glossator in word-to-word translation. Here ‘speech’ is more likely to be a genitive because a genitive cause is found elsewhere in type (iii), while an accusative cause is in general not attested at all with sceamian in OE.
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As in type (i), a finite clause is found as a Cause in type (iii) too, as in:

(15) Type (iii-3):

\[
gif \text{ we scomiaē bæt we to uncubum monnum suelc sprecen}
\]

\[
\text{if we shame(PL) that we to unknown men such speak}
\]

‘if we are ashamed to speak so to strangers’ (CP 63.5))

By contrast, an infinitival clause is not attested in our corpus.

In sum, the verb \textit{sceamian} occurs in all three types of constructions of Fischer and van der Leek (1983)—type (i), type (ii), and type (iii), although it varies as to which categories are taken as a Cause argument.

\textit{Eglian}

The surface forms surveyed are: \textit{eglap, eglde, egle, eglede, eglep, eglian, eglige, eglode}. All together there are 35 occurrences in our corpus.

For type (i), \textit{eglian} is not found with any unambiguous genitive Cause. Also, no unambiguous accusative Cause is found, though there are some examples which are indeterminate between an accusative and a nominative Cause.\footnote{In the following example, \textit{nan ðing} is indeterminate between the nominative and the accusative, thus ambiguous between types (i-2) and (iii):}

(i) him \textit{nan ðing} wiðinan ne eglæ ðænigre

\text{him(DAT) no thing(NOM/ACC) within not ails any(DAT/GEN)}

\text{brosnunge oðde gewæcednyse}

\text{corruption(DAT/GEN) or weakness(DAT/GEN)}

‘nothing pains him within [it] of any corruption or weakness’ (C: ÆCHom ii, 43 321.95)

However it is more likely that \textit{nan ðing} is a nominative because the genuine nominative cause is found in other instances.
(16) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

Him [Cain] eglde ðæt he [Abel] wæs betra ðonne he him(DAT) ailed that he was better than he 'he was troubled that he was better than he' (CP 235. 8)

Compared to other types, type (ii) is very commonly found with *eglian* as in (17):

(17) Type (ii):

a. þæt he us eglan moste that he(NOM) us(DAT/ACC) might(SG) 'that he might trouble us.' (BT: Jud 185)

b. Him næfre syðdan seo adl ne eglode him(DAT) never since the illness not ailed 'The illness never ailed him afterwards.' (BT: Guth 60.8)

For type (iii), a genitive Cause is not found, as also in type (i). But an accusative Cause is found in a single example:

(18) Type (iii-2)?:

Se man se þe unclæne neat ðigelð for his ðearfum, the man(NOM) who unclean animal consume for his needs, ne ðe eglad þæt nawiht not ails that nothing/not-at-all

'The person who consumes unclean animals for his needs will suffer nothing.' (C: Conf 1.1(Spindler) 399)

Since this is the only example in which the verb *eglian* is ever used in a personal construction and also the text itself is a translation from Latin, it is not certain whether this represents a genuine usage of the nominative Experiencer construction.

Whereas finite clauses are found in type (i) (or (i/ii)), they are not attested in type (iii). As in type (i) (or (i/ii)), infinitival clauses are not found in type (iii), either.

43
Except for (18) which is a translation from Latin, the causative construction is dominant for *eglian* in OE. Even type (i) is rarely found except with a finite clause.

The attested syntactic frames of the RUE verbs in OE are summarized in Table 2.4:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUE verbs</th>
<th><em>Hreowan</em></th>
<th><em>Sceamian</em></th>
<th><em>Eglian</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 2.4: Syntactic frames of the RUE verbs in OE

The number of tokens of each verb above is: *hreowan* (68), *sceamian* (109), *eglian* (35). Table 1 shows that semantically similar verbs have different attested syntactic behaviors in the same historical stage. The verb *eglian* is totally lacking in the genitive Cause and infinitival Cause while others show some instances of them. Also it is interesting that we cannot find any instance of infinitival Cause with *hreowan* while a finite Cause is commonly found.

---

9 In this and the following tables, the symbol ‘x?’ is used when the existence of a particular syntactic frame is very plausible on the basis of ambiguous examples but there is no direct evidence. The symbol ‘?’ is used when it is totally indeterminate. Finally, ‘??’ is used when the existence of a syntactic frame is questionable because it may not reflect OE syntax or because it is attested only in indeterminate examples which are more likely to be interpreted otherwise.
2.2.2 The PLEASE verbs

The verbs studied in this class are *lician*, *langian*, and *lystan* which are two-place predicates.

*Lician*

The surface forms surveyed are: *lician*, *liciap*, *licie*, *licien*, *licoden*, *licode*, *licodon*, *licap*. There are altogether 227 tokens in our corpus.

Although Denison (1990) notes that no genuine occurrences of the genitive NP are found, we find the following example as a candidate:

(19) Type (i-1):

Petrus cwæð, wel me licað pæs pe þu sægst
Peter said: it pleases me well what you say

'C: GD 1(H) 4.20.4' (i.e., Gregory's Dialogues, 1.420.4)

[cf. Petrus cwæð: wel me licað pæt þu sægst. (C: GDPref 3(C) 34.246.17)
Petrus cwæð: me licað pæt þu sægst. (C: GD 2(H) 3.108.22)]

An accusative Cause is also found in type (i), as in:

---

10 Denison (1990: 114) states that the OE *Concordance* leads to perhaps four examples of type (i) (*ge-lician*), all of which have the Cause argument apparently in the accusative not in the genitive. Others have a sentential Cause, or a nominal Cause indeterminately nominative or accusative and are thus ambiguous between types (i) and (ii). Elmer's (1981) survey also shows that this verb is never found in the syntactic frame of [NP(DAT) - NP(GEN)] in later stages, either. Allen (p.c.) comments that the text of Gregory's Dialogues which was composed earlier has *lysten* in this sentence and thus it is possible that the reviser of this manuscript made a change to the verb but failed to change the form of the demonstrative as he should have. However, we have in fact no clue that this example was a scribal error and I bring this example as it is attested.
(20) Type (i-2):

Ac wel licad wuldræd drehtne, þa þe hine
but well likes(SG) glory lord(DAT) those(ACC-PL) who him
him ond rædað dædum and wordum
themselves dread in-deeds and words

‘But the Lord of glory is well pleased with those who fear him in their deeds and speeches.’  (PPs 146.12)

Finite and infinitival clauses are found in non-nominative constructions, too:

(21) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

þa licade hire ... þæt heo wolde þa baan up adon
then liked her(DAT) that she would the bones up take
‘Then she wanted to take up the bones.’  (BT: Ælfred Bede 292.5)

(22) Type (i-4) (= i/ii):

þe licode mid him to beonne
thee(DAT/ACC) liked(SG) with them to be
‘You liked to be with them.’  (C: Ps 43.5)

For type (ii), numerous instances are found, as in (23):

(23) Type (ii):

a. Æghwylc man ... þurh gode dæda Gode lician sceal
every person(NOM) through good deeds God(DAT) like must
‘Everyone must please God through good deeds.’  (BIHom 129.33)

b. forþam hy þe þa licodon
because they(NOM-PL) thee(DAT/ACC) then liked(PL)
‘because they then pleased you’  (C: Ps 43.5)

Allen (1995: 78) suggests that licap could be a plural of an otherwise unattested Class I verb *lican. While it is true that some Germanic languages show a Class I verb corresponding to this verb, OE does not. So, the burden of proof would be on anyone arguing for licap as a plural rather than the straightforward interpretation of it as a singular of lician.
For type (iii), no genuine examples of genitive and accusative Causes are found and neither are any examples of finite and infinitival clauses. But a single example with a possible PP-Cause is found, cited by Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 352) as a crucial example for type (iii). Note, however, that this is a close translation from Latin:

(24) (=2):

\[ \text{hu eart sunu min leof, on he ic wel licade} \]

\[ \text{you are one my dear in whom/thee I(NOM) well liked} \]

\[ \text{you are my dear son in whom I was well pleased' (Mark; Skeat 1871-87: 11)} \]

cf. Lat. Tu es filius meus dilectus, in te complacui.

Since Fischer and van der Leek (1983) introduced this example as type (iii), many following studies have questioned the legitimacy of this example because this is a Latin-based sentence. Among those see Allen (1986: 387), Denison (1990: 114), and Harris and Campbell (1995: 84).

In sum, lician is used in types (i) and (ii). Type (iii) is questionable. All possible categories for a Cause argument were used when occurring in type (i). However, it is notable that the causative meaning of ‘to please’ of type (ii) is much more commonly found.

---

12 Only indeterminate sentences such as the following are found:

(i) we a worhton, ... georne þæt God licode
we ever did earnestly what(NOM/ACC) God(NOM/ACC) liked(SG)
‘we always have done earnestly what God liked (or we always have done earnestly what pleased God)’
(C: WHom 13 77)

Since both þæt and God are totally indeterminate, this can be analyzed in three possible ways: i) impersonal with the accusative Cause þæt, ii) causative meaning ‘please’ treating þæt as nominative and God as accusative, iii) personal with receptive meaning ‘like’ (i.e. personal) treating God as nominative and þæt as accusative (i.e. transitive use). Since a genuine usage of types (i) and (ii), but not type (iii), is found, we may conclude that this example belongs to (i) or (ii), but not to (iii).
Langian

The surface forms surveyed are: *longap, langian, langiap, langode, langap*. Langian is also found to occur with prepositional phrases having *on, for, after*. In general, the occurrences are very limited (15 tokens) and the non-impersonal usage of types (ii) and (iii) is hardly found. In type (i), only the genitive Cause is found, as in:

(25) Type (i-1):

a. Hine pæs heardost langode hwanne he...
   him(ACC) that(GEN) eagerly longed when he 'he eagerly longed for the time when he...
   (BT: BlHom 227.1)

b. Me a langad pæs pe ic pe on me(DAT/ACC) ever longs that(GEN) which I you in
   ñyssum hyndum wat this affliction know
   'I am always distressed by the fact that I know you being afflicted' (BTs: Seel 154)

No genuine accusative Cause is found. In the following, *awuht* may be indeterminate between nominative and accusative:

(26) Langað þe awuht Adam, up to gode?
    longs you(DAT/ACC) anything(NOM/ACC) Adam up from God
    'Do you long for anything, Adam, from God above?' (C: GenA,B 495)

But *awuht* is also used adverbially. Thus, this example may be simply interpreted as a type (i). The alternative interpretation, as type (ii), is rather unusual because a genuine type (ii) is not attested later in ME either.

The following example is ambiguous between type (i) and type (iii) because *hæleð* can be either a nominative or accusative:
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An indeterminate example between type (i) and (iii):

hæleð langode, wæglīðende, swilce wif heora, hwonne hero(NOM/ACC) longed seafarers likewise wives their when hie ... they ... 'the hero, the seafarers and their wives also, yearned for when...' (C: Gen A, B 1431)

From the fact that genuine type (i) is attested while type (iii) is not, it is safer to assume that (27) is impersonal. Then we may conclude that a personal construction was not used with this verb in OE. It is notable that langian is not found in type (ii) while type (ii) is quite commonly used in other verbs.

Lystan

The surface forms surveyed are: list, lyst, lystan, lystæ, lystæn, lyste, lystep, lyston, lysp. There are 186 tokens in our corpus. In type (i), a genitive Cause is commonly found with lystan, as in:

(28) Type (i-1):

a. δīses me lyst nu get bet
this(GEN) me(DAT/ACC) pleases/is pleased now yet better
'I am still better pleased with this'
(BT: Bt 35.4)

b. hine nanes hinges ne lyste
him(ACC) none(GEN) thing(GEN) not pleased/was pleased
on δīsse worulde
in this world

'he cared for nothing in this world'
(BT: Bt 35.6)

We find the following example with accusative Cause in type (i):
Type (i-2):

Hu done cealdan magan ungeliclice mettas
how the cold stomach(ACC) different food(ACC-PL)
lyste
desired(SG)

'how the cold stomach wanted different meals'  (BTs:Lch.ii.160,8)

Finite (= type (i-3)) and infinitival clauses (= type (i-4)) as a Cause argument are found:

Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. me lyste bet þu me sædest
me(DAT/ACC) desired better that you me said
'I was pleased better that you told me...'  (BT: Bt 34.6)

b. me lysteþ, Petrus, þæt ic nu gyt sæcge fela
me(DAT/ACC) desires Peter that I now get say much
'Peter, I am pleased that I still now say a lot...'  (C: GD 2(C) 36.174.27)

Type (i-4) (= i/ii):

a. Hine ne lyst his willan wyrcean
him(ACC) not desires his will to-work(Bare-INF)
'he does not want to do his will'  (BT: BlHom 51.16)

b. him lyst gehyran pa halgan lare
him(DAT) desires to-hear(Bare-INF) the holy teaching
'he wishes to hear the holy doctrine'  (C: ÆLet 2(Wulfstan I) 5)

For type (ii), no genuine example is found in our corpus. For type (iii), only a genitive NP, as in (32), and an infinitival clause are found as a Cause argument, as in (33):

Type (iii-1):

seo sawl þyrsteð and lysteð Godes reces
the soul(NOM) thirsts and desires God's kingdom(GEN)
'the soul thirsts and desires the kingdom of God'  (BTs: Gr.D 244.27)

---

I interpret mettas as an accusative, not as a nominative case failing to trigger verb agreement because it is not postverbal (see footnote 5 regarding occasional postverbal subjects failing to trigger verb agreement).
In sum, *lystan* occurs in two types of constructions, type (i) and (iii), although it varies as to which categories the verb selects as a Cause argument. The attested syntactic frames of the PLEASE verbs in OE are summarized in Table 2.5. The number of tokens of each verb above is: *lician* (227), *langian* (15), *lystan* (186):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE verbs</th>
<th>Lician</th>
<th>Langian</th>
<th>Lystan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 2.5: Syntactic frames of the PLEASE verbs in OE

### 2.2.3 The HAPPEN verbs

*(Ge-)*limpan

For the meaning ‘happen’, we investigate *(ge-)*limpan in OE. The surface forms surveyed are: *gelamp, gelimpan, gelimpap, gelimpæp, gelimpe, gelimp(e)p, limpan.*
limpatz, limpap, limpe, limped, limpep, limph, gelympan, gelympe, gelymp(e)p, lymp.

There are 621 tokens in our corpus.

With this verb, type (i) is often attested in which the dative Experiencer is present. But this verb does not occur with any nominal Cause such as genitive (type (i-1)) and accusative NPs (type (i-2)). Instead, the corresponding Cause may be expressed adverbially, as with wirse in (34a) and how in (34b). Gelimpan is often found in an adverbial subordinate clause such as (34b):

(34) Type (i):

a. Him dær wirse gelamp
   him(DAT) there worse happened
   ‘a worse thing happened there to him’ (C: Sat 24)

b. hu him on his life gelimpan scolde
   how him(DAT) in his life happen should
   ‘what should happen to him in his life’ (C: ÆCHom ii, 11 99.251)

For type (i/ii), we find numerous examples in which the Cause argument is a finite clause:

(35) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. me gelamp þæt ic wæs andweard sumum
   me(DAT/ACC) happened that I was present some
   brēðer æt his forðfore
   brother(DAT) at his departure
   ‘[it] happened to me that I was present with a certain brother at his departure.’
   (C: GDPref 4(C) 4.267.13)

b. oððæt eft gelamp þæt hie afyrde eft feond in firenum
   until again happened that they removed again fiend in crime
   ‘until [it] happened that they again drove away the enemy in crime.’ (C: Sat 472)

As we see in (35b), often the oblique Experiencer is not expressed.

In contrast to the situation with finite clause, the examples of an infinitival (bare infinitive or to-infinitive) are rare in this period. But Ogura (1986) finds the following example as a candidate:
(36) Type (i-4):

then happened him(DAT) suddenly with gift of-the divine
faith through relics of-the holy father Cuthbert
healed to-be(Bare-INF)

Lat. contigit eum subito divinæ pietatis gratia per sanctissimi Patris Cudbercti reliquias sanari

'then suddenly with the gift of divine faith he happened to be healed by means of relics of the holy father Cuthbert' (Bede 4 33.382.11)

Although this is a Latin translation, the difference between Latin contigit, with no object, and OE gelamp him, with an object, implies that the translator did not blindly follow the Latin morpho-syntax.

Type (ii), i.e. the nominal Cause argument in the nominative, is also found, as in:

(37) Type (ii):

a. hire se willa gelamp þurh beam godes
    her(DAT) the pleasure(NOM) happened through son of-God
    'The pleasure happened to her through the son of God' (C: El 961)

b. ðisum dæle gelimpað ðreo ðing
    this part(DAT) happen(PL) three things(PL)
    'Three things belong to this part' (C: ÆGram 223.7)

In the above example (37a), se willa 'the pleasure' in the nominative is the Cause (or Agent) argument, i.e. something that happened, and hire 'her' in the dative case is the one which experiences the happening.

For type (iii) in which the Experiencer is a nominative NP, no clear examples are found in my corpus.
2.2.4 The SEEM verbs

\textit{pyncan}

For the meaning 'seem' in OE, I examine \textit{pyncan}. The surface forms surveyed are: \texttt{pinc, pincan, pincap, pincæ, pince, pincean, pinceap, pinced, pinceg, pincen, pincep, pincb, pincpe, pyncan, pyncap, pyncæ, pynce, pyncean, pynceap, pyncen, pyncest, pyncet, pyncep}. The number of token is 596.

Because of the copulative property of the meaning of 'seem', this verb occurs with a predicative noun or adjective in numerous examples. The examples without clear predicative noun or adjectives are type (i-3), parenthetical clauses, as in (38a) or relative clauses, as in (38b):

(38) Type (i):

a. \texttt{sæg ponne us ðæt ðæ ðyncæ is alæfed to sellane}
\texttt{say then us what you(DAT/ACC) may-seem is granted to give}
\texttt{gæfel kasere}
\texttt{tribute to-emperor}

\texttt{'Then tell us what seems to you is allowed to pay tribute to the emperor.'}
\texttt{(C: MtGl (Ru) 22.17)}

b. \texttt{gif hi swa gehæwde wæron swa swa urum eagum ðincð.}
\texttt{if they so slight were so as our eyes(DAT) seems}
\texttt{as seems to our eyes'}
\texttt{(C: ÆTemp 1.30)}

In the examples like (38b) in which 'seem' occurs in a relative clause, \texttt{swa swa urum eagum ðincð, 'as seems to our eyes'}, the relativizer \texttt{swa swa 'as'}, thus in turn the preceding clause, may have the function of predicative. At any rate, it is notable that most of the type (i) without a predicative occur in subordinated adverbial (e.g. with \textit{how}) or relative clauses such as (38b), which provide some predication. As expected, there are numerous examples in which \textit{pyncan} occurs with a predicative, as in:
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(39) *pyncan* + predicative noun/adjective:

a. *Hwæt þinceð eow nu* what seems you(DAT/ACC) now
   ‘What do you think now?’  (C: Horn 24 (VercHom 1) 125)

b. *Hu þinceð eow* how seems you(DAT/ACC)
   ‘how do you think?’  (C: Mt(WScp) 21.28)

c. *gif þe gedafen þince* if you(DAT/ACC) fitting may-seem
   ‘if it may seem proper to you.’  (C: Jul 87)

d. *To heanlic me þinceð þæt ge mid urum* too poor me(DAT/ACC) seems that you with our
   *sceattum to scype gangon unbefohtene* treasures to ship go unattacked
   ‘[it] seems too bad that you walk unopposed to the ship with our treasures.’  
   (C: Mald 55)

e. *him þinceð æôryt to gehyrenne ymbe ða clænnysse* him(DAT) seems troublesome to hear about the cleanness
   *ðe god lufað* which God loves
   ‘[it] seems troublesome for him to hear about the cleanness that God loves.’  
   (C: ÆCHom ii.23.215.72)

Here, *hwæt* ‘what’, *hu* ‘how’, *gedafen* ‘fitting’, *heanlic* ‘poor’, and *æôryt* ‘troublesome’
have a predicative function. In (39d) and (39e), we see that those predicatives can occur
with finite and infinitive clauses. But only finite clauses can occur without predicatives, a
genuine type (i/ii):

(40) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. *Me þincð þæt þu bæde þinum bearnum fyrstes* me(DAT/ACC) seems that you bade your sons first
   ‘[it] seems to me that you ought to bid your children first.’ (C: ÆLS (Sebastian) 161)

b. *Us þincð þæt hi sy þam timan* us(DAT/ACC) seems that it(FEM.SG) be the time
   *swyðe gehende very near* ‘[it] seems to us that it must be very near the time.’  (C: WHom 1b.20)
In these examples, the name Cause may not be an appropriate name for the theta role of the clause. It may be better to call it a PERCEPT, as in Cowper (1992: 50), in that it is an entity which is experienced or perceived. The label for a theta-role, however, is not always clear-cut and in any case is not a central topic of this study. Thus, I use the name Cause for the sake of consistency, even if it may ultimately be somewhat inadequate.

In contrast to finite clauses, infinitival clauses of type (i/ii) are not found without predicatives.

For type (ii) in which the nominative has a Cause role, it will be impossible to find such a meaning relationship because of the copulative property of the meaning of ‘seem’. But clearly we find both nominative and dative cases in the same sentence. The latter corresponds to an Experiencer role found in other impersonal verbs, because it is an animate entity which ‘experiences the Percept’. The nominative, in contrast, is ‘what is being perceived’ by an animate entity, which we call a Cause (or Percept).

(41) Possible theta-roles with ‘seem’:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
  \text{NP[NOM]} & \text{NP[DAT/ACC]} \\
| & | \\
\text{CAUSE/PERCEPT} & \text{EXPERIENCER}
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, this is potentially a type (ii), Nominative-Cause construction. However, as mentioned before, ‘seem’ cannot stand alone without predicatives (or subordinate marker) in this type. Therefore we will find type (ii) always with a predicative or subordinate marker, as in:

(42) Type (ii) (only with predicatives):

a. ðonne ðyncæð him sumu weorc suide hefug
  then seem(PL) him(DAT) some works(PL) very heavy
  ‘Then some works seem to him very severe’ (C: CP 39.283.24)
b. hie noldon set hie mon ahofe ofer da de
they not-would that them man support over those(PL) who
him better Syncead
them(DAT) better seem(PL)
'they did not wish that one would support them over those who they think are
better'  
(C: CP 6.47.8)

For type (iii) in which the nominative is an Experiencer, the verb would have the
meaning 'think'. It is traditionally accepted that ḏencan 'think' is the personal counterpart
to the verb ḏyncan 'seem', and these two verbs are generally distinguished. However, the
only difference in orthography between these two verbs is the vowels in the stems:
ḑyncan, ḏuhte (SG, Past), ḏuhton (PL, Past); ḏencan, ḏohte (SG, Past), ḏohton (PL, Past). Therefore, a very few instances of type (iii) usage found with the forms of ḏyncan,
may be considered as a mistaken usage of ḏencan. Under this assumption we would not
find any instance of type (iii) with ḏyncan 'seem'.

The following Table 2.6 shows the attested types of the HAPPEN and SEEM verbs in
OE. The number of tokens of each verb is: gelimpan (621), ḏyncan (596).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>(Ge-)limpan</th>
<th>ḏyncan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x (w/ PRED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (w/ PRED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 2.6: Syntactic frames of the HAPPEN & SEEM verbs in OE
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2.2.5 The BEHOOVE verbs

*Behofian*

For the OE class with the meaning 'to behoove; be fitting; need', we study *behofian*. The surface forms surveyed are: *behofade, behofadon, behofas, behofast, behofap, behofan, behofed, behofedan, behofede, behofedon, behofep, behofiad, behofian, behofiap, behofie, behofien, behofigap, behofige, behofode, behofodest, behofodon*. The number of tokens is 140.

Except for type (i/ii), no clear type (i) is found. The following example may be considered as impersonal because it is indeterminate between type (i) and type (iii):

(43) Indeterminate examples:

a. Ælces licuman æagan behofaS þreora þinga on every bodys eyes(NOM/DAT) behoove three things(GEN) in hym silfum to habbæne themselves to have 'The eyes of every body require three things to have in themselves' (C: Solil 1.27.17)

b. Nu hem behofed Cristes helpe now them(DAT) behooves(SG) Christ's help(NOM/GEN/ACC) & eall Cristenes folces. & all of-Christian people 'now they need the help of Christ and entirely of Christian people' (C: ChronE (Plummer) 1131.41)

The problem of (43a) is that we cannot determine whether æagan 'eyes' is nominative plural or oblique singular, because the verb which may agree with it can be both singular and plural. Note that not just *behofian* but *behofan* is found as bare infinitive in OE. If *behofað* is interpreted as singular, then this example will be type (i-1). If *behofað* is interpreted as plural, then the construction will be type (iii-1). But as we see later, type (iii-1) is a very common type found with this verb in OE, while type (i) is not. Thus, presumably (43) belongs to type (iii), not type (i). In (43b) the verb *behofed* is clearly in
the singular form, but the problem is that *helf* `help' can be not just a genitive or accusative but a nominative as well. Thus, (43b) is indeterminate between type (i-1) and type (ii). But as we discuss later, type (ii) is not a productive type: there are only a few indeterminate examples. Therefore, (43b) remains indeterminate until we find further evidence.

For type (i/ii), some examples are found only with a finite clause. No examples are attested in my corpus for nonfinite clauses.\(^{14}\)

(44) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

> vel fordon behoafa þatte an monn sie dead...
> or(Latin) therefore behooves that one man be dead
> `or it is proper that one man ought to be dead...' (C: JnGl(Li) i8.14)

As mentioned above, the type (ii) Nominative-Cause construction is not productive. We find only a few examples which may be type (ii), like the following, which is in fact indeterminate between type (i-2) and type (ii):

(45) A possible type (ii):

> we nabbad na mare þonne us selfum behoafa
> we not-have no more than ourselves(DAT) behooves
> `We do not have more than is necessary to ourselves' (C: HomS 48.18)

The majority of examples are actually type (iii) personal constructions. When used in type (iii), the meaning of this verb would be `to need; require'. Type (iii-1) (with genitive Cause) is found very commonly:

---

\(^{14}\) As noted by Allen (p.c.), the BT says that *behofian* could be used impersonally in OE and gives a few examples of this verb occurring with an Experiencer in a non-nomminative case. Also the OED offers a similar example from c. 950 (in *behave* 4.C) and Mitchell (1985: 458) also list *behofian* as a verb which could have either a nominative or a dative Experiencer. But Allen argues that all the examples of dative Experiencers with *behofian* in the OED and BT fall into one of two categories: they are either from word-for-word glosses, or from manuscripts dating after the beginning of the twelfth century. If we accept her argument, the type (i-3), the only impersonal type unambiguously attested in the Concordance, such as (44), has a questionable status. Unfortunately, however, it is not entirely certain whether to consider such examples as OE syntax. It will be the subject of further research.
(46) Type (iii-1):

a. se eorðlic ā licham ā behofað þæs fodan
   the earthly body(NOM) behooves the food(GEN)
   ‘The earthly body needs the food’  (C: ÆCHom I.18 252.25)

b. ge ealles þysses behofað
   you(NOM) all this(GEN) behoove
   ‘you need all this’  (C: ÆCHom II. 36.1 270.87)

c. se þe þonne sealmsanges oððe hwilcre
   that(NOM) who then psalm-singing(GEN) or any
   rædinge behofað
   reading(GEN) behooves

   ‘One who needs the singing of psalms or any reading...’  (C: ChrodR 1.13.13)

Type (iii-2), in which the Experiencer is in the nominative and the Cause is in the accusative, so that the verb has the transitive function of the meaning ‘need’, is found in a few instances:

(47) Type (iii-2):

a. And drugoða eow cymð, þonne ge renas behofedan
   and drought to-you comes when you(NOM) rains(ACC) behooved
   ‘And drought comes to you when you needed rain’  (C: HomU 46 (Nap 57) 175)

b. Drihten hwænne wæs þæt æfre þæt þu
   Lord when was that ever that you(NOM.SG)
   þæt behofodest
   that(ACC) behooved(2-SG)

   ‘Lord, when was it ever that you needed that?’  (C: Nic (E) 102)

The nominative Experiencer is even found with a that-clause, as in:

(48) Type (iii-3):

a. þonne behofað heo wel þæt heo him gelicie
   then behooves she(NOM) well that she him like
   ‘Then [it] befits her well that she ought to please him.’  (C: ÆLet 6(Wulfgeat) 292)
b. Hwæt we behofigað hæt we gemunen hu mycel he for Lo we(NOM) behoove that we remember how much he for us gebrowode us suffered

‘Lo! we need to remember how much he suffered for us.’
(C: HomU 8 (VercHom 2) 111)

The behavior of behofian is striking compared to other impersonal verbs because for this verb type (iii) is most productive type whereas it is the least frequently used for other impersonal verbs in general. The attested syntactic frames of behofian in OE are summarized in Table 2.7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>Behofian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3)</td>
<td>x(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 2.7: Syntactic frames of the BEHOOVE verb in OE

2.2.6 The HUNGER verbs

As examples of HUNGER verbs, we study hyngrian and pyrstan. These verbs are mainly one-place predicates, but a few instances of two-place predicates are also found as discussed in the following.
Hyngrian

The surface forms surveyed are: hingrade, hingrap, hingrede, hingredon, hingrep, hingrian, hingriap, hingriaen, hingie, hingrigan, hingrige, hingrodan, hingrode, hingryde, hingrydon, hyngerde, hyngrade, hyngran, hyngrap, hyngre, hyngrede, hyngredon, hiygrep, hyngrie, hyngriœn, hyngriu. There are 80 tokens in our corpus.

For type (i), many examples are found:

(49) Type (i):

a. ponne him hingrap, he yt grædilice
when him(DAT) hungers he eats greedily
‘When he hungers, he eats greedily.’ (C: ÆHex 528)

b. he sægde pæt hine hingrede
he said that him(ACC) hungered
‘He said that he was hungry.’ (C: HomU 1 (Belf 10) 32)

As in (49a-b), hyngrian mainly occurs with only one argument, an Experiencer. But in a few examples, it is found with another oblique case as in (50):

(50) Two arguments of hyngrian (Type (i-1)):

hie hyngrip & ðyrstep soðfæstnisse
them(ACC) hungers(SG) & thirsts(SG) truth(GEN/ACC)
‘they hunger and thirst for truth.’ (C: MtGl (Ru) S.6)

In (50), soðfæstnisse ‘truth’ seems to be an argument, with the meaning ‘for + NP’. From the fact that this oblique NP soðfæstnisse is interchangeable with PP æfter soðfæstnisse, this ambiguous Cause (or Theme) NP is presumably a genitive case rather than an accusative:
(51) Interchangeability between NP and PP

Interchangeability between NP and PP


\[ \text{Eadge bidon } \delta \alpha \delta \text{lyrstras and hyncgras } \text{aftor sodfaestnisse} \]

happy are those who thirst and hunger after truth

‘Those who thirst and hunger for truth are happy’ (C: MtMarg(Li) 5.6)

There is another example attested in my corpus which seems to be a two-place predicate, apparently with an accusative case:

(52) he geseh \( \hat{\text{p}} \text{æt} \) him nan \( \delta \text{incg} \) ne hingrode

he saw that him(DAT) no thing(NOM/ACC) not hungered

‘he saw that he did not hunger at all’ (C: ÆCHom I, 11 168.16)

If \( \text{nan } \delta \text{incg} \) ‘nothing’ is used in the accusative case, the whole construction would belong to type (i-2). If it is used in the nominative case, the construction will be type (ii). Because neither example is genuinely attested elsewhere except for this single example, we cannot determine which case this sentence belongs to. Instead, it is possible that \( \text{nan } \delta \text{incg} \) has been used adverbially for an emphatic use of negative because the noun \( \delta \text{incg} \) is not really a content word. We then say that there is no true instance of type (i-2) or type (ii), until more attested examples are found.

Along with type (i), the personal constructions, type (iii) are frequently found with one or two arguments:

(53) Type (iii):

a. forpam-\( \hat{\text{p}} \text{e} \) ge hingria\( \delta \)

because you(PL) hunger(PL)

‘because you will hunger’ (C: Lk (WSCp) 6.25)

b. Eadige synt \( \hat{\text{p}} \text{a} \) \( \delta \text{e} \) rihtwisnesse hingria\( \delta \)

happy are those(PL) who righteousness(GEN) hunger(PL)

‘Those who hunger for righteousness are happy.’ or

‘Those who hunger for righteousness are happy’ (C: Mt (WSCp) 5.6)
The surface forms surveyed are: *pyrst, pyrstan, pyrstas, pyrstap, pyrste, pyrstes, pyrstet, pyrstep, pyrstep, pyrste, pyrstyp*. There are 86 tokens in our corpus. Type (i) impersonal constructions are found, as in:

(54) Type (i):

a. þonne him ðyrst, he drincip gif he hæfð
   when him(DAT) thirsts he drinks if he has
   ‘when he thirsts, he drinks if he has’ (C: ÆHex 528)

b. ðyrst sawle mine to gode
   thirsts soul my for God
   ‘my soul thirsts for God’ (C: PsGlC (Wildhagen) 41.3)

Like *hyngrian*, *pyrstan* is used in type (i) with or without a Cause. In many cases, the Cause argument is a PP, as in (54b). A genuine type (ii) is not found. Type (iii), by contrast, is found frequently with or without a (genitive) Cause, as in (55):

(55) Type (iii):

a. þonne seo sawl þyrsteð & lýsted Godes
   when the soul(NOM) thirsts & desires God’s
   rices
   kingdom(GEN)
   ‘when the soul thirsts and desires God’s kingdom’ (C: GDPref 3(C) 34.244.26)

b. Min sawl on ðe swyðe þyrsteð
   my soul(NOM) in you very thirsts
   ‘My soul thirsts for you very much’ (C: PPs 62.2)

The attested types of the HUNGER verbs in OE are summarized in Table 2.8 below. The number of tokens for each verb is: *hyngrian* (80), *pyrstan* (86).
2.3 Discussion

We see in the above that not all verbs take all three types of constructions. For most of these, the gaps occur in a sufficiently large enough number of tokens to allow one to conclude that they are real gaps, not accidents of attestation. This finding is counter to the generalizations or assumptions of Anderson (1986) and Lightfoot (1991). Also, there is no single verb that exhibits all the available syntactic frames in each type. Even the verb *hreowan*, which has been treated as a typical example does not exactly allow for all syntactic frames of each of three types. The category $S'$, which is also treated as type $S$ in Elmer (1981), is too general to capture the difference in the occurrences of finite and infinitival clauses for each verb. *Hreowan*, for example, varies in the cooccurrence with finite and infinitival clauses: It occurs with finite, but not with infinitival clauses. And even the finite clause occurs only in the non-nominative (= type (ii)) construction, but not in the personal (= type (iii)) construction.

It is notable that finite clauses in general occur more productively with impersonal verbs than infinitival clauses in OE. This characteristic is clearer in the non-nominative construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUNGER verbs</th>
<th><em>Hyngrian</em></th>
<th><em>pyrstan</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) or (i-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) or (iii-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 2.8: Syntactic frames of the HUNGER verbs in OE
The genitive Cause is relatively productive for RUE, PLEASE, BEHOOVE, and HUNGER verbs, but not for HAPPEN and SEEM verbs. In general, the incidence of the genuine accusative Cause is more limited than that of the genitive Cause.

Different verbs do not just have different preferences for the particular categories (e.g. NP[GEN], NP[ACC], S'[FIN], S'[INF]), but they also differ in the types of construction in which they occur. Fischer and van der Leek’s type (ii) is appropriate for some of the impersonal verbs, e.g., all RUE verbs, lician, gelimpan, pyncan (only with predicative), behofian (?), but not appropriate for the other verbs, e.g., both HUNGER verbs, langian, lystan. Similarly, type (iii) is appropriate for some of the impersonal verbs, e.g., hreowan, sceamian, lystan, behofian and all HUNGER verbs, but not appropriate for the other verbs, e.g., lician, langian, gelimpan, pyncan. This fact is counter to Jespersen’s claim (p. 208-210) that the verb began by type (ii) in most cases and came to be type (iii) (see section 1.4).

---

15 Again, type (iii) for eglian remains questionable.
CHAPTER 3

A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY OF IMPERSONAL VERBS IN ME

3.1 Introduction

One of the notable typological changes between OE and ME is the collapse of the morphological case system. The genitive noun phrase (NP[GEN]) is not well-attested except for the possessive. The NP[GEN] elsewhere in OE gives way to a prepositional phrase with of (PP[of]). For this reason we can find PP[of] in ME in a distribution similar to that of NP[GEN] in OE. Also, the accusative and the dative are not distinguished morphologically for nouns as well as pronouns. Thus we use the term OBLIQUE (OBL) to refer to these NPs ambiguous between accusative and dative. Nominative case is not distinguished from oblique case for nouns but is for pronouns, as in PDE. Thus, only pronouns can give a more convincing indication of which syntactic type a particular sentence belongs to. In an ambiguous situation, word order may be a sole indication of grammatical relations when the text belongs to quite late ME.\(^1\)

In general, inflectional endings are simplified earlier in northern and eastern parts of England than the South and the South-West Midlands. The following Table 3.1 is roughly described paradigms of nominal case systems in two dialect areas in EME (note that engel

\(^1\) Since the fixing of word order is a gradual syntactic change in ME, it would be hard to establish an exact date from which we can safely assume that the preverbal element in a declarative sentence is a subject. Elmer (1981: 149) assumes that the word order is fixed as SVO about the 14th century.
'angel' and *tun* 'enclosure' were strong nouns while *nome* 'name' was a weak noun in OE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM/ACC. SG</th>
<th>Early Southern Texts</th>
<th>North &amp; East Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engel</td>
<td>nome</td>
<td>tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>engles</td>
<td>nome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>engle</td>
<td>nome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC. PL</td>
<td>engles, -e, -ene</td>
<td>nomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>engles, -e, -ene</td>
<td>nomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>engles, -e, -ene</td>
<td>nomen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Paradigms of nouns in EME

The personal pronoun system of ME is very much the same as that of OE, except for the loss of distinction between accusative and dative e.g. OE *hine* (accusative) vs. *him* (dative); ME *him* (accusative/dative). Table 3.2 is the paradigms of ME personal pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.SG 'I'</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>ich, I</td>
<td>we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>min, mi</td>
<td>ure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.SG 'thou'</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>bu, bou</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>pin, bi</td>
<td>ower, 3our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>ow, 3ou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>(all genders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>ho, sho</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>hi, pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>hir, her</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>hor, her, payr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>hir, her</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>him, hem, hom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>hi, hir, her</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>him, hem, hom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Paradigms of personal pronouns in ME (simplified)
Forms of the first and second person pronouns survived throughout the ME period with little change. From an early date *ich* is often reduced to *i*. Similarly, *pu* is found alternatively with *pou. Min and pin* are often reduced to *mi* and *pi*. For the second person plural, the general use of *you* as a nominative form is a development of EModE and in ME the distinction between the nominative *se* or *ye* and the accusative *ow* or *3ou* is well preserved. The OE dual pronouns survived for a short while.

For third person singular, the accusative masculine *hine* is rapidly superseded by the dative form *him*, and it is universal by the 14th century. In the neuter, genitive *his* was occasionally replaced by *hit*; the modern form *its* does not appear until the end of the 16th century. The dative neuter form *him* was also sometimes replaced by *hit*, but more commonly a periphrastic form with ‘there-’ was used; e.g. *parmid pu clakes* ‘you clack with it (your bill)’ (Burrow and Turville-Petre 1992: 26).

The distinctive nominative feminine form *she*, the origin of which is disputed, was adopted at very different times in different parts of the country. In the spelling *sce*, it first appears in the final section of *The Peterborough Chronicle* in the mid-twelfth century, but two hundred years later the form *ho* is regularly used in the *Gawain* manuscript, side by side with occasional instances of *sho*. By the early 14th century, the old accusative form *hi* had been supplanted by the dative *hire*, a development that had already taken place in *The Peterborough Chronicle*, where *hire* is used as a direct object.

The forms of the plural pronoun also show regional differences in their development. The oblique forms derived from OE survived particularly well, so that John Gower at the end of the 14th century uses *hem* ‘them’ and *here* ‘their’ but *pei* for the nominative. The modern plural forms are Scandinavian in origin (cf. ON *peir, peira, peim*), and they are all
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recorded from the beginning of the 13th century in the East Midlands where Scandinavian influence was strong.\(^\text{2}\)

The determiner 'the', once with no fewer than ten different forms in OE, becomes indeclinable \(pe\) in ME, even in some early works. This fact will lead many examples involving nominals to remain undetermined in their exact grammatical cases.

In the following sections, I examine all the syntactic frames taken by each impersonal verb in ME.

3.2 Syntactic frames of ME impersonal verbs
3.2.1 The RUE verbs

*Reuen*

For type (i), the prepositional phrase with *of* occurs with this verb:\(^\text{3}\)

(1) Type (i-1):

a. himm reowept of hiss a\(\text{3}h\)enn woh & off hiss a\(\text{3}h\)enn sinne
   'he repents his own wickedness and his own sin'  (M: 13c. *Orm. 5566*)

b. of auelok rewede him ful sore
   'he was sorry very much for Haveloc'  (M: 13c. *Havelok 503*)

c. hir rewed of hir self ful sare, and haued for hir sin slic kare
   'she was sorry for herself very sorely and had such a grief over her sin'
   (M: 14c. *NHom. (I) Magd.* p.15)

---

\(^{\text{2}}\) The explanation of the personal pronouns in ME is based on Burrow and Turville-Petre (1992: 25-27).

\(^{\text{3}}\) The Cause argument can occur as other PPs such as with *on* (upon), *for*. For type i, the following is found:

\(pe\) tiding com wip care to blauncheflour...for hir me rewe\(\text{p}\) sare
   'the time has come with care to whiteflower... for her I am very sorry'  (14c. *Tristrem* 216)
As mentioned above, nominative case and accusative case are distinguishable only in pronouns in ME. Examples of a clear accusative pronoun as a Cause argument in type (i) are not attested.

As in OE, a finite clause occurs with this verb in ME:

(2) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. himm reoweþ þatt he dwelleþ her swa swipe lange onn eorþe
   ‘he regrets his detaining her so very long on earth’ (M: 13c. *Orm. 5576*)

b. þe wile sare rewen ðat tu þe seluen ne haddest ...
   ‘you will sorely regret that you yourself had not...’
   (M: 13c. *Vices & V. (1) 65/3*)

As in OE, *reuen* is not attested with an infinitival clause in ME for type (i/ii). A nominative Cause argument with the causative meaning ‘to displease’ is found in ME:

(3) Type (ii):

a. Alle hie weped and w onid... Hi me reweð swa swiðe ðat ic reste ne mai habben
   ‘they all weep and woe... they displease me so much that I cannot take a rest’
   (M: 13c. *Vices & V. (1) 155/14*)

b. I wott I have done wrang; þat sayng rewys me sore
   ‘I know I have done wrong; to say so makes me very sorry’
   (M: 15c. *MOTest. 15154*)

For type (iii), PP[of] is attested, as in the following:

---

4 Just like type (i), the Cause argument can occur as other PPs in type (iii):

(i) lesu c ris t.. thu rew vpon me
   ‘Jesus Christ, have mercy on me’
   (13c. *Ar ne kuthe 8*)

(ii) Noyt for his syn he sore rewys
    ‘not for his sin he rues sorely’
    (15c. *MOTest. 18346*)
(4) Type (iii-1):

a. no man shal rew of thy misfare  
   'no man shall be sorry for your ill-faring'  
   (M: 15c. Yk.Pl.39/115)

b. my herte rwyth sore of the deth of hir that lyeth yondir  
   'my heart sorely pities her death who lies yonder'  
   (M: 15c. Malory Wks. 118/24)

In contrast to type (i), the accusative case as a Cause is commonly found in type (iii), a transitive use of the verb, when we assume that no double nominative is possible in English:

(5) Type (iii-2):

a. we schold rew pat sore  
   'we ought to be very sorry for that'  
   (M: 14c. Swet ihc hend p.81)

b. God forbede that al a compaignye sholde rewe a synguler mannes folye  
   'God forbade that all the company should be sorry for a single man's folly'  
   (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.CY. G.997)

As in OE, no S'[FIN] is found as a Cause in type (iii) with this verb. But one example of S'[INF] is found in type (iii):

(6) Type (iii-4):

le te us plesyn hym tyl pat he rewe in hell to hangyn hye  
   'let us please him until he regrets to be hanging high in hell'  
   (M: 15c. Castle Persev.723)
Shamen

For type (i), the PP[of] Cause occurs with this verb:^{5}

(7) Type (i-1):

him sholde shamen of him
‘he will be ashamed of himself’ (M: 13c. Trin.Hom. 73)

In contrast to this, no genuine accusative Cause in type (i) is found. A finite clause is often found in type (i/ii), as in:

(8) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

a. vninete[read: vnimete] me scomeð þat hem[read: he] ... unmeasurably I am ashamed that he ...’ (M: 13c. Lay. Brut 12487)

b. Hym schameþ þat hys lynage is so lowe
‘he is ashamed that his lineage is so low’ (M: 15c. Walton Boeth. p.83)

An infinitival clause is often found as a Cause in type (i), too:

---

^5 The Cause can occur as other PPs involving the prepositions for, with in type (i) and type (iii):

(i) Type (i):

For þaim ne sal þe scam na mar
‘you shall be ashamed no more for them’ (14c. Cursor 23498)

Me shames with my lyghame!
‘I am ashamed of my body’ (15c. Yk.Pl. 25/110)

(ii) Type (iii):

þan schames nane with þair kyn, bot all may þam schame with þair syn, and with þair full pride.
‘then nobody is ashamed of their race, but all may shame themselves with their sin and with their full pride’ (15c. Quatref.Love 479-80)

þat schamez for no schrewedschyp, schent mot he worpe
‘the one that is not ashamed of any wicked behavior, may he become disgrace’ (14c. Cleanness 580)
Type (i-4) (= i/ii):

a. Me shamep for to begge  
   'I am ashamed to beg'  
   (M: 15c. Wycl.Serm, 1.22)

b. Me shamed at that tyme to have more ado with you  
   'I was ashamed at that time to have more trouble with you'  
   (M: 15c. Malory Wks. 443/25)

The nominative Cause with the causative meaning 'to disgrace' of the verb is also found:

Type (ii):

a. He hauede him so shamed  
   'He had him(self) so disgraced'  
   (M: 13c. Havelok 2754)

b. Wolt thou shame thyselff?  
   'will you disgrace yourself?'  
   (M: 15c. Malory Wks. 1122/9)

For type (iii), the PP[of] Cause is found, as in:

Type (iii-l):

a. and shame thei of alle thingus that thei diden  
   'and they are ashamed of all things that they did'  
   (M: 14c. WBible (1) Ezek.43.11)

b. salle swa schame ay of þair syn  
   'they will always be ashamed of thier sin.'  
   (M: 15c. PConsc. 7159)

A transitive use is commonly found in type (iii):

Type (iii-2):

a. nyle thou schame the witnessing of oure Lord Jhesu  
   'you are never to be ashamed of witnessing to our Lord Jesus.'  
   (M: 14c. WBible(1) 2 Tim.1.8)

b. whoso shamep me and my wordis bifore men, I shal shame him bifore my fadir þat  
   'whoever is ashamed of me and my words before men, I shall be ashamed of him  
   before my father that is in heaven.'  
   (M: 14c. 7 Gifts HG 153)
Both finite and infinitival clauses are found in type (iii):

(13) Type (iii-3):

a. ne ssame 3e no3t 3at ...  
   'you are not ashamed that ...'  

b. Alle his bretheren schamyd that so noble a persoun schuld be putt with lewde-men  
   'all his brothers were ashamed that such a noble person should be put with ignorant  
   men'  
   (M: 15c. Spec. Sacer 48/4:)

(14) Type (iii-4):

a. I shamed to asken of þe king foote men & horsemen in felashipe of grace  
   'I am ashamed to ask of the king the footmen and horsemem in the fellowship of  
   grace'  
   (M: 14c. WBible (1) (Bod 959) 3 Esd.8.52)

b. Thei shameden for to shewe to hem self her coueitise  
   'they were ashamed to show their covetess to themselves'  
   (M: 14c. WBible(1) Dan. 13.11)

In sum, the verb shamen also occurs in all three types of constructions in ME although the  
categories that they select vary.

Eilen

The Cause argument of PP[of] is not found with eilen in my corpus. Like other verbs,  
no genuine accusative Cause is found in type (i). Also no instances of finite clauses and  
infinitival clauses are attested with eilen.6 The only attested types are type (ii) and the  
transitive use with nominative Experiencer (type (iii-2)):

6 Some infinitive clauses are found with what. Without what, we might say the following example  
type (i-4). But with what, the S'[Inf] is a result rather than a cause:

(i) Alas, wat eiled vs to slepe þat we ne mitht him notht kepe?  
   'Alas, what troubled us to sleep so that we could not watch him?' or  
   'Alas, what was the matter with us, that we slept, so that we could not guard him.'  
   (14c. NPass. 1911)
In the above example (15a), the nominative se biodrine is a Cause providing the causative meaning ‘to trouble’ to the verb. However, this example is too early to be a representative of ME. Example (15b) is indeterminate between types (ii) and (i-2). However, considering that PDE has preserved a causative meaning, although in the frozen syntax like what/what ails you, it will be safer to conclude that (15b) is type (ii) rather than type (i-2). The following is type (iii-2):

(16) Type (iii-2):

And asked hym what he eyled
‘and asked him what he was troubled with’
(M: 15c. Malory Wks. (Caxton:Vinaver) 1258/3)

In sum, unlike reuen and shamen, eilen does not show impersonal usage in ME.

The following Table 3.3 summarizes the attested syntactic frames in RUE verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUE verbs</th>
<th>Reuen</th>
<th>Shamen</th>
<th>Eilen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Syntactic frames of the RUE verbs in ME
3.2.2 The PLEASE verbs

Likey

For type (i), a PP[of] Cause is (rarely) found with liken:

(17) Type (i-1):
   Of that syght lykyd hym full yll
   'that sight pleased him so badly' (M: 15c. Tundale(Adv) 1033)

The accusative Cause is found in type (i), too:

(18) Type (i-2):
   a. Sei me, loueli lemmann, how likes þe me nowþe?
      'tell me, lovely mistress, how do you like me now?' (M: 14c. WPal. 1740)
   b. So wel vs liketh yow ... that we ne kouden n a t...
      'we like you so well ... that we could not ...' (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Cl. E.106)
   c. The more that a man beheld hym, the bettre hym schuld like hym
      'the more a man beheld him, the better he would like him' (M: 15c. Ponthus 12/9)

Both finite and infinitival clauses are found in type (i/ii):

(19) Type (i-3) (i/ii):
   Me likez þat sir Lucius launges aftyre sorowe
   'I am pleased that sir Lucius is preoccupied with sorrow'
   (M: 15c. Morte Arth. (I) 383)

(20) Type (i-4) (i/ii):
   a. Hym likþ ... for to lovuen Him
      'he likes ... to love Him' (M: 15c. *Hilton SP 1.29.18a)

Likey occurs with other prepositional phrases with the prepositions such as in and bi:
(i) Howe lyke yowe be þys mayde younge?
   'how do you like this young maiden?' (15c. Parton. (1) (Add) 5452)
b. Me liketh nat to lye
'I do not like to lie' (M: 15c. Lydg. TB 4.1815)

The nominative Cause is also found with the causative meaning 'to please' of the verb:

(21) Type (ii):

a. Drihtin wel maȝ don All þatt himm sellfenn likeþ.
'Lord may do well all that pleases himself' (13c. Orm. 9912)

b. þis holi mihte, hit te wile likin be nihte oðer be daige.
'this holy might, it will please you by night or by day' (M: 13c. Vices & V. (1) 85/25)

c. To don al that may like unto youre herte
'to do all that can please your heart' (M: 14c. Chaucer TC 5.133)

For type (iii) personal constructions, type (iii-1) is found as:

(22) Type (iii-1):

a. Som man mai lyke of that I wryte
'a certain man may like what I write' (M: 14c.Gower CA prol.21)

b. Of this message he liked yll
'he disliked this message' (M: 15c. Gener.(1) 3124)

For type (iii-2), we find the following examples. If we assume that the word order is fixed as SVO about the 14th century (see footnote 1), the interpretation of the preverbal NPs as subject is possible:

(23) Type (iii-2):

a. Syr Launfal lykede her not ...
'sir Launfal did not like her ...' (M: 15c. Chestre Launfal 44)

8 Other prepositional phrases occur in type (iii) too:

(i) þer may no man be saf but if he loue and lyke in þe name of Ihesu
'there no man may be safe but he loves and like in the name of Jesus'
(15c. *Hilton SP 1.44.28b)
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b. [The Sultan] lekid hym right wele
'the Sultan liked him very well'

(M: 15c. Gener.(2) 661)

As regards a finite clause in type (iii), the following example may be interpreted as type (iii-3) when we assume that god 'god' is subject. Since it is a fourteenth century text, the word order leads us to conjecture that it may be a subject:

(24) Type (iii-3):

God liketh nat that Raby men vs calle
'God is not pleased that Raby men call us'

(M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Sum. D.2187)

(25) Type (iii-4):

a. As myn auctour liketh to devise
'as my author likes to devise'

(M: 15c. Lydg. ST 1003)

b. 3e pat louen & lyken to listen
'you love and like to listen'

(M: a1375 WPal. 162)

In sum, the verb liken is found in all types of constructions and selects (almost) all types of categories in question.

Longen

PP[of] is not found either in type (i) or in type (iii) constructions. But other prepositional phrases with after, to etc. occur in type (i), as in:

(26) Type (i):

a. swiðe þe longede after laðe spelle
'very much you long for an ugly story'

(M: 13c. Lay. Brut. 15808)

b. me longith to youre presense
'I long for your presence'

(M: 15c. Ludus C. 357/75)
The accusative Cause is not attested in type (i). But finite clauses and infinitival clauses are attested as in:

(27) Type (i-3) (i/ii):

Somdel hem longed... þt heuene cloue ofte atwo...
'he somewhat wished that the heaven would split often into two'
(M: 14c. SLeg.Prol.CV (Ashm) 45)

(28) Type (i-4) (i/ii):

a. hire longuede with hire brojier to speke
'she wanted to speak with her brother'  (M: 13c. SLeg. (Ld) 198/14)
b. sore has me longed to se þi freli face
'I have badly desired to see the noble face'  (M: 15c. WPal. 4570)

The genuine nominative Cause (type (ii)) is not found in my corpus. In contrast to this, the nominative Experiencer (type (iii)) is attested, as in:

(29) Type (iii):

a. ich langy so swi(ie after Gorloys his wifue
'I long so much for Gorloys's wife'  (M: 13c. Lay. Brut (Otho) 18918)
b. so longid this lady with lust to the Temple
'this lady so longed with desire for the temple'  (M: 15c. Destr.Troy 2914)

Among type (iii), type (iii-1) is not attested. For type (iii-2), one possible example is the following Object-Equi NP Deletion construction in which hyr 'her' is used the object of the matrix verb but the subject of longe 'to long':

(30) Possible type (iii-2):

Say I wylle come whan I may And byddith hyr longe no-thinge sare
'say I will come when I can and bid her to feel longing not at all badly'
(M: 15c. Morte Arth. (2) 511)
As noted in (53) in chapter 2, however, *nothing* 'nothing' here might be another adverbial use of negation. The fact that no other genuine type (iii-2) is attested makes this example really questionable.

In contrast to type (i), a finite clause is not found with this verb in type (iii). But as in type (i), an infinitival clause is commonly found in type (iii), as in:

(31) Type (iii-4):

a. *pe cwen...longede for to seon pis meiden*
   'the queen wanted to see this maiden' (M: 13c. *St.Kath.(l) 1556*)

b. *on a day she gan so sore longe to sen hire sister...*
   'on a day she began to yearn so sorely to see her sister' (M: 15c. Chaucer *LGW* 2260)

In sum, *longen* occurs in type (i) and type (iii). Except for the clausal Cause (type (i/ii)) which is indeterminate between type (i) and type (ii), genuine examples of type (ii) are not found in our corpus.

**Listen**

Type (i) without the expression of the Cause argument is found. When the Cause argument is expressed, an NP[GEN] in type (i) is not found except for very early period which may also considered as belonging to OE, as in:

(32) Type (i-1):

*pe hura metes ne lyst*
'you do not want their food' (M: 12c. (?OE) PDidax 29/19)

---

9 The Cause can occur as other PPs with *after* as in the following type (i) constructions:

(i) *schape þy cloute with þi scheres as þe liste aftir þe quantite of þe wounde*
   'make your clothes with you scissors if you wish some amount of wound' (15c. *MS Htrn. 95 101a/a)

(ii) *Alls he mare & mare gett, 33 lisste himm afterr mare*
   'as he has more and more, he always desires more' (13c. *Orm. 10220*)
In the later period, only indeterminate examples such as the following are found as potential instances of type (i-1):

(33) Indeterminate examples between type (i-1), type (iii-1):

\[ \text{pe leuedis listed noght o [Frfr: of] pride} \]
\[ \text{‘the ladies(SBJ/OBL) did not care for pride’} \quad (M: 14c. Cursor 1791) \]

However, by assuming a fixing of word order as SVO in the 14th century, we may say that the ladies is a subject and then this example is possibly type (iii-1).

No genuine example of accusative Cause in type (i) is found. Only indeterminate examples are found as a possibility for an accusative. Since what in the following can be a nominative as well as an accusative case, the sentences here are indeterminate between type (i-3) and type (ii):

(34) Indeterminate example between type (i-2) and type (ii):

a. \[ \text{tomorwe wol I seye thee what me leste} \]
\[ \text{‘tomorrow I will tell thee what I(OBL) want’} \quad (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.ML. B. 742) \]

b. \[ \text{lete hym drynke it with qwat licour pat hym lyst} \]
\[ \text{‘let him drink it with whatever liquor pleases him(OBL)’} \]
\[ (M: 15c. Agnus Castus ...) \]

No instances of finite clause are attested with this verb. But there are many examples of infinitival clauses in type (i/ii):

(35) Type (i-4) (i/ii):

a. \[ \text{He... sexde þatt him lisste þa wel etenn off an appell} \]
\[ \text{‘he said that he(OBL) then wished to eat well from an apple’} \quad (13c. Orm. 8119) \]

b. \[ \text{For wher as evere him lest to sette, ther is no myht which him may lette} \]
\[ \text{‘For where he(OBL) ever wishes to remain, there is no power which may hinder him’} \quad (M: 14c. Gower CA I.37) \]
As mentioned above, for type (ii), only examples ambiguous with type (i-2) are attested. When the Experiencer is oblique, the Cause arguments attested in our corpus were all such as *what*, *it*, and a nominal, which are indeterminate in their grammatical case.

There is rich evidence for type (iii) constructions. To type (iii-1), belongs the above example (33), to be judged by word order. But genuine type (iii-2) examples are found:

(36) Type (iii-2):

a. If ye list it be lefte, let me wete sone
   ‘if you(NOM) want it to be left, let me know soon’
   (M: 15c. *Destr. Troy* 2611)

b. qwat *þou* [Ashm: þe] list ellys
   ‘what else you(NOM) desire’
   (M: 15c. *Wars Alex.* (Dub) 1761)

Since there is no double nominative construction with different semantic roles in English, *qwat* must be an accusative in (36b) when occurring with *þou* (NOM). When *þe* (OBL) was used in other manuscript, the construction is ambiguous between type (i-2) and type (ii).

No finite clause is found as a Cause with *listen* in our corpus. It is remarkably contrasted to the infinitival clause which has rich evidence:

(37) Type (iii-4):

a. No lenger plaie þou ne list [vr. þe ne lyst]
   ‘no longer you(NOM) desire to play’
   (M: 14c. *Floris* (Auch) 377)

b. Who list to have joie and mirth also of love
   ‘who(ever) (NOM) wishes to have joy and mirth of love’
   (M: 15c. *RRose* 5028)

The following Table 3.4 shows the incidence of the syntactic frames of the PLEASE verbs:
3.2.3 The HAPPEN verbs

For the meaning of 'happen' in ME we can find two verbs. The verb *limpen* 'happen' which originates from OE *(ge-)*limpan is used in early ME, and diminishes about the 14th -15th century. Instead, it is replaced by *happen* (or *happenen*) approximately at the same time.¹⁰

*Limpen*

This verb occurs in type (i), but in a limited syntactic frame. Type (i) without nominal or pronominal Cause is found, as in:

---

¹⁰ ME *happen* is derived from a noun *hap*. In OE the verbal form *hæppan* is found rather uncommonly. ME *happenen* seems to be a further derivation from *happen*.
(38) Type (i):
   a. hem had lumpen harde
      'they(OBL) had fared ill'  (M: 14c. Cleanness 424)
   b. vs lympis [vr. falleth] þe worse
      'we(OBL) fare the worse' (M: 15c. Siege Jerus. 866)

But types (i-1) and (i-2) are not attested. For type (i-3), we find a few instances of finite clauses with this verb in EME:

(39) Type (i-3):
   a. him ilomp ... þat ...
      '[it] happened to him(OBL) ... that ...' (Elmer: 13c. Lay. 1391)
   b. & ta bilammp ... þatt hise lemninngcinhtess tokenn to sannenn fasste onngæn
      'and then [it] happened that his deciples began to maintain the fast'
      (13c. Orm. ii. 271, 1.17928)

In contrast to OE, an infinitival clause is more frequently found with this verb:

(40) Type (i-4):
   a. Ne limped nawt to ancre of oþer monnes ealmesse to makien hire large
      '[it] does not befit an anchoress to make herself generous with another's alms'
      (13c. AW 211/28)
   b. Than lympis ȝowe weddis to laye, or ȝoure londe selle
      'then [it] is proper for you(OBL) to pledge a pawn or to sell your land'
      (M: 15c. Winner &W. 284)

The above example (40a) show that the Experiencer was expressed in a PP. This reflects the indirect object status of the Experiencer NP with this verb. Type (ii) clearly occurs in ME, as in:

(41) Type (ii):
   a. yf heo þe limpeð, heo hrædllice ȝeswyceþ
      'if she(NOM) falls to you(OBL), she quickly deceives [you]'
      (M: 12c. Hr.HApul. 104. 71/1)
b. If all þe limp as þe list
   'if all happens to you(OBL) as you desire' (M: 15c. Wars Alex. 2060)

A few examples of type (iii) are found. The syntactic frame (iii-2) is attested. In this case, the meaning would be 'experience; suffer':

(42) Type (iii-2):
   whoso lympes þe losse, lay hym þeroute
   'whoever(NOM) suffers the loss, lay him out of there' (M: 14c. Patience 174)

For a possible type (iii-4), the following examples are found:

(43) Possible type (iii-4):
   a. whoso ... lympes to feche woodd
      'whoever(NOM) happens to fetch wood' (M: 15c. Winner & W. 449)
   b. May we noght lympe ... to couer ...?
      'May we(NOM) not happen to cover?' (M: 15c. Wars Alex. 2162)

Type (iii-4) above is in fact same as a Subject-to-Subject Raising construction. It has been noted (e.g. Denison 1993) that for the verb with the meaning 'happen', the raised subject can be identical to the Experiencer of the verb. Under a Raising analysis, this verb would show syntactic behavior like PDE seem or happen (e.g. there happens to be a good restaurant nearby). See the further discussion of Raising in chapter 6.

Happen, Happenen

As for type (i), this verb occurs only with type (i-3) and (i-4):

(44) Type (i-3):
   a. And happeth that ther lay a bok
      'and [it] happens that there lay a book' (M: 14c.Gower CA 2.868)
b. And happenyd that I hitt hym
'and [it] happened that I hit him' (M: 15c. Parl.3 Ages 54)

(45) Type (i-4):

a. If that thee happe to comen in our shire
'if you(OBL) happen to come to our province' (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Fri. D.1401)

b. Hym happend to mete with ane abbott
'he(OBL) happened to meet with an abbot' (M: 15c. Alph.Tales 2/10)

Type (ii) is commonly found, as in:

(46) Type (ii):

a. Now wol I tellen forth what happed me
'now I will tell forth what happened to me(OBL)'
(M: 14c. Chaucer CT.WB. D.563)

b. 3if it[a funeral] happyn in the day of Paske
'if it happens in the day of Easter' (M: 15c. Spec.Sacer. 235/16)

In these examples, no potential Cause subject shows clear nominative case because the Cause argument is in general inanimate and thus expressed in the nominal (NP) or pronominal it, this, what, etc. which do not distinguish between nominative and accusative. The other possibility is to assume the examples in (46) as type (i-2) and type (i) respectively. However, this assumption is highly unlikely on the basis of the behavior of limpen of the same meaning and its previous history. Thus, we can conclude that the examples in (46) are type (ii) nominative-cause constructions.

Like limpen, type (iii) is found in the following syntactic frames:

(47) Type (iii):

a. 3e wite þei do wrong, þe worse schul þei happé
'you(NOM) know they do wrong, they shall fare the worse' (M: 14c. WPal. 3340)
b. *ther was a knyght *hat happend seke, & he made his testament
    'there was a knight who fell sick and he made his will'
    (M: 15c. *Alph. Tales* 216/19)

c. If I happyn wele, ffull sore they shall repent it euer dele
    'If I(NOM) fare well, they shall repent every part of it very sorely
    (M: 15c. *Gener.*(2) 4542)

For type (iii-2), only examples with a preverbal NP as a potential subject are found, as in:

(48) Possible type (iii-2):

    Sall no duke in his dayes siche destanye happyn
    'no duke in his days shall suffer such destiny' (M: 15c. *Morte Arth.*(1) 2436)

Interestingly, type (iii-3) is also attested:

(49) Type (iii-3):

    yf *ou happe ... *at *ow hitte on clergie
    'if you(NOM) happen to choose the clergy' (M: 14c. *PPLC* (Hnt) 12.114)

Like *limpen*, type (iii-4) is attested, indistinguishable from a Raising-construction:

(50) Type (iii-4):

    a. *u may hapin to sla sum dere
       'you may happen to slay a beast' (M: 14c. *Cursor* (Got) 3602)

    b. He may happyn to day com agane
       'he(NOM) may happen to come again today' (M: 15c. *Towneley Pl.* 37/481)

In sum, *limpen* and *happen* show similar syntactic patterns. In the following Table 3.5, we summarize all the attested syntactic types taken by *limpen* and *happen* (and *happenen*):
### Table 3.5: Syntactic frames of the HAPPEN verbs in ME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAPPEN verbs</th>
<th>Limpen</th>
<th>Happen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3). (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4). (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4) (=Raising)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

#### 3.2.4 The SEEM verbs

In ME *thinken* and *semen* are found for the meaning 'seem'. The former, which originates from OE *pyncan* 'seem', is used in EME and diminishes in the fifteenth century, leaving some frozen expressions like *me thinks* as relic forms, continuing in use even now, but as a conscious archaism only. Around the thirteenth century, a new word *semen* instead enters the language as a borrowing and acquires a productive role, replacing *thinken*. According to the OED, *semen* is borrowed from the Old Norse (henceforth ON) form *séma* 'to befit, beseem'. This has cognates: Olcel. *sæma* 'to honor, conform'; ODan. *söma* 'to be proper, seemly' (cited from the MED). In the following, we survey the syntactic frames of both these verbs.
Thinken

Like OE, type (i) without predicative nouns or adjectives is found only in apparent parenthetical examples or subordinate clauses which may potentially contain a subject or predicative adjective in the matrix sentence:

(51) Type (i):

Nu mihht tu seggenn her to me þiss word, 3iff þatt te þinnkeþþ
'now you can say here to me this word, if you like' (M: 13c. *Orm. 5151)

In my corpus a single example from Chaucer looks like type (i-2), as in:

(52) Type (i-2):

wordes..., now wonder nyce and straunge us thinketh hem
'words..., now they(OBL) seem to us(OBL) marvelously nice and strange'
(M: 14c. Chaucer *TC* 2.25)

Type (i-3), however, is frequently attested, as in:

(53) Type (i-3) (i/ii):

a. him þouȝte þat þare stod a treo riȝt before is bedde
'it seemed to him(OBL) that there stood a tree right before his bed'
(M: 13c. *SLeg.Kenelm ILd. 115*)

b. Him thoght þat bath sun and mone...
'it seemed to him(OBL) that both sun and moon ...' (M: 14c. *Cursor 4064*)

c. Hem þinkith, & soth it is, þat men of perfeccion ...
'it seems to them(OBL), and it truly is, that men of perfection...
(M: 15c. *Dives & P. 2.214*)

By contrast, type (i-4) (i/ii) is not well attested without predicatives. The infinitival clause is found always with a predicative adjective, as in:

90
(54) S'[INF]-cause with predicatives:

a. te hunched uuel of ant eil for to heren
   ['it] seems to you(OBL) evil and painful to hear' (13c. HM 22.11)

b. though him loh houst no lenger to strive
   'though [it] seemed to him(OBL) loathsome to strive no longer'
   (M: 14c. WPal. 349)

Like OE, type (ii) is found always with predicatives:

(55) Type (ii) with predicatives:

ase a sterre hit hinch to ous
   'like a star it seems to us' (M: 14c. Ayenb. 164/28)

The prepositional phrase in (55) shows an indirect object status of the Experiencer. For type (iii), no clear example is found with this verb.

Semen

Like thinken, semen is found in type (i) constructions, exclusively type (i-3) when there is a Cause argument:

(56) Type (i-3):

Hym semed that he felte his herte colde
   ['it] seemed to him(OBL) that he felt his heart turn cold'
   (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Fkl. F.1023)

Interestingly, type (i-4) without a predicative element is found in ME, though it was not available in OE:

(57) Type (i-4):

Hire(OBL) semes curteys forto be, For she(SBJ) is fayr so flour on tre:
   'She(lit.: her) seems to be courteous, for she is fair as flower on the tree'
   (13c. Havelok 2917)
This construction, occurring from the 13th century to the 15th century is apparently very idiosyncratic. See chapter 6 for further discussion.

Type (ii) is productive when it occurs with a predicative element, as in:

(58) Type (ii) with predicatives:

How gentil and how kynde ye semed
'how gentle and kind you(NOM) seemed' (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Cl. E. 853)

Interestingly, a type (iii) with a nominative Experiencer is also found in ME. In this case the meaning of this verb would be 'think, consider':

(59) Type (iii):

a. Type (iii-1):
   and ye seme weel of hym
   'and you(SBJ) think well of him' (M: 15c. Twici Venery 153)

b. Type (iii-2):
   Se me ye hit right to don me lyue aloon...?
   'Do you think it right to make me live alone...?' (or)
   'Does it seem right to you to make me live alone...?'
   (M: 15c. C.d'Orl. Poems 200/5962)

c. Type (iii-3):
   Sche schal seeme bat her affeccioun and desier is alwey rewardid
   'She will think that her affection and desire is always rewarded'
   (M: 15c. Orch.Syon 201/27)

The different meaning correlates with different syntax to some extent. It is interesting that semen shows a semantic shift, although short-lived. To judge from the meaning 'to befit, beseem' in the source language, Old Norse, this meaning 'think' of semen must be an English innovation.

Raising Constructions like He seems to me to be nice-looking in PDE are attested in ME. But in such examples it is evident that the Experiencer is the oblique me, not the
subject *he*. Thus, these Raising examples are not type (iii-4) Nominative-Experiencer constructions, a difference from HAPPEN verbs.

The following Table 3.6 summarizes all the types that the two verbs meaning 'seem' take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEEM verbs</th>
<th>thinken</th>
<th>Semen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3). (=i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4). (=i/ii)</td>
<td>x (w/ PRED)</td>
<td>x (w/ or w/o PRED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x (w/ PRED)</td>
<td>x (w/ PRED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 3.6: Syntactic frames of the SEEM verbs in ME

3.2.5 The BEHOOVE verbs

*Bihoven*

With ME verb *bihoven*, type (i) without a Cause argument is found, as in:

(i) *The wikkide men semen to be bareyne and naked of alle strengthe.*

'The wicked men seem to be barren and naked of all strenth' (M: 14c. Chaucer Bo. 4 pr.2. 186)

cf.

(ii) *Alle thingis semen to ben confus and trouble to us.*

'All things seem to be confusing and troublesome to us' (M: 14c. Chaucer Bo. 4 pr.6. 182)

The subject in (i) must not be an Experiencer because the Experiencer is found as *to us* in the similar construction (ii).
(60) Type (i):

a. He nis nawiht also leful also him bihouede
   'he is not at all so right as he(OBL) ought to be' (M: 13c. *Lamb.Hom.Creed* 75)

b. So hym bihoueth
   'So he(OBL) must' (M: 14c. *PPl.B* (Ld) 8.34)

A Cause argument is not found in the form of PP[of] in type (i). The following is indeterminate between types (i-1), (i-2) and (ii). Because it is from an early text, the grammatical case of *Cristes helpe* may be any oblique case (genitive or accusative) and even a nominative case following OE source:

(61) Type (i-1), (i-2) or (ii):

Nu hem behoefed Cristes helpe
'now he(OBL) needs Christ's help' or 'now Christ's help is needed for him'

By contrast, a clausal Cause is well attested, as in:

(62) Type (i-3) (= i/ii):

Help me, lady, me bihoued þou beo my counsellour
'help me, lady, it is necessary to me that you become my counsellor'
(M: 14c. *Fadur and sone* 64)

(63) Type (i-4) (= i/ii):

   a. bihoued us to rennen to cristes quike welle
      'we(OBL) ought to run to Christ's living well' (M: 13c. *Bestiary* 252)

   b. ous bihoued selle our asse oway
      'we(OBL) must sell our ass away' (M: 14c. *Amis* 1808)

Type (ii) is found very frequently, as in:

(64) Type (ii):

   a. þan alden bihoued duรงende þewas
      'The old man (OBL) needs(PL) good servants(NOM-PL)'
b. Thys shelde behovith unto no man
'this shield is necessary to no man' (M: 15c. Malory Wks 878/27)

Example (64a) is type (ii) because the thing needed (cause argument) is in the plural nominative and the verb is in the plural, while the person (Experiencer argument) is in the oblique case. Example (64b) shows that the non-nominative status of the Experiencer.

There are many examples, like (61), ambiguous between type (i-2) and type (ii) because the 'thing' argument is indistinguishable between the nominative and oblique. However, because no true type (i-2) is found while type (ii) is found, as in (64), all these ambiguous examples may fall to type (ii).

Some instances of type (iii) are attested, although mostly in EME. Type (iii-1) is not attested except for the very early ME period which may be considered as OE, as in (65):

(65) Type (iii-1):

a. Ne he nanes þinges ne behofæð
'nor does he(NOM) need anything(GEN)' (M: 12c. (OE?) Bod.Hom 82/26)

No clear type (iii-2) or type (iii-3) is attested. The fact that type (iii-1), such as (65), is found only in EME copy of an OE example leads us to believe that type (iii-1) is not in a common use throughout ME (Allen, p.c.). Allen (1995: 224-225) claims that while the nominative Experiencer is common with this verb in OE, the usage with a dative Experiencer is more favored by the early twelfth century. She states that the retention of nominative Experiencers in the twelfth-century manuscripts, by the side of their

---

12 Allen's (1995: 167, 225) observation of the following is thus very interesting. She notes that when we have both an OE and a twelfth-century version of the same text, we can see the substitution of a dative Experiencer for an originally nominative one. For example, Homily 49 in MS Bodley 343 is a fairly close copy of one of Ælfric's homilies (Thorpe's (1844) volume 1, number 10) from the very end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh century. She finds that the Bodley scribe has changed Ælfric's swa we behofedon 'as it was necessary for us' (Thorpe 156.14) to swa us behofede (Warner 1917: 149.16).
replacement by the dative in the same manuscripts, is suggestive that scribes still considered the old usage acceptable, although it may have been archaic.

However, while other contractions in type (iii) are rare in ME, type (iii-4) is often found:

(66) Type (iii-4):

a. he to be Iewes bud say somwhat
   'he(NOM) ought to say something to the Jews' (M: 14c. NHom.(3) Pass. 1566)

b. He behoued to lete Bedyuer ly stille
   'he(NOM) ought to let Bedyuer lie still' (M: 15c. Merlin 661)

If even a single subtype in type (iii) is attested, this implies that type (iii) without a Cause argument will be possibly attested. It is true as in the following example:

(67) Type (iii):

If thou gif me mete ... as I behoued
   'if you give me food... as I needed' (M: 15c. Towneley Pl. 53/48)

In sum, the verb *bihoven* is found all three types of constructions, with some variation for particular subtypes. The following Table 3.7 summarizes all the attested types:

---

13 Here *bud* is a morphologically contracted form found in northern dialects. For present tense, there are forms such as *bos(e), bus(e)*; for past tense, *bod(e), bude(e), bust(e).*

14 Allen (1995: 270) again emphasizes that *behoove* was extremely resistant to nominative Experiencers in ME. She claims that nominative Experiencers were also unusual in the construction with a sentential complement, although more common than 2NP constructions (i.e. those with two nominal arguments). However, considering quite many examples of type (iii-4) in the MED (see 1b(a), 1c. under *behooven*) and the fact that such examples are attested in some dialects until at least the nineteenth century, we cannot treat type (iii-4) as unproductive usage in ME.
### Table 3.7: Syntactic frames of the BEHOOVE verb in ME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BEHOOVE verbs</strong></th>
<th><strong>bihoven</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-3) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i-4) (= i/ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-1)</td>
<td>?(OE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii-4)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

3.2.6 The HUNGER verbs

*Hungren*

ME verb *hungren* occurs in type (i) without a Cause argument, as in:

(68) Type (i):

a. Mine men schulen eoten & ow schal eauer hungrin
   'my people shall eat and you(OBL) shall ever hunger' (M: 13c. AW 84/24)

b. Me hungred, thou woldest not me fede
   'I(OBL) hungered [but] you did not wish to feed me' (M: 14c. *Bi west* 53)

But types (i-1), (i-2), (i-3), and (i-4) are not attested. No clear type (ii) is found either, but type (iii) is commonly found, as in (69) below. A Cause argument can be expressed in a PP with the preposition *after*, as in (69c):
(69) Type (iii):
   a. Whanne he hungride...
The (NOM) hungered' (M: 14c. Wible1 Lk 6.3)
   b. I hungered and yhe me fedde
      'I(NOM) hungered and you fed me' (M: 15c. PConsc. 6151)
   c. sche hungryd ryth sor aftyr Goddys word
      'she(NOM) craved sorely for God's speech' (M: 15c. MKempeA 142/15)

No other subtypes of type (iii) are found except for the following possible type (iii-2):

(70) Possible type (iii-2):

   Blessyd be l>ei l>at hungren & þrusten ry3twysnes
   'Blessed be those(NOM) who hunger and thirst for righteousness'
   (M: 14c. Bible SNT(1) Mat. 5.6)

Remember that OE had also similar examples (see (53b) in chapter 2) with a genitive case.
With the loss of nominal endings, ME now has an uninflected form ry3twysnes
'righteousness', thus possibly interpreted as (iii-2).

Thirsten

The ME verb thirsten shows the construction types similar to hungren. Type (i)
without a Cause argument is commonly found throughout ME, as in (71):

(71) Type (i):

   a. þa him þurste o rode.
   'when he thirsted on the cross' (13c. AW 4.50b.8)
   b. þah hire þurste in þe lust.
   'although she thirsts with desire' (13c. AW 4.64b.21)
   c. The more ydropsie drinketh The more him thursteth
      'There more the hydroptic drinks, the more he thirsts' (14c. CA 5.254)
And type (iii) is also found throughout ME in the patterns similar to *hungren*:

(72) Type (iii):

a. that I thurste in on.
   'that I thirst in one (instantly)' (14c. CA 6.262)

b. (=70)
   Blessyd be þei þat hungren & þrusten ryȝtwynes
   'Blessed be those(NOM) who hunger and thirst for righteousness'
   (M: 14c. *Bible SNT*(1) Mat. 5.6)

The following Table 3.8 summarizes the syntactic frames of *hungren* and *thirsten* in ME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUNGER verbs</th>
<th>Hungren</th>
<th>thirsten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) or (iii-2)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x: represents an attested syntactic frame)

Table 3.8: Syntactic frames of the HUNGER verbs in ME

### 3.3 Discussion

In ME too, the category a verb can select varies according to whether it occurs in impersonal and personal constructions. For example, *shamen* does not have an accusative in the impersonal but does in the personal construction. *Longen* has a finite clause only in the non-nominative, not in the personal construction. Also, which particular category is selected varies according to different verbs. For example, PP[of] is found with *reuen*, *shamen*, *liken*, and *listen*, but is not found with *eilen*, *longen*, *thinken*, HAPPEN, and HUNGER verbs. S[INF] is found with *reuen*, *shamen*, *liken*, *longen* and *listen*, but not with *eilen*, HUNGER verbs.
Moreover, type (ii) is not appropriate for all verbs above: no genuine example of type (ii) is found with longen and HUNGER verbs. Type (i) is not found for all impersonal verbs, either. For eilen, no impersonal construction is found. Type (iii) is now found in all RUE and PLEASE verbs, of course with some variation depending on what syntactic frames (i.e. which categories) they select, and also in some example of HAPPEN and SEEM verbs.

3.4 Accidental gaps?

Not all construction types are attested for a particular verb in a certain stage. The following types are non-occurring in my corpus, not just in OE but also in ME, for each impersonal verb under consideration:

(73) Non-occurring syntactic frames:

a. RUE class:
   i. 'rue': types (i-4), (iii-3)
   ii. 'shame': type (i-2)
   iii. 'ail': types (i-1), (i-2), (i-4), (iii-1), (iii-3), (iii-4)

b. PLEASE class:
   i. 'long': types (ii), (iii-3), (iii-1)
   ii. 'list': type (iii-3)

c. HAPPEN and SEEM classes:
   i. 'happen': types (i-1), (i-2), (iii-1)
   ii. 'seem': types (i-1), (iii-4)

d. HUNGER class:
   i. 'hunger': type (ii), (i-3), (i-4), (iii-3), (iii-4)
   ii. 'thirst': type (ii), (i-3), (i-4), (iii-3), (iii-4)

Anderson (1986) and Lightfoot (1991) assume that the verb hreowan, showing all three types (i), (ii) and (iii), represents the typical case, and that many verbs manifesting only one or two of these possibilities in fact are revealing only accidental gaps in the text.
Many other previous studies, although not clearly stating so in words, tacitly follow this assumption, as manifested in their use of data. In many studies, e.g. Cole et al. (1980), Fischer and van der Leek (1983), the examples of particular verbs are randomly used for a particular purpose, with frequent broad statements like ‘impersonal verbs in OE can occur ...’. This approach implies that potentially all impersonal verbs under consideration behave uniformly. Fischer and van der Leek (1983) seem to be aware of this problem but they later assume all three types for impersonal verbs.15

By contrast, Allen (1986)16 considers seriously the absence (or rarity) of type (iii) with lician in OE, and proposes that lician did not have this type as a lexical entry in OE (p.387). Also, Harris and Campbell (1995: 83-84) assume that type (iii) is ME innovation.

In the study of a corpus language, it is difficult to determine whether a particular type of missing construction for a particular verb is impossible or simply an accidental gap. In this case, to resort to the latter option may certainly make everything easier, such as finding a neat generalization about the syntactic patterns. However, it seems unreasonable to assume that all verbs showing a particular syntactic pattern, e.g. impersonal construction, will also naturally share all other syntactic patterns because a subset of those verbs shows those patterns. Just as the grammatical cases of the arguments of impersonal verbs are lexically

15 For example, Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 337) says, ‘Rather than assuming, with Jespersen and others, that ‘impersonal’ verbs had one meaning in OE and another, the converse, meaning in New English (NE), we uphold that in OE both meanings existed side by side, systematically associable with different syntactic constructions.’ When explaining type (iii), Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 353) says, ‘For almost all impersonal verbs listed in note 8, we have found instances of their appearance in experiencer-subject constructions. For some verbs this appears to be the preferred construction [...] ; other verbs occur more regularly in type (i) and (ii) constructions.’ However, they states later ‘Assuming that each OE impersonal verb has a ‘neutral’, a ‘causative’, and a ‘receptive’ meaning ...’ (p. 356).

16 Allen has the same view in her recent work (1995): ‘When a construction is absent from a text, we must judge whether the absence is simply a data gap, or is due to something other than chance. ... But with other verbs, chance is a much less likely explanation. ... It is important to remember that in some cases at least, our judgement that not all three frames were possible with all these verbs does not depend on the limited data available from one author, or even from one period, but is a conclusion based on the consistent absence of a frame over a long period of time.’ (p. 81)
determined (Fischer and van der Leek 1983: 356), the possible syntactic types associated
with impersonal verbs must be clearly lexical.

It is well known that classification is grouping by relevant similarities and differences.
A class may not be homogeneous, but normally it has some internal differentiation whereby
a NUCLEAR or PROTOTYPICAL set of members shows more of the properties of the class
than other less fully characterized members. A class also may not show sharply definable
boundaries (Warner 1993: 10). Linguistic categorization seems essentially like other areas
of human categorization. In psychology, Rosch's works (1978, 1988) suggest that
cognitive categories need not be homogeneous in the sense that some members will share
more of the relevant groupings of properties than others.

It is well observed that no two lexical items have exactly same syntactic properties.
Gross's (1979) study of the simple predicates of French shows that no two predicates have
identical syntactic properties (p. 860). In particular, Gross (1975) studied the distribution
of the sentential complements (ce) que $S$, and, independently, that of the infinitival
complements ($S$ without its subject). In each case, more than 2,600 verbs are involved.
Gross observes that about 250 verbs have only infinitival complements, and 200 verbs
have only sentential complements, and all other verbs have both constructions. Here, we
see lexical differences in respect to the verb's ability to take a certain complement.

As an example for the fact that a class of verbs which share one syntactic property will
not necessarily share another syntactic property, see the following:

(74)  a. The king ate my salad.
    b. The king inhabits Columbus.

Both verbs share a common property: both can have a subject and a direct object. Thus
both verbs belong to the same class, namely, transitive verb class. However, while the
verb *eat* can take a passive, *inhabit* cannot unless the Agent is plural or COLLECTIVE (Gross 1979: 864):

(75)  
   a. My salad was eaten by the king.  
   b. *Columbus is inhabited by the king.  
      (cf. Columbus is inhabited by rich politicians.)

Another example of the similar phenomenon is found in the Raising verb class. In the following the matrix verbs are members of the class which triggers Subject-to-Subject Raising:

(76)  
   a. Max seems to run.  
   b. Max happens to run.  
   c. Max began to run.

All these three verbs belong to A-verbs, a subclass within Raising verbs (Postal 1974). They share some common syntactic properties which make them qualify as Raising verbs, e.g., they can have the dummy *it, there* as matrix subjects:

(77)  
   a. There seemed to be riots in California.  
   b. There happened to be riots in California.  
   c. There began to be riots in California

However, they do not share all the syntactic frames possible. For example, *seem* and *happen* can occur with an extraposed *that*-clause, but *begin* cannot:

(78)  
   a. It seems that Mitchell is a cretin.  
   b. It happens that Max is going to Tunisia.  
   c. *It began that Arthur ran.*

Therefore, not all verbs belonging to the impersonal verb class will share all syntactic types available to one particular member. Based on this heterogeneity of a class, we may assume that when a particular type (i.e. types (i), (ii), or (iii)), or subtype (i.e. types (i-1),
(i-2), (i-3), or (i-4) for the type) is consistently missing with a particular verb not only in OE text but also in the later period of ME and ModE, that particular type is impossible with the verb. Sometimes this assumption gives us some insight into the account of why impersonal verbs later develop in diverse ways (see chapter 5).

When we assume that impersonal verbs have diverse syntactic frames so that they cannot be collapsed into a single basic frame, only a single common feature is shared by these verbs which keeps this group of verbs distinct from others: they are all able to occur without a nominative argument, a fact which is in itself a definition of impersonal verbs.17

3.5 Broad description of historical change between OE and ME

Now, let us see how each verb historically changed from OE to ME with regard to three syntactic types. The development is summarized in the following table:

---

17 Therefore, this group of verbs constitutes a syntactic constellation. The idea of morphological constellation has been originally proposed in Janda and Joseph (1990) where the various members are linked to one another in some features but kept distinct from one another from other features. See Välimaa-Blum (1988) for syntactic constellation based on Finnish word order patterns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Continue</th>
<th>Disappear</th>
<th>Appear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUE verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'rue'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>i-1, i-3</td>
<td>i-2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>iii-1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2, iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'shame'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>i-1, i-3, i-4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>ii?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>iii-1, i-3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2, iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ail'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>i-3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>ii-2??</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLEASE verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'like'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>all types</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>all types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'long'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>i-4</td>
<td>i-1, i-2??</td>
<td>i-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2?, iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'list' (19c.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>i-1?, i-2?, i-4</td>
<td>i-1?, i-2?, i-3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>iii-1?, iii-4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9: Comparison of syntactic frames between OE and ME
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb/Type</th>
<th>Continue</th>
<th>Disappear</th>
<th>Appear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAPPEN verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'limpen'</td>
<td>i-3, i-4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2, iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'happen'</td>
<td>i-3, i-4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-2?, iii-3, iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEM verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'thinken' = 'semen'</td>
<td>i-3, i-4(w/ PRED)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>i-2 (thinken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii(w/ PRED)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>iii-1, iii-2, iii-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHOOVE verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'behoove'</td>
<td>(i-3?)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>i-3?, i-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii?)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ii?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii-1?</td>
<td>iii-1?, ii-3, iii-3</td>
<td>iii-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGER verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hunger'</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i-1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii-1</td>
<td>iii-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'thirst'</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i-1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii-1</td>
<td>iii-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9: Comparison of syntactic frames between OE and ME (Continued)
The comparison of the two stages shows that different verbs historically develop along
different lines and at a different pace. One reason is that all the verbs did not have the same
syntactic types in the earlier stage. For example, the HAPPEN class never had two nominal
arguments in type (i), although they are two-place predicates. The RUE and PLEASE verbs
can take two nominal arguments in general, but among these classes ail is not attested
taking the genitive Cause (or its descendent PP[of]) in all periods. The same change occurs
at different times for different verbs. For example, long loses the genitive Cause earlier (i.e.
before ME) than others such as rue, shame, and like.

The BEHOOVE verb shows patterns of change very different from other verb classes.
While others show increasing patterns of personal constructions (i.e. type (iii)), behoove
shows rather an opposite direction. The personal constructions were more commonly used
in OE. All types of personal constructions were used except for type (iii-4) in OE, but types
(iii-2) and (iii-3) have been lost before ME, type (iii-1) probably in EME, and (iii-4)
becomes obsolete only in ModE. Instead, type (i-3), whose existence in OE is dubious,
begins to be commonly used in ME, alongside of the newly introduced type (i-4). These
two types continue to be used until the nineteenth century (see the OED), but type (i-3)
becomes now obsolete and only type (i-4) is used.

Although lexical differences are remarkable, we can still derive an after-the-fact
generalization. In general, the finite clausal complement tends to become lost or
continuously used. Except for the cases with long (i-3) which is soon discontinued, there is
no new introduction of the finite clausal complement since OE until ModE, unless they
were used in any type of constructions in OE.18 For example, the finite clausal complement
in type (i-3) is completely lost sometime between OE and ME with ail and list. Type (i-3)
is continuously used from OE until ME but lost sometime in ModE with rue, like. Type (i-

---

18  Seem has type (iii-3) which is used for short time in ME and lost in EModE. Like also develops the
type (iii-3). In these two cases, the finite clausal complement was used in type (i-3) in OE. Thus, type (iii-
3) may have been developed from type (i-3).
3) is continuously used from OE to ModE with shame, happen, and seem, when dummy it is used (e.g. It shames me that he failed in the test). For behoove, type (i-3) may be considered as a new type in ME but it was possible because the finite complement clause was already possible in OE. The type (i-3) continues with the dummy it until the nineteenth century. Again, we see that different verbs change in different ways.

The development of the infinitival clause is contrasted with that of the finite clause. For many verbs, e.g. rue, shame, like, long, happen, seem, behoove, the infinitival clause is newly introduced in ME. As expected, the acquisition of the infinitival clause is more apparent in the personal construction (i.e. type (iii-4)). It seems that this new acquisition is possible either when the verb originally could have type (i-4), thus, the change is simply from impersonal to personal constructions, or when the verb could have another clausal type (i.e. type i-3). The increasing tendency of the infinitival clause from the finite clause, not just with impersonal verbs as shown here but with ordinary verbs, is well known in the history of English, as in:19

(79) Finite clause to infinitival clause:

a. OE example:
   and bebead ðam cwellerum þæt hi hine mid
   and ordered the executioners(DAT) that they him with
   wiðum handum and fotum on þære rode gebundon
   cords hands and feet on the cross bound

   'and ordered the executioners(DAT) to bind him hand and foot to the cross with
cords.' (ÆCHom i. 38.594.30)

b. ME example:
   þis castel þat he bad hem goo intoo...
   'this castel that he asked them to go into...' (Denison 178: 15c. Loll. Serm. 1.150)

19 Infinitives have replaced finite complements with certain adjectives too, as the comparison of OE (ia) with the PDE (ib) shows (Joseph 1983: 248):

(i) a. ic ne eom wyrf þæt ic þin sunu beo genenmed.
   I not am worthy that I your son be called
   'I am not worthy that I be called your son.'

b. I am not worthy to be called your son.
c. PDE example:
He ordered them to leave / *He ordered them that they should leave

Manabe (1979) compares the relative frequency between finite and infinitival (or non-finite) clauses in five categories over time. According to Manabe's survey (p.4-5), we find a steady rise of the proportion of infinitival clauses until the sixteenth century when there are more infinitival clauses than finite clauses.

Another notable change between OE and ME is the development of the transitive construction (i.e. type (iii-2)). Except for behoove, which changes in a direction opposite to other verbs as just explained, many verbs newly acquire type (iii-2) at ME period. This is contrasted with the notable loss of type (i-2) with these verbs.

We see that in general the use of type (iii) has increased, of course, with some variation in its subtypes (e.g. iii-1, iii-2, iii-3, iii-4). Except for behoove, long(?), all the newly acquired subtypes in the ME period belong to type (iii). However, ail never newly develops type (iii) while the other verbs keep or newly develop this type. Again, we see a lexical difference.

The type (ii) construction tends to exist continuously from OE to ME, if it was possible with a particular verb in OE. We do not find any loss of the type in ME. For listen, type (ii) is newly attested in ME. In PDE, causative meaning is still available for ail (e.g. what ails him?), happen, etc. But for the words like rue, like and long, the causative construction was lost and only the personal (receptive) meaning is used in PDE. When only

---

20 The five categories studied in Manabe (1979) are:

(i) a. Subject:  -it (without it in extraposition)
       +it (with it in extraposition)

b. Complement
   Object -S (without a subject of the non-finite verb)
       +S (with a subject of the non-finite verb)
   Adjunct -purpose (non-purposive function)
       +purpose (purposive function)
   Adjunct modification
personal constructions remain for a verb in PDE, the impersonal construction began to diminish earlier than causative constructions.21

Difference between type (i) and type (ii) constructions are as follows. From a semantic perspective, type (i), as represented in (80), does not cause meanings of a verb to conflict with the personal construction as this becomes dominant.

(80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Impersonal:</th>
<th>Personal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>NP[DAT/ACC]</td>
<td>NP[GEN/ACC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>NP[NOM]</td>
<td>NP[GEN/ACC]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the causative construction, as represented in (81), has a completely opposite meaning to the personal construction because the same grammatical cases are associated with two completely contradictory thematic roles.

(81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Causative:</th>
<th>Personal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>NP[DAT/ACC]</td>
<td>NP[NOM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>NP[NOM]</td>
<td>NP[GEN/ACC]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a syntactic perspective, the impersonal construction came to violate a syntactic constraint in LME whereby the nominative case has to be present obligatorily in a sentence while the causative construction did not.

The later loss of the causative construction as compared to the impersonal construction seems to imply that in syntactic change a particular construction is more resistant to change when it satisfies a syntactic constraint of a language in spite of a semantic problem than vice

---

21 The causative meaning 'to please' of the verb like is found until the 19th century, as in the following example from OED:

(i) I rode sullenly upon a certain path that liked me not (Rossetti, Dante & Circ. (1874) I. 41)

The impersonal construction, comparatively, is not found in ModE except in the highly fossilized or lexicalized expression such as me thinks, presumably used as a conscious archaism for rhetorical reasons.
versa. This in turn suggests that the change of syntactic constraints was a primary cause to this diachronic change while the meaning restriction was secondary.

3.6 Conclusion

In chapters 2 and 3, I have focused on how heterogeneous the syntactic distributions of the impersonal verbs are in each synchronic stage of OE and ME. Different impersonal verbs behave differently in terms of their occurrences in particular syntactic types as well as in subtypes. Therefore, the diachronic change of each verb also varies with regard to particular syntactic types and subtypes. We have also seen that the timing of the (same) change is gradual and even the direction of the change is diverse (e.g. behoove vs. other verbs)

However, examining particular instantiations of impersonal verbs at two historical stages nonetheless does allow us to find some overall tendency in the changes between OE and ME. We found the tendency of increasing patterns of type (iii) constructions, although there is an exception (e.g. behoove). The innovative appearance of a personal construction is especially notable with regard to type (iii-2) and type (iii-4). We saw that the increasing tendency toward having infinitival clauses in the place of finite clauses is a general phenomenon in the history of English. By contrast, the impersonal construction (type (i)) in general follows a decreasing line, except for behoove.

My particularistic approach proposes the following points. First, a data-oriented approach to impersonal verbs shows how the change is gradual and how different verbs change along different lines of change. Divergent change is in part due to the synchronic variations across the verbs in the previous stage.

Second, contrary to Anderson (1986) and Lightfoot (1991), the three syntactic types (i), (ii) and (iii) did not occur for all impersonal verbs. Therefore, Fischer and van der
Leek's (1983) representation of lexical entries is overgeneralized because no single verb exactly matches such lexical entries.

Third, Fischer and van der Leek's (1983) account of the relations among three syntactic types by means of move-α is not accurate because the data show that the same verb selects different categories according to whether it occurs in impersonal or personal constructions.

Fourth, in spite of a divergence in synchrony and diachrony, we yet find some tendency of change in diachrony. For example, we have found that in cases where the impersonal and causative constructions are now both obsolete in ModE, the two types had undergone the decay at different times: the impersonal decayed earlier than the causative. This implies that syntactic change is more subject to syntactic constraint than to semantic restriction.
CHAPTER 4

SUBJECTHOOD IN IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

4.1 Introduction

In chapter 2, we saw that the constructions with nominative case, either Nominative-Cause (= type (ii)) or Nominative-Experiencer (= type (iii)), are already used for some verbs in OE. These verbs are hreowan (types (ii) and (iii)), sceamian (type (iii), ?type (ii)), eglian (type (ii), ??type (iii)), lician (type (ii)), lystan (type (iii)), (ge-)limpan (type (ii)), pyncan (type (ii) with PRED), behofian (type (iii), ?type (ii)), hyngrian (type (iii)), pyrstan (type (iii)).1 Except for langian, all the verbs more or less show some nominative constructions. Langian later develops type (iii), but never type (ii), in the ME period.2

In general, the nominative case is considered to be a subject (or a complement of copular verb) in PDE. This is true for OE too (Denison 1993: 16). Thus, the nominative case found in the constructions with impersonal verbs will be considered the subject of the sentence containing it. This will be proven correct later in this chapter, because the nominative case with impersonal verbs exhibits same subject properties which general subjects with ordinary verbs do.

1 The symbol ? before a type indicates that the type is possible, but not confirmed. The symbol ?? means that it is more questionable than the ones with a single question mark.

2 This shows that different verbs have developed subject constructions at different times.
Traditional analyses have simply assumed that dative or accusative cases are objects in a sentence, thus treating (preverbal) dative/accusative Experiencers of the impersonal verb as objects. However, many recent studies report that grammatical cases are not identical to grammatical relations. In this chapter, thus, a basic assumption is that case marking does not determine a grammatical relation. We reserve the term CASE to refer to morphological characteristics.

The question is whether one of the two arguments, though in the oblique case, in the impersonal construction (= type (i)) has a role of subject. The target sentences under examination are those which have two nominal arguments, i.e., types (i-1), (i-2). The sentences with finite and infinitival clauses, i.e., types (i-3), (i-4), I argue, show indeterminacy in this respect because the clausal Causes have different categorial status from the nominal Experiencers. Thus, the relevant impersonal verbs under consideration are hreowan, sceamian, lician, langian, and lystan, which can take types (i-1) and (i-2). I propose that one of the two arguments in the impersonal construction behaves as a subject. If true, those impersonal constructions are not truly subjectless.

Before proceeding with this issue, we need to distinguish two clearly different types of sentences. In the following, both sentences are without nominative cases. But the nominativeless construction in (1a) is different from the nominativeless one in (1b):

(1) Two constructions without nominative case:

a. Het hi þa swingan
   bade her(FEM.ACC) then scourge (INF)
   ‘[The father] then commanded her to be scourged’ (Jul 142)

b. hi þæs ne sceamode
   them(ACC) that(GEN) not shamed(SG)
   ‘they were not ashamed of that’ (C: Ps 21.4)

In example (1a) the verb hatan ‘to bid’ in its nature is not an impersonal verb, but simply the subject (nominative) is missing (or not expressed) and is recoverable from previous
context. This is called a pro-drop phenomenon and found in many other Indo-European languages in which the verbal ending representing the person and number makes it possible to recover the non-expressed subject (see more discussion of the pro-drop in chapter 7). However, example (1b) is different from the pro-drop phenomenon of (1a). The nonoccurrence of the nominative case is not the case of non-expression. The verb is a two-place predicate and the required arguments are both actually expressed: one in the accusative, the other in the genitive. Thus, no argument is missing, suggesting one may indeed be a subject. This is one of the properties of the impersonal verbs that we have already discussed.

For the impersonal constructions like (1b), I claim that one of the two arguments in (1b) shows some syntactic properties of a subject already in OE and that these properties give way to the concrete status of this subject which later results in morphological distinctions too. The idea that a non-nominative case can be a subject is not new at all. There is not always a complete correlation between nominative case marking and subjecthood. Non-nominative subjects are found in many languages, including Japanese and Korean (Shibatani 1977), Georgian (Cole et al. 1980, Anderson 1984), Bengali (Klaiman 1980), Kannada and some other South Asian languages (Sridhar 1979), Malayalam (Mohanan 1982), Icelandic (Thráinsson 1980, Maling 1980, Andrews 1982, and Zaenen et al. 1985), and Polynesian and Germanic languages (Cole et al. 1980).

Cole et al. (1980) examined the historical process of subject development and proposed a three-stage unmarked order of acquisition of subject properties. At an early stage in the development of the construction (Stage A), the NP in question displays no subject properties, whether coding or behavioral properties. The coding properties are morphosyntactic properties, e.g. nominative case-marking and control of verb agreement. The behavioral properties are transformational properties, e.g. control of reflexivization. At a later time (Stage B), the analogous NP exhibits behavioral, but no coding, properties. If
coding properties are found at any stage, they are acquired subsequent to behavioral properties (Stage C):

(2) Three-stage development of subject properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage A</th>
<th>Stage B</th>
<th>Stage C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No properties</td>
<td>Behavioral properties</td>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Coding properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cole et al. provide the following behavioral properties: (a) only subjects control the process of reflexivization, (b) subjects undergo and trigger rules of deletion under identity (e.g. Equi-NP-Deletion), (c) only subjects are raised (e.g. Raising).

As discussed already in chapters 1 and 2, the impersonal constructions such as (1b) do not show coding properties for the subject. The verb is always in the third person singular, and thus is controlled by neither the Experiencer nor the Cause.

Cole et al. (1980: 728-30) try to explain English data showing behavioral properties. They claim that OE shows sporadic instances in which Experiencer NPs behave as subjects. As the only evidence they present the property of Subject-to-Subject Raising. For ME, Equi-Deletion and Conjunction Reduction are presented as the evidence.

Studies of subjecthood specializing in English are found in Lightfoot (1979), Allen (1986), Kim (forthcoming). Lightfoot, like Cole et al., proposes that the dative Experiencer behaves like subject in ME. As evidence, he invokes Conjunction Reduction. Allen (1986) deals with a single verb, like. On the same assumption that Conjunction Reduction is a valid indicator of subjecthood, she proposes that already in OE the preposed dative Experiencer behaves as subject. However, Conjunction Reduction as a subject property is problematic, as Allen herself pointed out and as is discussed later.

In the following, I want to argue that in the impersonal constructions with two oblique nominal arguments, the oblique Experiencer, not the oblique Cause, exhibits some subject
properties in its syntactic behavior in OE. In so doing, I first examine the validity of the
previously proposed subject properties in OE and ME. Then I propose more convincing
subject properties available for OE. Those are (i) relative order between the subject and
object in the inverted topicalization, (ii) relative order between the subject and object in the
inverted nexus-question, (iii) Equi-NP-Deletion.

4.2. Subject properties of the non-nominative Experiencer (Types i-1, i-2)
4.2.1 Previous proposals of subject properties
4.2.1.1 Conjunction Reduction

Let us first discuss Conjunction Reduction, which has been claimed as a syntactic
property of subject. This is the property that the subject of a coordinated clause can be
deleted under identity with the subject of the preceding conjunct clause. In PDE a deleted
element in coordinated structure may be interpreted as anaphoric to a full NP only if it has
the same grammatical function. Thus in the following PDE examples a deleted subject
cannot be interpreted as anaphoric to an object in (3a), nor can it be even if a full NP
occurring in the objective case is preposed (Lightfoot 1979: 235):

(3) Conjunction Reduction in PDE:
   a. *They fired Fred and ___ is teaching astrology.
   b. *Fred they fired and ___ is teaching astrology.

Lightfoot (1979: 234-5) and Cole et al. (1980: 730) observe that this restriction holds in
ME too and claim that the dative Experiencer in the impersonal construction in ME exhibits
this subject property, as in the following ME sentence:
(4) Conjunction Reduction in ME:

Us thoughte it was noght worth to make it wys, and ___ granted him
withouten moore avys
‘We thought it was not worth to make it wise, and [we] allowed him
without more advice.’ (Lightfoot 235: 14c. Chaucer CT A. 785)

In (4) the second conjunct clause does not have an overt subject, yet the verb *grant* is not
an impersonal verb and normally takes a nominative as subject. Since the verb *grant* has a
clear nominative subject and its subject understood from meaning is *us* in the preceding
clause, it seems that *us* in the preceding conjunct clause corresponds to a subject function.

As another type of Conjunction Reduction in ME, Cole et al. provide the following
example in which the oblique Experiencer is deleted in the second conjunct clause under
identity with nominative subject in the preceding clause:

(5) Conjunction Reduction in ME

Lewed men leued hym well and ___ liked his wordes.
‘Ignorant men loved him well and liked his words’
(Cole et al. 729: 14c. Langl. *Piers Plowman*, prol. 72)

However, this example is problematic because the impersonal verb *like* can take a
nominative Experiencer subject as well, by the time this example is used (14c.), as seen in
Chapter 3 (and Cole et al. are aware of it (p.729 fn. 16)). The deleted element may be
identified as a nominative subject, not an oblique subject. Thus this example does not prove
that subjecthood of the oblique Experiencer.

Allen’s (1986) study is different from Lightfoot (1979) and Cole et al. (1980), in that
she applies this restriction to OE too. Allen proposes that this control of coordinate subject
deletion by an oblique Experiencer did not first appear in ME, and it is not at all unusual in
OE with the verb *like*, as in the following example:

Here I must clarify that Allen (1986) herself pointed out (p. 391) that there were a few examples in
which the deleted pronoun is coreferential to the object, not the subject of the earlier sentence. Later, Allen
(1995: 59) states that Conjunction Reduction can be used with caution as a test for subjecthood in OE.
(6) Conjunction reduction in OE:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ac} & \text{ gode ne licode na heora geleafleast} \\
\text{but} & \text{ God(DAT) not liked(SG) not their faithlessness(NOM)} \\
\text{ac} & \text{ asende him to fyr of heofonum} \\
\text{but} & \text{ sent them to fire of heaven}
\end{align*}
\]

'But their faithlessness did not please God, but [he] sent them fire from heaven.'

(Allen 390: Alc. P. 20.71)

On the assumption that control of coordinate subject deletion is a property only of subjects, Allen claims that the dative-marked Experiencer (gode), if preposed, is subject in the examples such as (6), although there is a nominative-marked Cause. She observes that conjunction reduction is usually controlled by the nominative cause but can also be controlled by a preposed dative experiencer. Thus, Allen proposes to treat like as a verb which permitted two assignments of semantic to grammatical relations. The first, and much more commonly used, subcategorization frame assigned the Experiencer to the object role and the nominative Cause to the subject role. In the second frame, the Experiencer played the role of subject, with dative marking. Allen represents these two frames in a LFG framework as follows (Allen 1986: 388, 394):

(7) Allen's (1986) subcategorization frame of like in type (ii):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. EXP} & \quad \text{CAUSE} \\
\text{Pred 'LICIAN < (OB) >'} \\
\uparrow \text{OB CASE = DAT} \\
\uparrow \text{SB CASE = NOM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. EXP} & \quad \text{CAUSE} \\
\text{Pred 'LICIAN < (SB) >'} \\
\uparrow \text{SB CASE = DAT} \\
\uparrow \text{OB CASE = NOM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

However, it is not very convincing to treat the (postposed) nominative case as the object of the verb like, merely based on a single test whose legitimacy has been questioned. In example (6), even if the nominative case were a subject, it would more
likely to be placed at the end of clause, because it is heavier than the dative Experiencer. This phenomenon is well known. Reszkiewicz (1966) and Strang (1970), for example, claimed that although there is unmarked element order, marking could be achieved on account of the weight of elements. They note that rhythmically light elements tend to occur at the start of the clause and heavy elements, such as a clause, at the end of the clause. It is generally agreed that pronouns tend to come earlier in a clause than functionally equivalent full NPs and subordinate clause later in a clause. In (6), therefore, we can interpret that the heavier NP (heora geleafleast), although subject, came later than the lighter NP object (gode).

The Conjunction Reduction test is Allen's only evidence leading her to claim the possibility of nominative object. However, there is evidence that the controller of the deleted subject in the second conjunct of a coordinate structure was not limited to a subject in ME (Mustanoja 1960, Visser 1963, Wolfe 1970). Warner (1983: 206) and Anderson (1984: 250) remark that the Conjunction Reduction test is simply false as applied to OE and ME, because there are some instances of deletion of the subject anaphoric to a preceding non-subject from OE until EModE.

In Mustanoja (1960: 141) and Visser (1963: 5-6), we find many ME examples of regular (or non-impersonal) verbs showing the subject coreferential with a non-subject oblique case in the preceding conjunct clause:

(8) Oblique antecedent to the deleted subject in coordinate structure in ME:

a. fil me i a cuppe of ful god ale, And ___ i wile drinken er y spelle 'Fill me a cup of full good ale, and [I] will drink before I speak.'
   (Mustanoja: Havelok 15)

b. And with that worde his i hewe fadeth. And ___ i saide...
   'and with that word his hew fades and [he] said...' (Visser 6: 14c. CA i.251)

c. that knyght smote down sir Trystramus i frome hys horse, and ___ i had a grete falle.
   'that knight smote down sir Tristramus from his horse and [he] had a great fall.'
   (Visser 6: 15c. Malory, M.d.'A. 482.22)
In OE examples too, we find a deleted subject in coordinate structure inferred from a clearly non-subject oblique case in a preceding clause. The following OE examples are from Mitchell (1985: 630):

(9) Oblique antecedent to the deleted subject in coordinate structure in OE:

a. His _ forme gefeohht wæs wið Atheniense & ___ i
   his first fight was against Athens
   the overwon.
   them over-won

   ‘his first fight was against Athens and [he] overcame them.’ (Or 114.8; Or 110:31)

b. Da easteman tungelwitegan gesawon niwne steorran $$ i$$ beorhtne,
   the eastern star-prophet saw new star(ACC) bright
   na on heofenum betwux oðrum tunglum, ac ___ i wæs angenga
   not in heavens between other stars but ___ he was alone
   betwux heofenum and eordan
   between heavens and earth

   ‘The eastern astrologer witnessed a new bright star not among other
   stars in the sky but [it] was alone between heaven and earth.’ (ÆCHom i. 106.24)

Allen (1986: 391) herself also concedes that there are exceptions to the Conjunction Reduction but considers them as quite unusual and suggests it is even hard to tell whether they are not simply errors. She states that Conjunction Reduction is highly favored when there is coreference with the subject of the previous conjunct. According to Allen’s statistics, four cases (1%) of the 313 relevant examples show the exceptions, while the two conjuncts have the same subject where deletion is found in 80% of the 1747 examples. She notes that even if we accept these exceptions as grammatical sentences, they are not in and of themselves proof of the existence of a free subject pronoun deletion rule, because similar deletion is found in colloquial PDE:

(10) I saw John yesterday. Told me you were sick.
But this PDE example does not involve conjunctions. All the examples cited from OE and ME above have a coordinate structure. In colloquial PDE we do not say the following:

(11) * I saw John yesterday and told me you were sick.

Thus, the Conjunction Reduction patterns of OE and ME are clearly different from those of PDE.

Although Allen’s statistically-based argument is compelling, a handful of exceptions still remain as questions. Therefore, we need more convincing support from other subject properties. Conjunction Reduction test can only be used as a subsidiary evidence.

4.2.1.2 Subject-to-Subject Raising

Cole et al. (1980) use Subject-to-Subject Raising as a subject property in OE and ME, claiming that only subjects can raise in a Raising construction. The OE example they use has the accusative Experiencer verb langian ‘to desire, long for’ appearing embedded under the subject-to-subject Raising verb onginnen ‘begin’, and the raised Experiencer retaining its accusative case:

(12) Raising of oblique Experiencer in OE

ḁa ongan hine eft langian on his cyōōe.
then began he(ACC) again V(INF) for his homeland
‘Then he began to long for his homeland’ (Cole et al. 729: BlHom 113. 15)

In this kind of Raising example, it is questionable whether it can be a true test for subjecthood. The Raising verbs are transparent to impersonal constructions just as auxiliary verbs are as in the following:
a. hine sceal on domes dæg gesceamian beforan gode
him(ACC) shall at Dooms day shame(INF) before God
‘He shall be ashamed before God at Doomsday’
(Warner 123: Wulfstan, Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien 238.12)

b. þonne mæg heora wiðerwinnan sceamian
then may their enemies(ACC-PL) shame
‘then their enemies may be ashamed’
(Warner 123: Wulfstan, Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien 199.12)

Warner (1993: 128) calls the verbs found in the transparent position within impersonal constructions I-verbs. Central to this group of verbs are modal auxiliaries. He finds that the incidence of the so-called Raising verbs which occur in impersonal construction is very low, apart from onginnan ‘to begin’, aginnan ‘to begin’. He sees that on distributional grounds it is impossible to distinguish between a more general group of Raising verbs and the I-verbs. The Raising verbs also share with auxiliaries a semantic characteristic: they assign no semantic role to their subject. Based on these facts, Warner treats the I-verbs as Raising verbs. Whether or not we treat modal auxiliaries as Raising verbs in that they show

In case of other verbs, Callaway (1913: 59-60, 72, 82), also cited by Warner (1993: 130), shows a handful of indisputable examples of Raising constructions. Some of them, however, like would, meahte, belong to auxiliaries. Others are like the following:

(i) Hwilc cræft þe gepuht betwux pas furþna wesan?
Which occupation you(D/A) seems between those superior to-be(Inf)
‘Which occupation seems to you to be superior among those?’ (/EColl 221)

In this case the raising verb used is (ge-)pyncan ‘to seem’. But remember that this verb by itself can take impersonal constructions. Thus this example does not imply anything about the subject property.
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transparency to impersonal constructions like Raising verbs, the importance here is that there is no clear-cut boundary between central auxiliaries and Raising verbs like begin, as far as the transparency to the impersonal construction is concerned. If we should treat the Raising construction involving begin as a subject test, then we would have to include so many similar examples involving auxiliaries like (13) as evidence for the subjecthood of the oblique Experiencer in impersonal constructions.

Such a move, however, is dubious. For instance, Anderson (1984: 249), in the same context, notes that given that the putatively raised pronoun in (12) retains its accusative inflection and that its position provides no evidence either way, it is difficult to maintain that Raising has in fact necessarily taken place here. The fact that the Raising verb onginnan 'to begin', used in (12), has a bare infinitive as a complement, rather than to-infinitive, shows that this verb behaves more like an auxiliary verb. Therefore, the Raising test involving onginnan 'to begin', aginnan 'to begin' can give only a subsidiary support to the subjecthood of the oblique Experiencer. If the Raising verb is used with a to-infinitive, as in PDE, then we can more clearly say that the subject of infinitival clause is actually raised.

4.2.1.3 Reflexivization

One of the commonly used subject tests, one based on certain universalistic assumptions, is reflexivization. The idea is that only grammatical subjects can be the antecedents of reflexive pronouns. Zaenen et al. (1985), for example, use this test for Icelandic.

For English, van Kemenade (1985) argues that the impersonal construction (type i) is different from types (ii) and (iii) with nominative case in that it does not contain the feature AGR (agreement) in spite of the fact that it is tensed. As evidence for that, she makes use
of reflexive pronouns as anaphors which must, according to Chomsky’s Binding theory, be bound in their minimal governing category. Fischer and van der Leek (1987: 84-87) summarize her argument well and point out that it is mistaken. For OE, there are no distinct reflexive forms. Any personal pronouns in an oblique case can be used reflexively as follows:

(15) Reflexive use of personal pronouns in OE

a. Ic i bletsige me i
   I bless me
   ‘I bless myself’ (Mitchell 112: ÆCHom ii 600.22)

b. dios sæ cwïð ðæt ðu i dïn i scarnige, Sidon
   this sea commands that you you shame, Sidon
   ‘This sea commands that you be ashamed of yourself, Sidon.’
   (Fischer and van der Leek 85: CP 52.409.33)

Differently from PDE, moreover, the sylf- forms, in combination with personal pronouns, can be used emphatically but need not be used reflexively. Sylf- pronouns can occur in the tensed clause, i.e. with AGR, without having their antecedents in the same clause (i.e. the minimal governing category containing them). In the following examples, the antecedent of

\[\text{\textit{Van Kemenade's argument is as follows. The reflexive pronoun is bound to its antecedent in its minimal governing category. In example (15b), the minimal governing category is the subordinate clause because it contains a SUBJECT accessible to the ‘reflexive’ Oin. Thus, Oin is bound to Ou. Van Kemenade notes, incorrectly, that the situation is different in case of impersonal constructions as follows:}}\]

\[(i) \text{ ðæt he ðres mannes ungëlimp bësargie, and nanum geboðan ðæt they other man’s unhappiness deplore, and none to-command that him sylfum ne licie him self not please} \]

\[\text{‘that he would deplore another man’s unhappiness and... to command to no one what he does not like’ (Fischer and van der Leek 85: ÆCHom I 38. 584.4)}\]

Here the antecedent of the ‘reflexive’ pronoun is not to be found in the same clause as the pronoun, but in the higher clause. Van Kemenade attempts to explain this by claiming that in case of impersonal constructions the AGR is absent while in case of the nominative constructions (types (ii) & (iii)) the AGR is present, when they show agreement. Thus in the above example, says van Kemenade, the subordinate clause can not be a minimal governing category and thus the antecedent of the ‘reflexive’ pronoun may be found in a higher clause. However, this is incorrect. In nominative constructions too, this ‘long-distance reflexivization’ is found in OE.
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the *sylf-* pronoun is in the higher clause although the subordinate clause which contains the *sylf-* pronoun shows agreement.

(16) *Self-* pronouns as non-reflexive pronouns.

a. Sōð ic ēow secge þæt ge me sylfum dydon þas
   truth I you tell that you me self did the
   foresædan ðing..., above-mentioned things

   ‘I tell you truly that you did the above mentioned things to me’
   (Fischer and van der Leek 86: ÆCHom 11.426)

b. And þæt is swyðe god spell, þurh Godesi tocyme us
   and that is very good message through God’s coming us
   to gehynne þæt we habban moton þa heofonlican wununge
   to hear that we have may the heavenly home
   mid himi sylfum æfre,...
   with him self ever

   ‘and that is a very good message for us to hear through God’s coming that we may
   have the heavely home with him himself for ever’
   (Fischer and van der Leek 86-87: ÆCHom 8.3)

Therefore, since the *sylf-* forms are not necessarily bound to the subject in the minimal governing category, reflexivization cannot be used to test subjecthood in OE.

4.2.1.4 Equi-NP Deletion

Cole et al. (1980) use Equi-Deletion as a subject property. Their claim is that only a subject undergoes deletion by Equi-verb, when controlled by the subject or object in the matrix clause. As evidence they provide the following ME example:

(17) Equi-NP-Deletion of oblique Experiencer in ME:

Him burp to liken well his lif.
him befits to V(INF) well his life
‘[It] befits him to like his life well.’ (Cole et al. 729: 13c. Dame Sirith 82)
However, it is not clear if this example is really an Equi-construction. The interpretation of this sentence is twofold. First, because the matrix verb *biren* is by itself an impersonal verb, the oblique case *him* legitimately can occur as a semantic argument of *biren*, giving an interpretation of (17) as the Extraposition of an infinitival sentence rather than an Equi-NP Deletion construction. Second, the matrix verb *biren* can be also glossed as 'to be compelled to; must', which is auxiliary-like and thus closer to a Raising verb than to an Equi verb.

Whether (17) is an Extraposition, Equi or Raising, it still shows the subjecthood of the Experiencer of *like*, for the subjects can be not just the target of Equi-NP Deletion but also understood as ARBITRARY or anaphorically controlled PROs (Zaenen et al. 1985: 454). Thus, it would be better to explain the situation of (17) with a broader term, Infinitival Deletion (i.e. subject deletion in the infinitival clause). A deleted argument of an infinitival clause is subject. When we accept the general understanding that the first incidence of nominative Experiencer with *like* is the fourteenth century (see Allen 1986: 400), the deleted argument (i.e. Experiencer) of *like* in (17) is identified as the oblique. Thus (17) will be a true example for the oblique (Experiencer) subject, assuming *his lif* as accusative (even though it is indeterminate between nominative and accusative).

**4.2.2 Other subject properties in OE**

Our discussion above has shown that Reflexivization cannot be used as a subject test. Conjunction Reduction can be loosely used as a subject test, because it involves a few exceptions. The Raising test can be properly used when the matrix raising verb is not an auxiliary. If we include auxiliary-like verbs in the raising test, the incidence of the examples of the oblique Experiencer being a subject will be, of course, greatly increased. The Equi-NP-Deletion can be used as a subject test, although the previous study invoking this test
does not properly use it. The broader term Infinitival Deletion, instead, can be used. In the following I propose other subject tests available in OE.

4.2.2.1 Inverted Topicalization

In OE the subject tends to appear immediately after the finite verb if another constituent has been preposed as a means of Topicalization. This word order has been generally described as X’VS, where X’ is a topicated element. But not only this order but also non-inverted order X’SV can occur though at relatively low rates. The frequency of VS introduced by adverbials is greater in principal (or main) clauses. The topicated element can be adverbials, negators, complements, and direct or indirect objects. According to Kohonen’s (1978: 163) study, negators and adverbials show relatively the highest rates of topicalization. When a sentence includes both complement (including objects) and adverbial (including negators) and the adverbial is topicated, then the possible constituent orders are inverted X’VSO, and non-inverted X’SVO and X’SOV. Here the abbreviation O represents both objects and complements. The following examples are cited from Bean (1983), Kohonen (1978) and Mitchell (1985):

(18) Constituent orders in topicalization:

a. X’VSO (most common):
   Her lædde Beocca aldormon Wesseaxna ælmesan ... to Rome
   here took Beocca nobleman West Saxon’s alms to Rome
   ‘In-this-year nobleman Beocca took the alms of the West Saxons to Rome’
   (Bean 74: Chron. A 888.1)

b. X’SVO:
   Mid myrran man behwyrð deadra manna lic
   with myrrh man prepares dead man’s body
   ‘with myrrh man prepares the bodies of the dead’
   (Kohonen 164: CH 166.6)
c. X'VOS:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{on westenum wunigende woruldlíce} & \quad \text{estas and gælsan} \\
\text{in waste inhabitants worldly pleasures and wantonness} \\
\text{mid strecum mode and stíðum life fortæðon} \\
\text{with firm mind and strict life trampled-on}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Then the inhabitants in wilderness trampled on the worldly pleasures and wantonness with firm heart and strict life’ (Mitchell 968: ÆChorn i. 544. 27)

When an adverbial is topicalized, the order between the subject and the object is such that the subject precedes the object, unless the subject is so heavy as to move to the end of the sentence. In OE there is a tendency for heavy NPs to occur toward the end of the sentence. And I do not find any instance in which an object (or complement) precedes a subject when the verb is inverted and both arguments are of the same weight, i.e., *X’VOS.

Mitchell (1985: 973) cites two possible instances which may be considered as X’VOS, one from *Cædmon’s Hymn*, the other from *Beowulf*. But note that both of these are from poetry:

(19) a. Nu scylun hergan hefaenrices uard, now shall(PL) praise heavenly-kingdom’s protector metudæs maecti end his modgidanc, uerc uuldurfadur creator’s might and his intent works wonderous-father

‘Now [we] shall praise the protector of the heavenly kingdom, the might of the Creator and his intent, the works of the Father of glory’

(Mitchell 634: Cæd(M) 1)

b. ðonne sægdon þæt sælíþende, ... þæt he... then said(PL) that seafarers(PL) that he....

‘Then seafarers said that he...’  (Beo 377)

In example (19a), Mitchell (p. 634) suggests that despite the difficulty of the order Adv.VOS, *uerc uuldurfadur ‘works of father’* may be subject. However, this example has been controversial. The more commonly accepted interpretation is that the subject, *we*, is unexpressed by a pro-drop phenomenon. And this claim has been supported by that fact
that other manuscripts have *Nu we*. In the second example the subject is *sælipende* ‘seafarers’ and the object is the first *pæt* ‘that’ which is anaphoric to the following clause beginning with complementizer *pæt*. In this case the weight of the subject and the object is not same: one is a noun and the other a pronoun. In general, pronouns tend to occur close to the verbs. Therefore, neither of these example seems to be true counterexample to our claim.

The aforementioned general order of subject and object in topicalization can give us an insight useful in determining which one of the two arguments, of the same weight, in the impersonal construction has the subject property. If one argument consistently occurs immediately after the verb when both arguments are post-verbal, then it can be considered as showing a subject property.

4.2.2.2 Inverted Nexus-Question

Another property of the subject in OE is found from an interrogative sentence type. In OE nexus (or yes-no) questions can be asked in two ways, with the element order VS or with introductory *hwæðer* ‘whether’ and the order SV. When auxiliary verbs (v) occur, we find vSV order. When an object (or complement) occurs with a subject, the object follows the subject, i.e. VSO, as follows:

(20) VSO in a question:

a. ne ondrætst δu δe god?
   not fear(2-SG) you(NOM-SG) to-you God
   ‘Don’t you fear God?’ (Mitchell 679: ÆCHom ii. 256.12)

b. Habbe ic he awer benumen þinra gifena...?
   have I to-you ever deprived of-your gift
   ‘Have I ever deprived you of your gift?’ (Mitchell 679: Bo 17.17)

Sometimes an object can be topicalized in a question, giving OSV, such as follows:
(21) O/XSV order in a question:

Anwaldes du wilnast? ... Gilpes āu girst?
power you desire glory you yearn
'Do you desire power? Do you yearn for glory?' (Mitchell 679: Bo 71.25)

However, when a subject and a finite verb are inverted as usual and the object is not topicalized and is thus positioned after the verb, the order between subject and object is always subject-first, unless the subject is much heavier than the object in weight. Thus *VOS is ungrammatical but VSO is grammatical. Therefore, if a specific argument in impersonal constructions always occur after a finite verb in an inverted question, then this argument can be considered as subject.

4.3 Subject properties of the oblique case in impersonal constructions

In the following I examine Subject-Object-Order in Topicalization, Subject-Object-Order in Nexus questions, and Equi-NP Deletion as main subject properties to be discussed for impersonal constructions.

Among the impersonal verbs studied, hreowan, sceamian, lician, langian, and lystan are attested as taking two oblique arguments in impersonal constructions. The other verbs are not attested with nominal arguments as a Cause theta role. Therefore, only these five verbs are possible candidates to be examined.

4.3.1 Subject-Object-Order in Topicalization

The first criterion by which to equalize the weights of the two arguments is to eliminate the comparison between the pronoun and the noun phrase. Thus the following types of
examples are abandoned, although they represent typical examples of the phenomenon that
the oblique Experiencer precedes the oblique Cause:

(22) XVSO involving a pronoun and a noun phrase:

a. þonne hreoweð hyre swiðe þa yfelan dæda
   then rues(SG) her(DAT) very-much the evil deeds(ACC)
   ‘then she repents the evil deeds very much’  (C: HomS 4. 80)

b. Ne lyste eow þæs oferflowendan welan
   not desire(SG) you(DAT/ACC) the overflowing well(GEN)
   ‘you would not like the overflowing well’  (C: ChrodR 1.38.11)

The incidence of both arguments occurring in the same weight is very limited when the
examples like (22) are eliminated. Yet, there are some examples of impersonal
constructions taking two arguments of the same weight. Examples (23.a-e) show that both
arguments are of the same or similar weight, either both pronouns or both noun phrases of
the same or similar length. In this case the Experiencer typically (or at least for lystan,
sceamian, lician) occurs in the subject position:

(23) The relative order between Experiencer and Cause in the topicalization:

a. Ne lyst me nu þæs.
   not desires me(DAT/ACC) now that(GEN)
   ‘I do not desire that now.’  (C: Solil. 1.37.11)

b. þa lyste hi þæs.
   then desired them(ACC) that(GEN)
   ‘Then they desired that.’  (C: GD 1(C) 4.30.33)

c. ne sceamode ðe min ofer eordan.
   not shamed you(DAT/ACC) I(GEN) over earth
   ‘You were not ashamed of me on earth’  (C: ÆCHom l. 23.336.20)

d. þeah mæg þone wisan on gewitlocan þære gitsunge
   nevertheless may the wise(ACC) in mind the greediness
   gelpes scamian boasting(GEN) shame
   ‘Nevertheless the wise man in his mind may be ashamed of the fame from
   greediness’  (C: Met 10.7)
4.3.2 Subject-Object-Order in Nexus question

The relative order between the subject and the object in a nexus question is subject-first when the length of both elements is same. On the basis of this observation, we find that in the impersonal constructions the Experiencer typically (or at least for *lystan, langian*) takes the subject position.

(24) The relative order of Experiencer and Cause in the nexus question:

a. *Hu swiðe lyst ðe þæs?*
   *how much desires you(DAT/ACC) that(GEN)*
   ‘how much do you desire that?’ (C: Solil. 1.37.16)

b. *Langað þe awuht, Adam, up to gode?*
   *Longs you(DAT/ACC) anything(ACC) Adam up from God*
   ‘Do you long for anything, Adam, from God above?’ (C: GenA,B 495)

4.3.3 Infinitival Deletion

For deletion of the subject of the infinitive complement in OE, the following Object-Equi Deletion examples are found:

(25) Object-Equi Deletion in OE:

a. *Læt be sceamian ðæs hlisan*
   *Let thee(DAT/ACC) shame(Bare-INF) that rumor(GEN)*
   ‘Make you be ashamed of the rumor’ (C: Prov. 1 (Cox) I. 69)

b. *ne hit forðum him ne læt hreowan*
   *nor it forth him(DAT) not hinder rue(Bare-INF)*
   ‘nor does it further hinder him from repenting’ (C: Bo 39.134.28)

The controllers, *þe* and *him*, of the deleted subjects of the infinitive clause, are the objects of the matrix verb.
However, the impersonal verbs *sceamian* and *hreowan* already show personal usage in OE (See chapter 2). Unless we divide OE period into more subperiods, it will be hard to judge which type is earlier. Therefore, it is not clear whether the deleted subject of the infinitive clause is a nominative or oblique Experiencer. The Equi-NP-Deletion test will be more effective for the verbs *lician* and *longian*, for which morphologically proven nominative constructions (i.e. type (iii) and type (ii) respectively) do not occur. But such Equi-NP-Deletion examples are not found in OE. In early ME the Infinitival Deletion of the clear oblique subject is found, as in (17'), cited from Cole et al (1980):^6

(17') Infinitival Deletion of oblique subject in EME:

\[
\text{Him/ burj) [PRO/ to liken well his lif.} \\
\text{him befits to V(INF) well his life(ACC/NOM)} \\
\text{'[It] befits him to like his life well.' (Cole et al. 729: 13c. Dame Sirith 82)}
\]

4.4 Subject properties of the nominative case

The next question is whether a nominative-marked Experiencer or Cause has a role of subject. As we discussed section 4.2.1.1, Allen (1986) proposes a dual analysis: the nominative case usually has the role of subject, but the postposed nominative NP can have the role of object, as evidenced by the Conjunction Reduction test, when the preposed oblique Experiencer is co-occurring. However, we have seen that the Conjunction Reduction test is not a solid test for subjecthood. Instead, I want to claim that nominative

---

^6 For the type (i-4), as in the following translated example, it is difficult to decide between an analysis as Extraposition and that of Equi-NP Deletion:

(i) *Me* likes [ei to grant]

Here the lower verb *grant* is not an impersonal verb. One thing clear is that the empty subject in the lower clause, represented by *e*, is coreferential with the oblique subject/object *me* in the higher clause. If this is analyzed as Equi-NP Deletion, just as Cole et al.(1980) did, then it is more plausible to conclude that *me* is the subject of Equi-verb. The reason is that the verb *like* cannot take another referential argument as a subject, triggering an Object-Equi construction. This is further discussed in chapter 6.
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case always has the role of subject, whatever the position is. In this section, I first examine the verbs which are clearly able to take nominative case in type (ii). Those verbs in OE are *hreowān, eglian,* and *lician.*

4.4.1 Subject properties of the nominative Cause

4.4.1.1 Subject-Object-Order in Topicalization

When the Experiencer is in the oblique case and the Cause is in the nominative case, the Cause takes the subject position in inverted topicalization, if both are of the same length:

(26) X'vSOV order with *lician:*

*buton hæm ne mæg næni man gode lician*

without that not can no-any man(NOM) God(DAT) like

'without that no man can please God'  (C: HomS 32. 121)

This example is good evidence because the nominative phrase *næni man* 'no man' is heavier than the dative *gode,* thus eligible to move toward the end of the sentence. We see here that although heavier, the nominative occupies the immediate post-verbal position what we have identified as the subject position.

4.4.1.2 Infinitival Deletion

The Infinitival Deletion with the Equi-verb *tilian* 'to try' is found with the verb *lician* in the infinitive clause, as in:

---

7 For *gehreowān,* the following example is a candidate:

(i) *hton ne gehreowē hit be na.*

then not rues it(NOM/ACC) thee not

'Then it does not depress you'  (C: BenR 3.27)

Although the status of *hit* 'it' is not clear in terms of case-marking, it is more likely to be considered as a nominative subject.

135
(27) Subject-Equi Deletion of the nominative Cause:

\[ \text{iC \ symle \ tildode, \ mid \ rihtwisnesse, \ [\text{PRO} \ \text{he \ and \ him \ to} \] \]
\[ \text{I \ always \ tried \ with \ righteousness, \ thee \ and \ him(DAT) \ to} \]
\[ \text{licianne} \].
\]
\[ \text{like} \]
\[ \text{‘I \ always \ tried \ to \ please \ you \ and \ him \ with \ righteousness’ (C: Ps 25.3)} \]

Here, because the phrase \text{pe \ and \ him} ‘you \ and \ him’ is in the dative case, not the genitive case, it must be an Experiencer. Then the meaning of \text{to \ licianne} should be ‘to please’ with nominative Cause subject, which is commonly found in OE. The deleted subject PRO of \text{lician} is controlled by the subject \text{iC} of the matrix clause.

4.4.1.3 Conjunction Reduction

As noted above, Allen (1986) argues that the preverbal (i.e. preposed) oblique Experiencer has a role of subject even if there is a nominative Cause in the same clause, because the oblique Experiencer controls the deletion of the subject of the second conjunct in the coordinate structure, as in the example (6). The nominative Cause has the role of subject by such a Conjunction Reduction test, because the nominative Cause is the controller of the deleted subject of the second conjunct in the following example:

(28) Conjunction Reduction of the nominative Cause:

\[ \text{hi\, mægen \ ðæm \ inncundan \ Deman \ on \ hira \ agnum} \]
\[ \text{they(NOM) \ can \ the \ secret \ Judge(DAT) \ in \ their \ own} \]
\[ \text{inngeðonce \ lician, \ & ___ \ eac \ utane \ mid \ godum \ bisenum} \]
\[ \text{thought \ please \ & \ also \ outside \ with \ good \ models} \]
\[ \text{hiera \ agnes \ lifes \ hiera \ hieremonnum \ bisenigen} \]
\[ \text{of-their \ own \ life \ their \ servants \ set-example} \]
\[ \text{‘They \ can \ please \ the \ secret \ Lord \ in \ their \ own \ thought \ and \ also \ externally \ become \ an} \]
\[ \text{example \ for \ their \ servants \ with \ good \ models \ of \ their \ own \ life’ (C: CP 28.195.20)} \]
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Moreover, there are some examples in which although the oblique case is preverbal, the post-verbal (i.e. postposed) nominative case is found to control the deleted subject of the second conjunct, as in the following example:\(^8\)

(29) Conjunction Reduction of the postverbal nominative:

\[
\text{Hine geswencte seo wædlung; and } \underline{\text{---i}} \text{ afeormode}
\]

\[
\text{him(ACC) afflicted the poverty(NOM) and purified}
\]

'Poverty afflicted and purified him' (ÆCHom i. 332.9)

Although the verb *geswencan* is not normally an impersonal verb, this example has the same syntax as (6). And the post-verbal nominative in this case is a subject. Again, we can see that the Conjunction Reduction is an inconsistent test for subjecthood.

4.4.2 Subject properties of the nominative Experiencer

Next, let's see if the nominative with a Experiencer role also has the role of subject. Since only *hreowan, sceamian, lystan, and behofian* are truly attested as taking type (iii) with two nominal arguments, only these verbs will be taken into consideration.

4.4.2.1 Subject-Object-Order in Topicalization

The nominative Experiencer is also qualified as a subject in the following Inverted Topicalization test:

---

\(^8\) According to Allen (p.c.), she did not analyze the nominative NP of verbs such as *lician* as behaving like inverted subjects. This seems to mean that the evidence of postverbal nominative subject in (29) with the different verb *geswencan* does not prove against the claim with *lician*. However, I do not think it convincing to treat the same non-impersonal constructions as different ones because the characteristics of the verbs in concern are different (i.e., one is not an impersonal verb; the other is).
4.5 Conclusion

So far we have seen that some of the previous proposals advocating the oblique subject in OE or ME started from incorrect assumptions. They used either imperfect or invalid subject properties. The imperfect subject properties used are Conjunction Reduction and Subject-to-Subject Raising; the invalid subject property is Reflexivization.

We have examined other properties which may qualify the oblique Experiencer as a subject. Except for some indeterminate Infinitival Deletion examples, the main properties are shown in the relative order in inverted sentences, i.e. Subject-Object-Order in the inverted Topicalization, Subject-Object-Order in the inverted Nexus-Question. Although the element order is not fixed and is quite variable for the non-inverted sentences in OE, it is fixed when inversion is involved and more narrowly when there is no weight difference which may affect the rearrangement of the element order. When two nominal arguments of the same weight are involved, we have found that the dative or accusative Experiencer assumes the subject role over the accusative or genitive Cause. This process was under way already in OE.

However, when the nominative case is used (types (ii)), the oblique Experiencer does not behave as a subject whether or not the Experiencer is pre-verbal, but instead the nominative has always the subject role. This is different from Allen's (1986) proposal who argues that the nominative has a dual role. In fact, the frequent post-verbal position of the nominative Cause can be naturally explained by means of the fact that the Cause is in
general more likely to be heavier than the Experiencer. Allen (1995) has also noted that 'In contrast with the Experiencer, the Theme [Cause -- HK] of the type I [type (ii) -- HK] verbs was more likely to be a noun than a pronoun'. We also know that the Cause argument can be even clausal, much heavier than the Experiencer which is normally a pronoun or a noun.

In the above we used inverted sentences to determine the subject position. In non-inverted declarative sentences, the element order is quite variable for many reasons (e.g. Topicalization). But all other things being equal, the unmarked order is generally understood such that a subject precedes an object (SVO or SOV depending on the principal and subordinate clauses). Elmer (1981: 61) comments 'Evidence from word order is also very consistent: the NPa [= Experiencer -- HK] is regularly initial, the genitive NP postverbal'. This observation agrees with my claim that the Experiencer is subject in impersonal constructions.9

Proposing that the impersonal construction contains an actual subject in itself, though the subject is in the oblique form, is compatible with Chomky’s (1984) Extended Projection Principle. This principle, supposed to be universal, can be roughly stated as, 'every sentence has a subject'. Suppose both oblique arguments in impersonal constructions are objects, then we would hypothesize a null subject in those constructions, for the subject position to be filled. In general, the null subject hypothesis is best reserved for a pro-drop phenomenon. However, as explained in (1) above, the impersonal construction in concern does not involve the pro-drop of a referent argument. Moreover, it is not a pro-drop of an expletive pronoun either, for the insertion of an expletive it or (non-locative) there is impossible with these constructions: e.g. *Hit liced him ðes *it likes him

---

9 Allen’s recent publication (1995: 104-07) also observes that the position of the Experiencer may be an indication of subjecthood. However, her examination deals with the general order between the Experiencer and Theme, not limiting to inverted sentences as I have done.
of that', *dær lieð him dæs 'there likes him of that'. Thus, positing a null subject for these constructions is not correct.

So far, we have seen that the oblique Experiencer shows some subject properties already in OE. This is clear when the impersonal verb takes both nominal arguments (i.e. types (i-1) and (i-2)). When the Cause argument is clausal (i.e. types (i-3) and (i-4)), by contrast, the tests by means of the element order will not work, because the clausal element will occur at the end of the clause, regardless of whether or not the sentence is an inverted construction. Since even the clear nominal subject, if heavy, can be located at the end of the sentence, by analogy the heavier clausal element can be interpreted as subject. On the other hand, since the normal position of an object is more at the end of the sentence than a subject, the clausal element can be also interpreted as an object. This two-way analysis seems to be exactly the speakers' interpretation at that time, and the historical development of the constructions involving clausal elements reflect this interpretation. This is further discussed in chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

THE HISTORY OF THE DUMMY PRONOUN IT

5.1 Introduction

In chapter 5, I investigated the subjecthood of types (i-1) and (i-2), i.e. impersonal constructions with two nominal arguments. We saw that some subject properties of the oblique Experiencer are already found in OE and these properties are a forerunner of the subsequent occurrence of the Nominative-Experiencer construction. In this chapter, I study the historical development of the rest of subtypes in the impersonal construction: types (i-3) and (i-4). Since these two types involve a complement clause, they have the potential to acquire the dummy pronoun *it*.

The use of the dummy pronoun *it* has had a varied history in English. Some verbs which earlier could not take a dummy *it* as a subject now can, while others that once could take *it* no longer do. In this chapter I attempt to account for what makes possible the acquisition (and the subsequent loss) of the dummy.

There are at least two types of the dummy pronoun *it*. One is used as a subject in the construction with weather verbs, as in (1), the other is used in the constructions in which the subject does not seem to have a thematic role but is clearly related to a post-verbal sentential complement, as in (2) (Bennis 1987: 93):

(1) *It* with weather verbs:
a. It is raining.
b. It is windy.

(2) *It* with (quasi-)impersonal verbs:

a. It seems that John is happy.
b. It pleases me that he plays the piano.

Since the focus of this study is on the impersonal verbs like (2), we examine here the use of the dummy in the constructions involving those verbs.

In PDE, the Dummy-Construction — the construction with the dummy *it* — can not only occur with a finite clause, as in (2), but also with an infinitival clause (with *to-*infinitive), as in (3):

(3) *It* with infinitival clause:

a. It pleases me for John to be happy.
b. It shames me for John to play with dolls.

As we already saw in preceding chapters, both finite and infinitival clauses could occur without any nominative case-marked NP in a sentence, i.e. in an impersonal construction, in OE, as in (4) and (5) respectively:

(4) Impersonal usage in OE (type (i-3)):

\[
\text{nu } \text{þince } \text{þæt } \text{se } \text{mon } \text{micelne } \text{anwalde } \text{hæbbe}
\]

'it seems now that the man may have a great control.' (C: Bo 29.66.6)

(5) Impersonal usage in OE (type (i-4)):

\[
\text{Us sceal } \text{þæt } \text{se } \text{mon } \text{micelne } \text{anwold } \text{hæbbe}
\]

'we are ashamed to say all the disgraceful witchcraft.' (C: LS (Auguries) 1.100)

We also saw in chapters 2 and 3 that the ability to occur with finite and/or infinitival clauses is not necessarily shared by all impersonal verbs in each historical stage. This fact
may thus correlate with different patterns with the dummy pronoun development. For this reason, we need to examine these two clause-types separately.¹

The organization of this chapter is as follows. In the following section, I first provide a descriptive survey of the incidence of the dummy pronoun with a finite clause. In 5.3, I argue that whether or not a particular verb will acquire (or lose) the dummy is predictable. I propose that some syntactic conditions, along with semantic conditions, make possible the acquisition (or loss) of the dummy pronoun. In 5.4, I show that the same account can explain the acquisition (or loss) of the dummy with infinitival clauses too. In 5.5, I first summarize my findings thus far and discuss the grammatical relation of the dummy *it*. Butler (1980) suggests a possibility that the earlier counterpart *hit* of the dummy might be an object. This hypothesis is not entirely implausible because *hit* in principle could be an accusative case in as much as it is a neuter. I confirm in this chapter that the dummy pronoun *it* has the function of subject. In 5.6, I attempt to explain the underlying motivation of the acquisition of dummy pronoun *it*. I reject the previously proposed V-2 Constraint Hypothesis (Haiman 1974) and Movement Hypothesis (Butler 1980), and instead propose that the acquisition of the dummy *it* is motivated simply as one way to fill in the subject position as the language moves towards the fixing of subject position before the verb.

¹ In spite of the difference between finite and infinitival clauses, Elmer(1981), Fischer and van der Leek(1983) and others consider them as the same category and lack a more detailed account of the two types.
5.2 Development of the dummy pronoun *it* with finite clauses

Some verbs in PDE, descended from impersonal verbs in earlier stages, do not take dummy pronoun *it*. The verbs *rue, ail, like, long,* etc. belong to this class. By contrast, the verbs *shame, happen, seem,* etc. can take the dummy in PDE:

(6) The occurrences of *it* in Modern English:

a. *It rues me that John lost his book.
   b. *It ails me that John lost his book.
   c. *It likes me that John found his lost book.
   d. *It longs me that John will found his lost book.
   e. It shames me that John plays with dolls.
   f. It happened that John found his lost book.
   g. It seems to me that John found his lost book.

All these verbs which were once categorized as impersonal verbs show historically different patterns of change in their incidence with the dummy *it*.

The OE correspondents to PDE dummy grammatical subject *it*, could be *hit, pæt,* or occasionally, *pis.* The following Table 5.1, cited from Butler (1980: 82), shows the instances of *hit, pæt,* and *pis* which occur as grammatical subjects of Extrapolations in general, in which the matrix predicates include *be*+predicative substantive, psychological verbs, etc. But note that Table 5.1 figures in not only *pæt*-clause and *to*-infinitive but also other types of clauses such as *if*-clause, *when*-clause, etc. for which it is disputable that these clauses are co-indexed with the dummy pronoun or are simply adverbial adjuncts.

---

2 Some of the data and the findings in this and the following section were published in Kim (1995).

3 I sometimes use the term EXTRAPPOSITION as simply referring to the construction in which the clausal element is located at the end of the clause, like in PDE *it bothers me a lot that John failed in the test.* It does not necessarily mean that the clause is actually moved from the subject position (i.e. the initial position of the clause) as is usually assumed in PDE grammar, although the term itself has admittedly implies ‘movement’. When available, I also use more theory-neutral terms like ‘*it*-construction’ or ‘dummy-construction’ instead.
Table 5.1: Pronouns as grammatical subjects of Extrapositons (Butler 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>hit/it</th>
<th>that</th>
<th>his/this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOE</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0(1?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are some examples of *that* in OE and ME which Butler counted as Extraposition:

(7) Dummy *that* in OE:

\[ that \text{ were } \text{uncynlicre, } \text{gif } \text{God } \text{næfde } \text{on eallum his} \]
\[ \text{that were more-unnatural if } \text{God } \text{not-had } \text{in all his} \]
\[ \text{rice } \text{nane } \text{frige } \text{gesceaf} \]
\[ \text{kingdom } \text{no } \text{free } \text{creature} \]

'that would be more unnatural if God didn't have in all his kingdom any free creature.' (Butler: Bt C 142.6)

(8) Dummy *that* in ME:

a. \[ pet \text{ is } \text{quoð } \text{he eche lif to seon } \text{& cnawan sod godd} \]
\[ \text{'that is, said he, eternal life to see and know the true God'} \]
\[ \text{(Butler: SW 315 (EME))} \]

b. \[ \text{for } \text{pat es his ioy when we er strenghfull to stande agaynes pe pryue} \]
\[ \text{for that is } \text{His joy when we are strong (enough) to stand against the secret'} \]
\[ \text{(Butler: Fl 9.3 (LME))} \]

Table 5.1 shows that *that* which occurs quite frequently as a dummy subject in OE disappears in ME. The frequency of *his* is very low throughout all periods.

The occurrence of the dummy pronoun shows four different patterns, according to which I divide these verbs into four classes.
5.2.1 Class I

The HAPPEN and SEEM verbs belong to this class. They can take the dummy pronoun in PDE. The original OE word *(ge-)*limpan (*ME limpen*) 'happen' diminishes in use about the fourteenth century and was replaced by happen (or happenen) approximately at the same time. OE *pyncan* (*EME thinken*) 'seem' diminishes in the thirteenth century and instead the verb *semen*, newly entered into the language from Old Norse, is used.

Numerous instances of constructions with the dummy pronoun are found with *gelimpan* 'happen' already in OE:

(9) Dummy *it* with *gelimpan* in OE:

a. gyf hyt gelimp hæt he hyt fint soðlice
   ‘if it happens that he it finds truly’
   (C: Mt(WSCp) 18.13)

b. hit gelamp æt sumum sæle hæt ða deofulgyldan [...] gecwædon
   ‘it happened at a certain time that the idolaters spoke’
   (C: ÆCHom I.4 70.23)

With *pyncan* 'seem', the dummy-pronoun is also found, although it is less frequent:

(10) Dummy *it* with *pyncan* in OE:

swa hit þincan mæg hæt sume synd to wlanice
   ‘as it seem may that some are too proud’
   (C:WPOL 2.1.1(Jost))

In ME, with the verbs happen (happenen) and fortunen entering the lexicon after the thirteenth century with the loss of OE representatives *gelimpan, geweorpan*, the dummy *it* is continuously used side by side with impersonal ones (i.e. without any grammatical subject):
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(11) Dummy *it* with *happen* and *fortunen* in ME:

a. if it so ... happe that a man of gretter myght and strengthe than thow art do thee greuance
   'if it so happens that a man of greater might and strength than you causes you grief'
   (M: 14c. Chaucer *CT.Mel.* B. 2676)

b. it fortuned so that a man wrought aloone vppon the Saturday
   'it happened that a man worked alone on that Saturday'
   (M: 15c. Idley *Instr* 2. A.941)

In case of the meaning of 'seem', the OE representative *pyncan* continues to be used in its ME form *thinken*. The dummy pronoun is found in ME:

(12) Dummy *it* with *thinken* in ME:

And tah hit punche opre men ṭat ...
   'but it seemed to other people that ..'
   (13c. HM 9.76)

In the thirteenth century *semen* 'seem' enters the lexicon and has also the dummy pronoun:

(13) Dummy *it* with *semen* in ME:

so it semeıp to ṭis clerk ṭat ṭe grete Anticrist schulde come...
   'so it seems to this clerk that the great Antichrist should come'
   (M: 14c. Wimbledon *Serm*)

Therefore, the verbs here have not really changed much. OE shows both impersonal usage and the dummy construction together. ME too shows them together. But my own survey of the incidence of the Dummy-Construction at three historical stages, OE, EME and LME, shows an increasing tendency for having the Dummy-Construction, especially for the meaning 'seem'. Table 5.2 below illustrates the frequency of the dummy subject compared to that of the total in different historical stages. For LME *happen*, *semen* are surveyed as semantic counterparts to the verbs *limpen, thinken* in EME:4

---

4 Another example with the dummy for the verb *thinken* is when it occurs with a predicative adjective/noun such as 'It seems good that John found his lost book'. The problem with this kind of example is that the verb acts as a copula like *be*. In this case it will not be clear whether the impersonal usage of the sentence comes from the property of the verb *thinken/semen* or from the adjective because
Table 5.2. Incidence of the dummy subject with class I verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Incidence of</th>
<th>Dummy</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>(ge-)limpan</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ñyncan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td>limpen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AW,Orm, HM) thinken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>happen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CA) semen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample examples of the verbs with the meaning 'happen' in these three stages are given in the following:

(14) OE (ge-)limpan with the dummy *it*:

Gif þe þæt gelimpe on lifdagum þæt ðu gehyre
if you(DAT/ACC) that happen in lifedays that you hear
ymb þæt halige treo...
about the holy tree
‘if it should happen to you in your life that you hear about the holy tree...’ (C: El 432)

(15) OE (ge-)limpan without the dummy *it*:

þa gelamp þæt hig huntedon on mergen on þære ylcan stowe
Then happened that they hunted in morning in the same place
‘Then [it] happened that they had hunting in the same place in the morning.’
(C: Mart 2.1 164)

(16) EME limpen with the dummy *it*:

tatt bilimmpeþþ wel þatt Crist iss þurrh þe word betacnedd
‘it befits well that Christ is signified by the word.’ (Orm i.333. 1.9571)

be+adjective is also widely found as impersonal, usually called impersonal adjective/predicative. Therefore, we have to exclude this example from being a true example of the dummy with the verb *thinken.*
(17) EME *limpen* without the dummy *it*:

> uppo þe þridde dazæ bilamp swa summ þe Goddspell kipæþ þatt i þe land off
> Galile was an bridale jarrkedd
> 'on the third day [it] happened, as the Gospel reveals, that in the land of Galilee a
> bridal feast was prepared.'  (13c. Orm ii. 132.1.14000)

(18) LME *happen* with the dummy *it*:

> and in his weie it hapneth that this bere cam
> 'and it happens that this bear came in his way.'  (14c. CA 5. 6317)

(19) LME *happen* without the dummy *it*:

> and hapneth that he hadde a bowe
> 'and [it] happens that he had a bow.'  (14c. CA 2. 2234)

For both *(ge-)*limpan in OE and *happen* in LME, some clauses with other
complementizers and clauses with no complementizer (zero-COMP) are at times found with
similar function to the *that*-clause, as in:

(20) The HAPPEN verbs occurring with other clause (with the dummy *it*)

a. Hit gelamp ðus soðlice be iobe swa swa he
   it happened thus truly about Job just as he
   sylf awrat
   self described
   'it happened thus indeed concerning Job just as he himself described.'
   (C: ÆCHom II, 35. 267.231)

b. so that it hapneth ate laste, the queen on him hire yhe caste
   'so that it happens at last [that] the queen threw her eyes on him.'
   (14c. CA 6. 1863)

(21) The HAPPEN verbs occurring with other clause (without the dummy):

a. þisum ealdum wundrum gelamp in urum dagum gelic
   these old wonders(DAT) happened in our days similar
   wise, þeh þe hit of ungelicre gescaefte gewurde
   way although it from different origin came
   'it happened in our time similarly to these old wonders though it came from
   a different origin.'  (C: GDPref 3(C) 19.220.1)
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b. and hapneth thilke time so, the lordes bothe and the comune ...
   ‘and [it] happens at that time [that] both lords and commons...’ (14c. CA 8. 1612)

But it is not clear that these clauses have exactly the same function as a that-clause. Moreover, in (20b) it hapneth ate haste may be interpreted as a parenthetical clause. Thus these occurrences have not been figured in for Table 5.2.5

The examples of the verbs with the meaning ‘seem’ in three stages, OE, EME, and LME, are given in the following:

(22) OE *pyncan* with the dummy *it*:

```
Me þæt þinceð þæt hie for æfstum inwit
l(DAT/ACC) that seems that they for envy evil
syredon þurh deopne gedwolan
designed through deep heresy
```

‘it seems to me that they contrived evil by means of serious heresy because of envy’  (C: And 609)

(23) OE *pyncan* without the dummy *it*:

```
op þæt þam abbode ðince þæt hi fulbet hæbben
 till that the abbot(DAT) seem that they made-full-amends have
‘until [it] may seem to the abbot that they have made full amends’ (C: BenR 44.5)
```

(24) EME *thinken* with the dummy *it* (=12):

```
and þah hit punche ðære men þæt ha drehen hearde, hit ne derueð ham nawt
‘and although it seems to other men that they suffer hard, it does not trouble them’ (13c. HM 6. 10)
```

(25) EME *thinken* without the dummy *it*:

a. and þuncheð þet hit sōð beo
   ‘and [it] seems that it is true’ (13c. HM 34. 17)

b. me þuncheð þi ha mei seggen
   ‘[it] seems to me(OBL) that she can say’ (13c. AW 5. 93b.5)

---

If the examples of zero-COMP and other types of COMPs are included in the statistics, the frequency of the dummy-construction in LME, for instance, becomes 42%, which is not significantly different from 40% of Table 2. Also, if only the other types of COMPs are included but the zero-COMP is excluded, the frequency of the dummy-construction becomes 44% in LME.
(26) LME *semen* with the dummy *it*:

> For as it semeth that a belle lik to the wordes that men telle answerth
>  'For just as it seems that a bell answers to the words that men speak'
>  (14c. CA 1. 1949)

(27) LME *semen* without the dummy *it*:

> Me semeth that thou tharst noght care
>  'it seems to me that you ought not to care'  (14c. CA 4. 1774)

As for the meaning 'seem' too, there are some examples of zero-COMP-clause and the clauses with other COMPs in both OE and ME:

(28) The SEEM verbs occuring with other clause:

a. him *puhte swylce he eode ofer blotstman*
   *him(DAT) seemed as he went over blossom*
   'It seemed to him that he was walking over flowers'  (C: ÆLS (Sebastian) 379)

b. Somtime it semeth as it were a sterre
   'sometimes it seems that it were a star'  or 'it looks like it were a star'  (CA 7. 325)

c. It semeth love is welwillende to hem that ben continuende with besy hearte
   'it seems [that] love is favorable to those who are continuing with caresmitten heart'
   (CA 4. 507)

In (28b), the question is whether the *as*-clause can be interpreted as co-indexed with *it* just as *that*-clause can be. But it can be also interpreted as predicative just as other adjective or noun predicatives can be. Thus, as in 'happen' verbs, these kinds of examples have not been included in Table 5.2.

---

6 In PDE, the *seems like / looks like* construction is different from the *seems that*. The former allows the copying type of Raising (?) of non-subjects as in *John looks like you whipped him*. Thus, the examples (28a-b) also may be this type of examples, rather than the Extraposition type [B. Joseph, p.c.].

7 Again in LME, if the examples of both zero-COMP and other COMPs are included in the statistics, the frequency of the dummy-construction becomes 78%, higher than the number (50%) in Table 2. But if only zero-COMP clauses are excluded, the frequency of the dummy-construction becomes 75%. 
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In Table 5.2 we see that the frequency of the dummy with the SEEM verbs has been greatly increased through time while that of the dummy with the HAPPEN verbs has been consistently quite high. The following is a chart chronologically comparing the incidence of HAPPEN and SEEM verbs with and without the dummy respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>ModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (i-3) (i.e. without it)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy-Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (i-3) (i.e. without it)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy-Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Chronological chart of class I verbs

5.2.2 Class II

The verbs sceamian (→ ME shamen → ModE shame) and behofian (→ ME bihoven → ModE behoove) are similar to class I in that they can take it with the finite clause in PDE. For behoove, using a finite clause sounds archaic but this construction has been used until nineteenth century as in the following examples:

(29) Behoove with finite clause in ModE:

a. It behooves, likewise, that you give some roome and place to those that speake to you. (OED: 1647 W. Browne Polexander I. 126)
b. It well behooves that every faithful friend...should dread to disclose...his passion. (OED: 1860 Adler Fauriel’s Prov. Poetry xvii.389)

8 The productivity of impersonal constructions with SEEM verbs after 16c. is constrained: The impersonal construction is most productive with first person pronouns, like meseems, methinks, whereas with second and third person the dummy-construction is more general (Elmer 1981: 135). Thus I represent this non-productivity as a wavy line.
But a difference between these verbs and class I verbs is that the Dummy-Construction is a much later development here than with class I verbs, although the *that*-clause without the dummy pronoun is used since OE as in (30) and (31):^9

(30) Finite clause with *sceamian, behofian* (?) in OE

a. mænigne mon sceamæþ þæt he wiordæ wyrsæn
   *man(ACC) man shames that he become worse*
   *that many a man is ashamed to become worse* (C: Bo 30.69.11)

b. vel forðon behofad þætte an monn sie dead...
   *or(Latin) therefore behooves that one man be dead*
   *‘or it is proper that one man ought to be dead...’* (C: JnGl(Li) 18.14)

(31) Finite clause with *shamen, bihoven* in EME (13c.):

a. Ful swide us mæi scomien ... þat heo sculle senden ...
   *very much we(OBL) may be ashamed that she will send...*
   *(M: 13c. Lay.Brut 12487)*

b. Nu him behofed þæt he ...
   *‘now it is necessary to him(OBL) that he...’*
   *(M: (or OE) 12c. Peterb.Chron. an. 1131)*

(32) Finite clause with *shamen, bihoven* in LME (14-5c.):

a. Hym shameþ þæt he ys ouercome
   *‘he(OBL) is ashamed that he is overcome’* *(M: 14c. Mannyng HS 12029)*

b. (= (62) in Chap. 3)
   Help me, lady, me bihoueþ þou beo my counsellour
   *‘help me, lady, it is necessary to me(OBL) that you become my counsellor’*
   *(M: 14c. Fadur and sone 64)*

The attested Dummy-Constructions are given in (33) below. In my corpus, the first attestation of the Dummy-Construction of *behoove* is earlier than that of *shamen*:

---

9 See the discussion of the controversial status of the example (30b) in footnote 14 in chapter 2.
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(33) *Bihoven, shamen* with the dummy *it* in ME

a. & it behoofeth wel þatt he nu forþward waxe
   ‘and it is very proper that he should grow up now henceforth’ (13c. *Orm. 17966*)

b. It shameþ the þat men vpon thi visage see.
   ‘it disgraces you(OBL) that people look upon your face’
   (M: 15c. *Sidrack & B. 11711*)

This innovation is predictable, as will be discussed in 5.3. The following Figure 5.2 illustrates the occurrences of *shame* and *behoove* with and without the dummy respectively. This class is different from class III, discussed below, in that the latter cannot take the dummy *it* in PDE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>ModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shame Type (i-3) (without <em>it</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>burial-Construction -&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behoove</td>
<td>12c.</td>
<td>burial-Construction -&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2: Chronological chart of class II verbs

5.2.3 Class III

*OE verbs hrowan -> ME reuen -> ModE rue*, *eglian -> ME eilen -> ModE ail*, *lician -> ME liken -> ModE like*, *langian -> ME longen -> ModE long*, and *lystan -> ME listen -> ModE list* (archaic) belong to this class. For this class of verbs, the dummy is not attested in OE.
From ME, however, we find that the dummy pronoun *it* begins to be used with the verbs *reuen, liken* side by side with the constructions without *it*, for which we refer to class IIIa.  

(34) *Reuen* with the dummy *it* in ME:

a. sore hit me rwez þat ever I made hem myself
   'sorely it displeases me(OBL) that I ever made him myself.'
   (M: 14c. *Cleanness* 290)

b. Hyt scholde hym rewe ... that he slow with unryst
   'it might displease him(OBL) that he committed a murder unrighteously.'
   (M: 15c. *Otuel & R.* 737)

(35) *Reuen* without the dummy *it* in ME:

a. Himm reowepþ þatt he dwelleþ her swa swipe lange onn eorþe
   '[it] displeases him(OBL) that he lives here so very long on earth' (13c. *Orm.* 5576)

---

10 Allen (p.c.) points out that the dummy is attested with *lician* in OE since we included *þæt* and *þis* in our definition of dummies, as in the following:

(i) eac hit gesæd is, þæt he gefægnode on his untrumnesse &
    but it said is that he rejoiced in his infirmness
    him sylfum þæt licode, þæt he teonan browode, &
    him self that liked/pleased that he injury suffered
    he þæt cwæð, þæt him waere...
    he that spoke that him were

   'but it is said that he rejoiced in his infirmness and it pleased him (or he liked) that he suffered
   injury, and he said that ...' (C: GDPref 3(C) 17.218.9)

There is a possibility that *that*-clause is provisionally used in the accusative form of 'that', as also found in
the following phrase (e.g. *he þæt cwæð*) in the same text above. However, as Allen (p.c.) pointed out, *hit*
*it* is also found with the related verb *gelician*, as in:

(ii) þa gelicode hit. ðam leodebiscope ... þæt he . his lichman. up
    then pleased it the bishop(DAT) ... that he his body up
    ða gelogode
    then placed
    *then it pleased the bishop ... that he then raised up his body (C: ÆCHom II. 10.90.333)

Presumably, then, the non-occurrence of the Dummy-Construction with *hit* in *lician* may be an accidental
gap. Suppose that *lician* belongs to class I along with the HAPPEN and SEEM verbs, it would be good for
my proposal, because it increased the correlation between type (ii) and the possibility of a dummy in the
clausal type.
b. Me rewes sore ðat I missayd ðe ȝisterday
   ‘[it] displeases me(OBL) sorely that I spoke wrongly to you yesterday’
   (M: 14c. Ywain 1040)

(36) Liken with the dummy in ME:

   a. Hit ðe likede wel ðat þu us adun læidest
      ‘it pleased you(OBL) well that you laid us down’
      (M: 13c. Lay. Brut 8746)

   b. Hit ne likede nouȝt seint Thomas ðat holi churche...scholde ...
      ‘it did not please saint Thomas that the holy church should...’
      (M: 13c. SLeg.Becket (Ld) 361)

   c. It likyd to þoure lordschip þat it were translatyd out of þe tonge of arabye yn
to latyn
      ‘it pleased your lordship that it should be translated from the tongue of Arabic
to Latin’
      (M: 15c. SSecr.(1) 41/26)

(37) Liken without the dummy in ME:

   Me likez þat sir Lucius launges aftyre sorowe
   ‘[it] pleases me(OBL) that sir Luke longs for sorrow’ (M: 15c. Morte Arth. (1) 383)

By contrast, there are another group of verbs (class IIIb). For example, eilen is not
attested with a that-clause although it once did occur with a pæt-clause in OE. The verb
longen does not occur with the dummy although it occurs with a that-clause. Also listen
does not occur with any type of that-clause although it once did occur with a pæt-clause in
OE. Compared to such numerous occurrences of listen with the infinitival clause (with to-
ininitive or bare infinitive), it is especially notable that a that-clause is not found with this
verb throughout ME.

The following Table 5.3 compares the incidence of that-clauses and infinitival clauses
for listen in different stages:
Table 5.3: Incidence of the finite and infinitival clauses with *listen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Finite</th>
<th>Infinitival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Figure 5.3 illustrates the incidence of the impersonal construction with the *that*-clause (i.e. type (i-3)) and Dummy-Construction with finite clause for five verbs discussed above:

*OE* 13c. ME 15c. ModE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rue</th>
<th>Type (i-3)</th>
<th>I-Dummy-Construction (16c.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Type (i-3)</td>
<td>I-Dummy-Construction (16c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ail</td>
<td>Type (i-3) (in OE only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>I-Type (i-3) (16c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Type (i-3) (in OE only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3: Chronological chart of class III verbs

It is fair to ask, then, why the verbs *eilen*, *longen*, and *listen* do not show the use of the dummy in ME while *reuen* and *liken* do. We discuss this question in 5.3.
5.2.4 Class IV

Some impersonal verbs, in particular hunger, thirst are not found with any kinds of clauses, whether as subject or as object, throughout all periods. Presumably, their meanings do not allow for a proposition as an argument. Thus in PDE the following examples are unacceptable:

(38) PDE HUNGER verbs:

a. *It hungers me / is hungry to me that he is eating a steak.
   b. *I hunger / am hungry that he is eating a steak.

5.3 An account of the acquisition and loss of the dummy pronoun it

Up to this point, the history of different verbs has been presented in respect to their cooccurrence with the dummy it. We have found that not all the verbs show the same pattern of development. There are at least four classes, each class showing different development from the other. Class I verbs have the Dummy-Construction at all periods, with an increasing tendency toward having it. Class II verbs did not have the Dummy-Construction in OE, but had it in ME and have preserved it up to PDE. Class III verbs did not have the Dummy-Construction in OE, but some of them had it in ME and then later lost it, so that in PDE they do not have the Dummy-Construction. Class IV verbs consistently have no Dummy-Construction in all periods. In class III particularly, reuen and liken (IIIa) had the dummy pronoun it in ME but eilen, longen, and listen (IIIb) did not. Therefore, it seems that there is no across-the-board, uniform treatment of this historical development of the Dummy-Construction. However, in the following section I propose that this diverse development is predictable. This prediction derives from some syntactic facts in the same period involving those verbs.
5.3.1 Acquisition of the dummy pronoun in class II and III

We saw in chapter 1 that an impersonal verb in OE could take not only a clausal complement (i.e. type (i/ii)) but also a noun phrase which shows a clear distinction between types (i), (ii), and (iii), as given in (39):

(39) Three types of constructions of impersonal verbs

a. Type (i): nominativeless (impersonal):
   him ofhreow þæs mannes
   he(DAT) rued the man(GEN)
   ‘he pitied the man’  (ÆCHom i. 192.16)

b. Type (ii): Nominative-Cause:
   þa ofhreow ðam munece þæs hreoflian mægenleast
   then rued the monk(DAT) the leper’s feebleness(NOM)
   ‘then the monk pitied the leper’s feebleness’  (ÆCHom i. 336.10)

c. Type (iii): Nominative-Experiencer:
   Se mæsepreost þæs monnes ofhreow
   the priest(NOM) the man(GEN) rued
   ‘the priest pitied the man’  (ÆLS ii. 26.262)

However, not all the verbs share the syntactic frames in (39). Note in particular type (ii) and type (i-3): not all the verbs had these types in OE or ME. (40) below summarizes whether a particular verb occurs with these two types in OE:

(40) Variation of the incidence of type (i-3) and type (ii) in OE

a. Both types occur: sceamian, hreowan, lician, eglian, behoove(?)
   b. Only type (i-3) occurs: lystan
   c. No types occur: langian

11 The mark (?) with behoove here is because type (ii) is possible but not confirmed; Type (ii) is found only in ambiguous examples in OE.
The following shows the incidence of ME verbs with regard to type (i-3) and type (ii) with that-clause:

(41) Variation of the incidence of type (i-3) and type (ii) in ME:

a. Both types occur: shamen, reuen, liken, behoove
b. Only type (ii) occurs: eilen
c. Only type (i-3) occurs: longen
d. No types occur: listen

Whatever the underlying motivation for acquiring the dummy pronoun it is, it seems that the new acquisition of the dummy for a particular verb is possible only under specific syntactic conditions. We see above that shame, rue, like and behoove occurred with a that-clause in both OE and ME. However, ail and list, although they occurred with a that-clause in OE, no longer did in ME. So, we can presume that the non-productive (or even ungrammatical) use of the that-clause with ail and list in ME prohibited the acquisition of the dummy it at the same stage. But what about the verb long? For long, a that-clause is well attested in ME. We immediately see that this correlates with the fact that the verb does not take the Nominative-Cause construction (i.e. type (ii)) throughout its history.

This correlation can be explained in terms of the meanings of the verbs in class II and III. They all have potential to take transitive meaning with the Cause theta-role as subject:

(42) It pleases/displeases/afflicts me ...

When it is not followed by a that-clause in the above example, we identify this it as referential (with Cause theta-role), not as a dummy. But when the same sequence in (42) is followed by a that-clause, we identify the real Cause role as played by that clause and the preceding it as just a dummy (co-indexed with the clause). Therefore, the position occupied by it now can be the position of both a referential NP and a dummy.
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The dummy pronoun *hit/it* is different from other NPs in that it may be bound by an S'. Thus, whether or not a particular verb generally selects S' as its complement is a crucial factor for the historical acquisition of the dummy. When the dummy is introduced as a placeholder for the subject position, it has to be properly connected to the S' in order to be part of a chain, i.e. to receive a theta role under co-indexation. Thus the dummy shares the same thematic role as the clause, as illustrated below:

(43) Co-indexation of the dummy and *that*-clause

sore hit\textsubscript{th} me rwez [pat ever I made hem myself]\textsubscript{th}.
'sorely it displeases me that I ever made him myself.' (M: 14c. Cleanness 290)

Therefore, when a certain verb selects a nominative Cause (i.e. type (ii)) in general, it provides an optimal environment for the introduction of *hit/it*. Then it can be said that when a certain verb with the meaning similar to classes II and III does not select a nominative Cause or clausal complements, that verb cannot introduce the dummy construction. The verbs *shame, rue* and *like* provide an optimal syntactic environment when the dummy begins to be introduced, because both the clausal complement and the nominative Cause construction are commonly taken by these verbs. But the dummy could not be introduced with *ail, long, and list* because they lack one of these conditions.

5.3.2 Loss of the dummy pronoun in class III

Next, we need to explain why the newly acquired *it*-construction has been eliminated with verbs such as *rue* and *like* of class III in early ModE, but it has not been lost with *shame, behoove* of class II. We have claimed that the Dummy-Construction could be acquired only when the verb is able to take both nominative Cause construction and a clausal complement. The verbs *rue* and *like*, however, cannot support the Dummy-
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Construction any longer because they began to lose not only a *that*-clause but also the causative meanings of 'depress' and 'please' respectively. The lack of a *that*-clause may be a sufficient reason for *rue* because a *that*-clause is not used at all even in personal constructions in ModE; e.g. *I rue that I have left.* But with *like*, a *that*-clause occurs as an object in earlier ModE and still can in PDE, but with *it* in apposition to it:

(44) *That-clause* as object of *like* in ModE:

a. Less lik'd he still, that scornful jeer Mispris'd the land he lov'd so dear.
   (OED: 1805 Scott Last Minstr. v. xxx)
b. I like it that you are working hard.

This is evidence for the fact that taking a *that*-clause is not the only condition for the occurrence of the dummy-construction, but that a causative meaning (type (ii)) is also an important factor. Thus, the loss of the type (ii) construction side-by-side with the loss of the causative meaning of the verb seems to have forced the loss of the Dummy-Construction.

This is in contrast to the behavior of *please*. The causative counterpart to *like* can still take the dummy together with a clausal complement, while *like* cannot:

(45) Contrast between *please* and *like*:

a. i. It pleases me that he plays the piano.
   ii. John pleases me by playing the piano.

b. i. *It likes me that he plays the piano.
   ii. *John likes me by playing the piano.

Meanwhile, *shame* and *behoove* in class II still has a causative meaning, i.e. the nominative Cause construction (type (ii)) in which the nominative (subject) is the Cause and the accusative (object) is the Experiencer, as in (46b):
(46) *It*-construction and type (ii) with *shame*

   a. It shamed his mother that he played with dolls.
   b. He shamed his father by playing with dolls.

Therefore, we can suppose that only a verb optimally taking the type (ii) construction and the clausal complement could inherit the Dummy-Constructions from ME up to PDE.

In fact, we find such a relationship among *that*-clause construction, type (ii), and the Dummy-Construction in the diachronic survey. The following Tables 5.4 and 5.5 are mainly from Elmer (1981: 88-134) with some emendations. Where my survey is different from Elmer's, I mark the difference in a superscripted alphabet in order and put a corresponding example below each table.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\) Therefore, any faults resulting from the emendation to this chart are mine.
•: that-clause without nominative (type (i/ii); type S in Elmer)
○: it-construction
▲: Nominative-Cause construction (type (ii); type I in Elmer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>12c.</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>14c.</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>16c.</th>
<th>17c.</th>
<th>18c.</th>
<th>19c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.shame</td>
<td>▲ ▲ a</td>
<td>▲ ▲ b</td>
<td>▲ ▲ c</td>
<td>▲ ▲ d</td>
<td>▲ ▲ e</td>
<td>▲ ▲ e</td>
<td>▲ ▲ e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behoove</td>
<td>▲ ▲ (?)</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Type (ii) in OE:
And heora æfstu eac ealle sceamien,
and their hatreds(NOM-PL) also all shame(PL)
‘and their hatreds also cause all to feel shame’  (C: PPs 69.4)13

b. Type (ii) in the 13th century:
hefiʒlike he shamep þe
‘he severely disgraces you’  (13c. Orm. 18284)

c. Type (ii) in the 14th century:
Ac þou þi-self sopliche schomedest him þere
‘but you yourself truly disgraced him there’(M: 14c. PPLA (I) 3.183)

d. It-construction in the 15th century:
It shamep þæt men vpon thi visage see.
‘it disgraces you that people look upon your face’
(M: 15c. *Sidrak & B. 11711)

e. Type (ii) from the 16th century through the 19th century:
i. To tell thee whence thou cam’st, of whom deriu’d, Were shame enough to
shame thee, wert thou not shamelesse (OED: 1593 Shakes, Hen. VI, iv.120)

ii. Then, Sir, she is so modest ... The least Obscene word shames her
(OED: 1639 Mayne City Match IV, V. 43)

iii. Who shames a Scribbler
(OED: 1735 Pope Prol. Sat. I. 89)

iv. I wish I were Some mighty poetess, I would shame you then
(OED: 1847 Tennyson Princess Prol. 132)

Table 5.4: Diachrony of three constructions with class II verbs

---

13 This example is indeterminate between the Nominative-Cause construction (type (ii)) and the Nominative-Experiencer (type (iii)) construction. However, considering that the Nominative-Experiencer occurring with accusative Cause is very limited in OE in general, that æfstu is preverbal where SOV is the default word order, that ealle can be a singular dative used adverbially, and finally that the nominative Cause construction is commonly used in later stages, we conclude that this is a type (ii).
•: *that*-clause without nominative (type (i/ii); type S in Elmer)
◦: *it*-construction
▲: Nominative-Cause construction (type (ii); type I in Elmer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>12c.</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>14c.</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>16c.</th>
<th>17c.</th>
<th>18c.</th>
<th>19c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>• ▲</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ail</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
<td>(▲)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listc</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(▲)d</td>
<td>(▲)d</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The Nominative-Cause constructions with 'ail' from the sixteenth century through now are limited to expressions like 'what/nothing/anything ails you'. So this is a lexicalized nominative-cause construction.

b. Elmer (1981: 120) says that type (ii) is only sporadically used in the fourteenth century and fifteenth century. However, his examples, taken from MED, are not actually Nominative-Cause constructions. Example (ii) below is ambiguous between type (ii) and type (i-2):

i. Hom longe^ tramtris l> e trewe. For heled was his wounde
   'Tramstris [Tristram] the true is homesick because his wound was healed'
   (M: 14c. Tristrem 1275)

ii. To seen his sustyr that(REL) her longeth so
   'To see his sister who she so yearns for'
   (M: 15c. Chaucer LGW (Tan) 2286)

c. Elmer (1981) does not distinguish between S[FIN] and S[INF], and treats them as both type S. So his chart is different from here. But all his type S examples are actually S[INF]. And my survey has not shown any instances of *that*-clause.

d. Since 'what' can be either nominative or accusative, the available examples as follows are indeterminate between type (ii) and type (i):

i. And what him list he tok and wan
   'and he took and won what he desires'  (14c. CA 1.1922)

ii. Lete hym drynke it with qwat licour pat hym lyst
   'let him drink it with whatever liquor that he likes'
   (M: 15c. Agnus Castus 192/22)

Table 5.5: Diachrony of three constructions with class III verbs
In Tables 5.4 and 5.5, we see that the *that*-clause complement (represented by ●) and the nominative-cause (represented by ▲) always precede the introduction of the dummy construction for class II and III. And the loss of the Dummy-Construction occurs in almost the same period (17c.) as the loss of the nominative Cause in the case of *rue*. As for *like*, the *that*-clause is no longer used in nominativeless constructions since the seventeenth century, but the verb can take the nominative Cause in the seventeenth century through the nineteenth century. But the causative meaning was not common with this verb. Rather, the receptive meaning of ‘like’ is widely used, and the causative sense is expressed largely by *please* used since the fourteenth century. Thus, type (ii) became obsolete and is never used in contemporary English. For these reasons, in this period *like* began to lose the Dummy-Construction.

5.3.3 An account of class I

Up to this point we have seen the history of the dummy pronoun *it* whose patterns of occurrence require a division into four different classes of verbs. We have found that the acquisition of the Dummy-Construction of class I verbs is chronologically different from that of verbs of classes II and III. Class I started to use the dummy pronoun earlier (as early as OE) than classes II and III. For class I verbs which use the dummy already in OE, we cannot trace back what the situation would have been in Pre-OE. Yet, it is generally assumed that the dummy was an innovation in OE, implying that Pre-OE did not have the dummy pronoun. From the behavior of the verbs meaning ‘seem’, which show a dramatic increase of the Dummy-Construction over time, we may hypothesize that the use of *it* is an innovation in the OE stage. On this assumption, how can we explain the development of the dummy pronoun with ‘happen’ and ‘seem’ in OE?
First, the meanings of ‘seem’ and ‘happen’ are different from those of the classes II and III. The former are potentially Raising verbs, while the latter are not. Second, the meaning of ‘seem’ by its copulative nature cannot take a Cause/Percept subject (47a) without the predicative nouns or adjectives (cf. (47b)):

(47) Type (ii) with ‘seem’ in PDE:
   
   a. *The concept seems to me.
   b. The concept seems easy to me.

Therefore, ‘seem’ by its semantic nature cannot require type (ii) as a syntactic condition for the acquisition of the dummy pronoun.

The verb ‘happen’ lies in between. In PDE, this verb is a Raising verb but contrasts with ‘seem’ in that it can take a Cause-subject:

(48) Something happened to him.

Therefore, the same conditions applied to classes II and III can be applied to ‘happen’. Both that-clause and type (ii) construction is commonly found with gelimpan in OE.
•: that-clause (type (i/ii); type S in Elmer)
ô: it-construction
▲: Nominative-Cause construction (type (ii); type I in Elmer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>12c.</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>14c.</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>16c.</th>
<th>17c.</th>
<th>18c.</th>
<th>19c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gelimpan:</td>
<td>^A^a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happen:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>^A</td>
<td>^A</td>
<td>^A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortunen:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>^A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyncan:</td>
<td>^b(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem:</td>
<td>(▲)</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
<td>(▲)^c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Type (ii) construction in OE:
Swa þeah ær ðan þe ðas ðing gelimpåð
Nevertheless before those things(Pl) happen(pl)
‘However, before those things happen....’ (C: ÆCHOM I. 40. 608.3)

b. See example (22).

c. All the examples of type (ii) represented by (▲) for pyncan and seem are possible only with a predicative.

d. Elmer’s chart (1981:130) does not show it-construction in the 18c. and 19c. He states (p.131), ‘In the 16c. and 17c., the two natural syntactic representatives of the grammatical relations associated with ‘happen’ — type S and the it-construction — are continued, although the latter is no longer found in the 18c.’ However, the absence here is presumably an accidental gap, since it is OK in PDE.

Table 5.6: Diachrony of three constructions with class I verbs
Class I is not changed later with regard to the dummy pronoun because the meaning of the verb is not changed at all. Thus the usage of the verbs of class I in PDE is almost the same ever since OE, except for the now obligatory occurrence of it for subject position when a that-clause is used.

5.4 The history of it with infinitival clauses

Next, we examine the use of the dummy with infinitival Causes. Earlier impersonal verbs are now different in the possibilities of co-occurring with to-infinitives, as in the following examples:

(49) The occurrences of it in PDE:

a. *It rues me (for John) to have lost that book.
b. *It ails me (for John) to have lost that book.
c. *It likes me (for John) to have found my lost book.
d. *It longs me to find my lost book.
e. *It happened to me (for John) to have found my lost book.
f. *It seems to me (for John) to have found my lost book.
g. It shames me (for John) to play with dolls.
h. It behooves me/*for John to work objectively.

Only shame and behoove can take a Dummy-Construction with an infinitive clause. For seem, the Dummy-Construction is possible only in case that the verb occurs with predicatives as follows:

(50) Dummy with copula seem:

It seems reasonable to me (for John) to play with dolls.

But in these examples the verb is simply used as a copula just like the verb be. The ability to take a Dummy-Construction is the property of the predicative adjectives, not the verb seem. The adjectives reasonable, necessary, tough, easy, etc. can occur in these constructions, but pretty, ready, etc. cannot. Therefore, whether or not the dummy occurs
in these constructions in earlier stages is also the property of the adjectives rather than the verb itself.

In chapters 2 and 3, we saw that not all impersonal verbs were able to take infinitival clauses. In my corpus, only sceamian, lician, lystan and gelimpan\textsuperscript{14} could take them in type (i) in OE. With the same verbs that could take an infinitival clause in type (i), however, the dummy pronoun it is not yet found in OE. The following are the examples of the verbs which take type (i-4) in OE:

(51) OE verbs in impersonal constructions:

a. Sceamian:
us sceamað hyt openlice to secgenne
us(DAT/ACC) shames it openly to say(INF)
‘we are ashamed to say it openly’ (C: Gen. 19.5)

b. Lician:
me bet licað to forlætenne nu þisne
me(DAT/ACC) better likes to abandon now this
hwilwendlican wurðmynt transitory honor
‘I prefer to abandon now this transitory honor’ (C: ÆLS (George) 28)

c. Lystan:
Men þa leofostan, us lyst nu eow
Men the most-beloved us(DAT/ACC) desires now to-you
secgan be þam halgan godspelle to-say(Bare-INF) about the holy gospel
‘Dearest men, we wish to tell you about the Holy Gospel’ (C: ÆCHom 2.1)

d. Gelimpan (= (36) in Chap. 2):
þa gelamp him semninga mid gifte þære godcundan
then happened him(DAT) suddenly with gift of-the divine
arfæstnesse purh reliquias þæs halgan fæder Cuðbryhtes
faith through relics of-the holy father Cuthbert
gehæledne beon.
healed to-be(Bare-INF)

Lat. contigit eum subito divinae pietatis gratia per sanctissimi Patris Cuðbercti reliquias sanari
‘then suddenly with the gift of divine faith he happened to be healed by means of relics of the holy father Cuthbert’ (Bede 4 33.382.11)

\textsuperscript{14} The examples with gelimpan are very rare according to Ogura’s (1986) examination.
In ME, *shamen, liken, longen, listen, limpen, happen* and *bihoven* are attested in the type (i-4). The verb *reuen* is attested taking an infinitival clause in type (iii), but not in type (i). The verbs *eilen, hungren,* and *thirsten* do not take an infinitival clause in either type (i) or type (iii). The following ME examples show the instances of the verbs which take type (i-4):

(52) ME verbs in impersonal constructions:

a. *Shamen (= (9a) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Me shameb for to begge
   
   ‘I am ashamed to beg’
   
   (M: 15c. Wycl.Serm, 1.22)

b. *Liken (= (20b) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Me liketh nat to lye
   
   ‘I do not like to lie’
   
   (M: 15c. Lydg. TB 4.1815)

c. *Longen (= (28a) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Hire longuede with hire broper to speke
   
   ‘she wanted to speak with her brother’
   
   (M: 13c. SLeg. (Ld) 198/14)

d. *Listen (= (35b) in Chap. 3):*
   
   For wher as evere him lest to sette, ther is no myht which him may lette
   
   ‘For where he(Obj) ever wishes to remain, there is no power which may hinder him’
   
   (14c. Gower CA 1.37)

e. *Limpen (= (40a) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Ne limped nawt to ancre of oper monnes ealmesse to makien hire large
   
   ‘[it] does not befit an anchoress to make herself generous with another’s alms’
   
   (13c. AW 211.28)

f. *Happen (= (45b) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Hym happend to mete with ane abbott
   
   ‘he(Obj) happened to meet with an abbot’
   
   (M: 15c. Alph.Tales 2/10)

g. *Bihoven (= (63b) in Chap. 3):*
   
   Ous bihouep selle our asse oway
   
   ‘we(Obj) must sell our ass away’
   
   (M: 14c. Amis 1808)

Since EME, the dummy *it* begins to occur with *liken* (14c.), *listen* (14c.), *limpen* (13c.), *happen* (14c.), *bihoven* (since 14c.), but not with *longen:*

171
(53) ME verbs which occur with the dummy

a. Liken:
   Syth hit lyke you to take so symple an offyce
   'since it pleases you to take so simple an office' (M: 15c. Malory Wks. 361/18)

b. Listen:
   Hit lyst me to be fedde in kynge Arthures courte
   'it pleases me to be fed in King Arthur's court' (M: 15c. Malory Wks. 313/4)

c. Limpen:
   hit limped to euch wummon cundeliche forte werien wimpel
   'it is natural to every woman to wear a wimple' (M: 13c. AW 215/21)

d. Happen:
   Yit it happeth him to go
   'yet he happens to go' (14c. Gower CA 5. 6901)

e. Bihoven:
   Som tyme bihoueth it to be conseiled by manye
   'sometimes it is necessary to be advised by many'
   (MED 14c. Chaucer CT.Mel. B. 2360)

The following Figure 5.4 illustrates the history of the Dummy-Construction with an
infinitival clause compared with impersonal construction with the same clause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>ModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ail (none)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behooove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type (i-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4: Chronological chart of Dummy-Constructions with infinitival clauses
The two syntactic conditions which make it possible for a verb to acquire the dummy \textit{it}, coreferential with a finite clause, can explain too why the dummy could be acquired for \textit{likin}, \textit{listen}, \textit{limpen}, \textit{happen} and \textit{bihoven}, and why it could not be acquired for \textit{longen}, \textit{eilen}. The optimal syntactic conditions for the acquisition of the dummy \textit{it} come when the verb is able to take both the infinitival clause construction (i.e. type (i-4) or type (iii-4)) and the nominative-cause construction (type (ii)). The reason why \textit{longen} cannot acquire the dummy is that this verb does not take type (ii) although it takes an infinitival clause in ME. Thus \textit{longen} did not have the optimal conditions for the introduction of Dummy-Constructions. Similarly, \textit{eilen} could not acquire \textit{it} because it did not even take an infinitival clause.

Interestingly, in ME (about 13c-15c.) \textit{seem} begins to be found in the same construction, not with the meaning 'appear to be', as in PDE, but with the meaning similar to \textit{behoove} 'befit'. According to the OED, this word was borrowed from the Old Norse \textit{séma} 'fitting, seemly' and ME \textit{seem} originally had the meaning of 'befit' in accordance with the meaning of the cognate form \textit{sóma} in Old Norse. The OED provides the following examples under such meaning:

(54) \textit{it}-construction with \textit{seem} in ME:

\begin{itemize}
\item a. It semes a kynge to haue discrescioun. (OED: c.1400 Secreta. Secret., Gov. Lordsh. xx. 58)
\item b. It semeth any discrete man y-cladde with clerks clothing for to occupie gentil mennez bordez. (OED: a1425 Arderne's Treat. Fistula, etc. 6)
\end{itemize}

Note that the native word \textit{thinken} is not found in such examples. The appearance of the \textit{it}-construction with \textit{seem} is also compatible with the fact that \textit{seem} can take both \textit{to}-infinitives and type (ii) constructions:
(55) Type (ii) of *seem*:

a. How all hir dedes can hir seme. (a 1300 Cursor M. 3311)
b. A red cros on his scheld seemed him feire (a 1375 Joseph Arim. 564)

The following is the summary of the relationship of the three constructions in question:

(56) Variation of the incidence of an infinitival clause and type (ii) in ME

a. Both types occur: *liken, listen*\(^\text{15}\), *limpen, happen, shamen, reuen*\(^\text{16}\), *bihoven, semen*.
b. Only infinitival clause occurs: *longen*.
c. Only type (ii) occurs: *eilen*.

A problem with (56) becomes apparent. Why can’t *shamen* and *reuen* be found in the Dummy-Construction in ME although they both have syntactic conditions optimal enough to acquire a Dummy-Construction? Although no Dummy-Construction is found until the end of ME (i.e. 15c.) in my corpus with these verbs, the Dummy-Construction is actually found, only a little later in early ModE, as could be predicted from my proposed explanation:

(57) Early Modern English Dummy-Constructions with *shame* and *rue*

a. It shameth and irketh me to abide such thyngs...
   (OED: c. 1577, St. Augustine’s Man. 17)
b. It would haue rued any good huswiues heart, to haue beholden...
   (OED: c. 1548, Patten Exped. Scotl. Bvb.)

This fact may lead us to think that the lack of the Dummy-Construction in ME is simply a gap in the record, not a systematic absence. Or this fact may be understood as indicating that *shamen* and *reuen* do ultimately conform to the pattern, but not at the same time that

---

\(^{15}\) In chapter 3 we saw the examples indeterminate between type (i-2) and type (ii) with *listen* in ME. Perhaps we should interpret these as the true examples for type (ii).

\(^{16}\) For *reuen*, type (i-4) is not attested, but type (iii-4) is found giving the necessary availability of infinitival clauses with *reuen*. 
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the other verbs do. The conclusion to be drawn is that although some verbs are destined to change in the same direction, not all those verbs change at the same time.

5.5 Syntactic conditions for the acquisition of the dummy *it*

In the above, we have examined the syntactic conditions under which dummy *it* could be acquired and lost. The two syntactic conditions required for acquisition of a Dummy-Construction are:

(58) Syntactic conditions for acquisition of *it*:

a. Ability of the verb to take Nominative-Cause constructions,
b. Ability of the verb to take clausal complements,
in which taking a finite clause is limited to the acquisition of the dummy with the finite clause and taking an infinitival clause is limited to the acquisition of the dummy with the infinitival clause

When either of these conditions was lacking, the dummy was not acquired. For example, *ail, long, and list* did not acquire a Dummy-Construction with a finite clause; *ail* and *long* did not acquire a Dummy-Construction with an infinitival clause.

The later loss of the dummy with some verbs, like *rue* and *like* (class IIIa), has been similarly explained. Those verbs developed in such a way that they failed to meet these conditions later in ModE, once they underwent a change of meaning. Their development contrasts with the case of *shame* and *behoove*, where the causative meaning was productive in ModE, and the Dummy -Construction continued to be used.

This proposal implies that the dummy has the same grammatical function as the nominative case in type (ii) does. Butler (1980: 134-5) proposes a possible analysis of the dummy *it* as an object rather than a subject, in order to explain the rarity of the co-occurrence of the Experiencer and the dummy, although he later rejects this. This is not entirely implausible idea because *it* or *hit* can in principle be an accusative as well as a
nominative case. However, from investigating the syntactic behavior of the nominative case in type (ii), as discussed in chapter 4, we know that the nominative case is a subject of the sentence containing it. Thus, the dummy *it*, which shares the same semantic role as the nominative subject in type (ii), should also be considered as a grammatical (or formal) subject. This approach has an advantage over the previous studies (e.g. Elmer (1981), Allen (1986b)) which pretheoretically assume that the dummy pronoun *it* is a grammatical subject. I instead demonstrated that this was really so, by showing that dummy *it* shows the same distribution as the nominative Cause.

5.6 Motivation of the acquisition of the dummy pronoun

Next, I attempt to address the ultimate question as to why this acquisition of the dummy pronoun is needed to begin with. In the following, two previous proposals for the motivation of the acquisition of dummy *it* and the problems of those proposals are discussed. Then, I propose an alternative account of the motivation.

5.6.1 The Verb-Second Hypothesis

One account, the VERB-SECOND HYPOTHESIS, has been proposed by Haiman (1974) and supported by Elmer (1981). Haiman particularly pays heed to Wahlen’s (1925: 9-10) observation of ‘two environments in which the pronoun is almost invariably omitted: in those sentences that are introduced by an adverb phrase, and in those that are introduced by an object pronoun’. Haiman claims that dummy subjects exist for the purpose of keeping the verb in the second position in the sentence. The dummy subject is inserted by a Pronoun Insertion Transformation when no other constituent precedes the verb (p. 23). Haiman claims that all modern Germanic languages other than English have a V-2 (or verb-
(second) constraint in tensed declarative main clauses, but in the past, English was no more of an exception to this constraint than were any other of these languages (p. 63). Although he warns that it is dangerous to talk of more than tendencies in OE (p. 63), Haiman strongly implies that a dummy was used at OE stage only to satisfy the V-2 requirement, saying ‘the pronoun did not appear when the verb stood in second position anyway’ (p.125).

The following examples cannot be explained by a simple V-2 constraint, in which the grammatical subject and the verb have been inverted:

(59) Presence of post-verbal dummy:

a. pa gelamp hit þæt Abiathar, se sacerd, brohte myccle
then happened it that Abiathar, the priest, brought great
gyfe þam bisceope
of-gift to-the bishop

‘Then it happened that Abiathar, the priest brought a great gift to the bishop’
(C: LS 18.2. 396)

b. pa gelamp hit þæt se mæssepresse wæs
then happened it that the mass-priest was
unwenlice abysgod ...
unexpectedly busy ...

‘Then it happened that the high-priest was unexpectedly busy ...’
(C: GD 1(C) 12.88.16)

First, it would be necessary to establish that pa really does fill the first position. Given this assumption, these examples do not violate V-2 constraint but the constraint itself is not the cause of the appearance of the dummy pronoun. Without the dummy pronoun, the position of the verb would be second position after the adverb pa. Thus, there would be no need to insert the dummy pronoun.

There are other kinds of counterexamples to Haiman’s V-2 hypothesis. In the example (60), the insertion of the dummy þæt actually prohibits the verb from being in the V-2 position when the verb is in V-2 otherwise.
(60) Presence of second position of the dummy:

\[ \text{us } \text{æt } \text{binc } \text{æt } \text{he } \text{ah } \text{bines gewald} \]
\[ \text{it seems that he owns your control} \]
\[ '\text{it seems to us that he has control of you}' \quad \text{(C: LS 14. 128)} \]

Moreover, a verb is found in clause-final position too, right before the *that*-clause, not second position.

(61) Presence of V in the final position with the dummy:

a. \[ \text{so-that } \text{it } \text{thee(DAT/ACC) seems that thee most need} \]
\[ \text{sy } \text{be} \]
\[ '\text{so that it seems to you that you are in greatest need}' \quad \text{(C: Solil 1.14.15)} \]

b. \[ \text{it then happened according-to the teacher's words that} \]
\[ \text{the wife witty him with words greet} \]
\[ '\text{then it happened, according to the teacher's words, that the wise woman greeted him with words}' \quad \text{(C:ÆCHom ii, 10. 85.153)} \]

The example (61) shows that the insertion of a dummy in the initial position in effect takes the verb out of V-2 position.

Allen (1986b: 466) notes that Haiman appears to have misconstrued Wahlen's remarks as claiming that *hit* was equally rare in the two environments: in one sentence beginning with an adverb phrase, in the other beginning with an Experiencer. In fact, Allen states, 'Wahlen’s exact words concerning adverbs are “as mentioned already, the tendency to add a formal subject, in OE, the pronoun *hit* is very far from constant. This applies e.g. to impersonal sentences initiated by an adverb or an adverbial phrase.”' Moreover, Allen’s
statistical survey shows that at least for the OE verb *gelimpan*, the dummy can occur in different positions.\(^1\)

(62) Use of dummy *it* in attaining V-2 order (Allen (1986b: 467))

Total number of examples: 198

a. Use of the dummy assures V-2 order  
   Total: 58 = 29%
   i. *Hit* V COMP: 58

b. Use of the dummy prevents V-2 order  
   Total: 65 = 33%
   i. *X hit* V COMP: 62
   ii. *Hit* X V COMP: 3

c. The dummy is irrelevant to V-2 order  
   Total: 75 = 38%
   i. *X hit* COMP: 72
   ii. *X X hit* COMP: 1
   iii. *X hit* X V COMP: 2

*Note:* ‘*X*’ stands for any single constituent, other than conjunctions and Experiencers of the verb. ‘COMP’ stands for a complement clause, finite or infinitival.

Therefore, it is evident that the grammatical subject *hit/it* is not part of a V-2 rule conspiracy.

### 5.6.2 Extraposition (Movement) Hypothesis

Butler’s dissertation (1980) focuses on the historical development of the grammatical subjects *it*, *there*, in several types of constructions. Butler claims that the dummy *it* was introduced to fill the gap after Extraposition and refer forward to the extraposed constituent. He suggests that Extraposition is part of the more general OE tendency to position many types of constituents, most of them long or complex, at the end of the clause or farther to the right than they would normally appear. As other types of rightward movements, Butler

---

\(^1\) Allen (1986b) finds 227 instances of the verb *gelimpan* in the OE concordance. The number is different from my survey given in section 5.2.1. The reason is because Allen’s survey is limited to main clauses in prose texts. She finds that 198 (87%) instances of the verb have a dummy subject and only 29 (13%) have no dummy subject.
lists Relative Clause Extraposition, Conjunct Extraposition, rightward movement of heavy subjects that were not clauses or infinitives, and the use of *it* — which he calls syntactic *it* — to refer to non-clausal subject, etc. (pp. 138-42)

As an answer to why this tendency occurs, he adopts Carkeet (1976)'s proposal that OE possessed a constraint against interrupting the simple constituent of the main clause with internal embedding clauses. The avoidance of internal embedding accounts for rightward movement phenomena such as relative clause extraposition, the movement to the end of non-clausal heavy subjects, and some instances of syntactic *it*.

If it is correct that Extraposition occurs to avoid internal embedding, we would expect to find no internal embedding. However, internal embedding of long or complex constituents is common in OE:

(63) Examples of internal embedding:

a. *pa mæn be dis eall beoþ donde þanne beoþ þare saula breothran þanne sunne*  
the men who this all are doing then are their souls brighter than sun  

`the men who are doing all this, then their souls are brighter than the sun’  
(C: HomM 5 (Willard) 290)

b. *On þære orsorgness oft þæt he to gode gedyde he forliesð*  
in the prosperity often which he for good made he ruins  

`often he is ruined in the prosperity that he accomplished for good’(Butler: CP 35. 8)

Here, we find that relative clauses are embedded inside of the main clause.

Because of the problem with Carkeet’s proposal, Butler later proposes as another motivation for extraposition a typological shift from OV in Proto-Germanic to SVO in OE. He assumes that OE is an SVO language but tolerates very little before the verb. So only a
simple subject can be preverbal, possibly accompanied by pronoun objects and adverbs such as *pa* ‘then’ (p.145).\(^{18}\)

Butler’s EXTRAPOSITION HYPOTHESIS naturally presupposes that there once was a stage prior to OE in which the heavy constituents were not extraposed. If the cause (or trigger) for Extrapolation were basic word order change, as he claims, the stage with OV word order should have unextrapolated examples — though possibly with extrapolated ones if we weaken the OV hypothesis. However, Early OE shows virtually no relic examples of unextrapolated *that*-clauses. Butler tries to solve this problem with the claim that *that*-clauses themselves are relatively recent development in OE. He claims that the *that*-complementizer developed at the time of the transition to VO. The problem with this proposal is twofold. First, the assumption that Proto-Germanic had OV word order is only tentative, as Butler himself remarks in earlier part of his dissertation (p. 2). Second, it is questionable, if the *that*-complementizer was not present in OV order, what type of complementizer was used at that stage. It is worth noting that *that*-clauses are found elsewhere in Germanic languages and that Gothic has *patei* with clauses after verbs of saying.\(^{19}\) Therefore, the whole claim seems to be arbitrary.

The Extrapolation Hypothesis cannot be supported if it does not show that the *that*-clause was actually ‘moved’ historically. Thus, without relic examples of unextrapolated examples as evidence, Butler’s proposal is only a speculation.

\(^{18}\) One problem with this account is that it is built on his working assumption that the basic order of OE is SVO. Canale (1976), Vennemann (1984), Van Kemenade (1987), by contrast, assume that the basic word order of OE is (S)OV, based on the subordinate sentence.

\(^{19}\) B. Joseph, p.c.
5.6.3 An alternative account

My claim is that no movement like Extraposition has occurred historically. There is no evidence showing that the earlier stage had a construction with a non-extraposed clause. Throughout OE, a *that*-clause was always post-verbal; thus, it cannot be claimed that any movement of *that*-clause has occurred over time. Instead, I propose that the dummy *it* began to be used only to fill in the subject position as the language turned from the status which does not require a clear (or prototypical) subject to that which does require it. One way of having prototypical subject is to take a nominative case, if case has an important role for grammatical relation in a particular language. The increase of the personal (type iii) and causative constructions (type ii) from OE to ME reflects this requirement of the (nominative) subject. Another way is by means of the word order, if a grammatical relation becomes to be determined by the word order in a particular language (see more discussion of the Prototypical Subject Requirement in chapter 7).

With impersonal constructions with clausal elements, one way to achieve the purpose would be to move the clause to a preverbal position, as the subject is determined in terms of its position in the sentence. Thus we can have the clausal element in the subject position in a later period: e.g. *That John is playing with dolls drives me crazy.* Another way to achieve the subject requirement would be simply to insert the dummy *it* in subject position to mark the following coreferential clause. Thus, both mechanisms are found in PDE.

Since the (nominative) subject requirement is starting already in OE, the dummy begins to be introduced in OE for some verbs. (Also note that causative and personal constructions having a nominative subject are already found with some impersonal verbs in OE period.) But the dummy is even more commonly found later in ME when the subject requirement...

---

20 This constant post-verbal position of *that*-clause prohibits us from assuming an Extraposition movement synchronically in OE, too.
becomes very much settled down. Around this time the subject begins to be determined by
the position in the sentence and thus the dummy pronoun tends to occur in the pre-verbal
position.

In section 5.5, we interpreted the dummy as a subject, not an object. This interpretation
contrasts with the situation in which there is no dummy subject. In chapter 4, we saw the
oblique Experiencer can play a role of subject in many constructions without a nominative
case. It is more clear when two arguments are oblique NPs, e.g. in types (i-1) and (i-2).
When the oblique Experiencer occurs with a clausal complement, e.g., types (i-3) and (i-
4), it is more indeterminate (see the discussion in chapter 4). The Experiencer can be
interpreted as either subject or object in OE period. It is possible to interpret the Experiencer
as subject, especially when preverbal. Likewise, it is also possible to interpret the clausal
complement as subject, because in OE it is customary to have a heavy subject occurring at
the end of a sentence. It is the second interpretation which becomes the driving force
underlying the introduction of the dummy \( \textit{it} \), as in (64b.i) below, if a particular verb has
type (ii) meaning productively. The first interpretation results in the rise of the Nominative-
Experiencer construction, as in (64b.ii). For many verbs this nominative Experiencer
construction wins out:

(64) Historical divergence:

a. Stage 1: Me likes that I leave / Me likes to leave.
b. Stage 2:
   i. It likes me that I leave / It likes me to leave.
   ii. I like that I leave / I like to leave.
c. Stage 3: I like it that I leave / I like to leave

At first glance, this two-way interpretation (or analysis) at the same stage (e.g. Stage 2
above) concerning the same verb may sound conflicting, but actually it is not. The same
situation occurs, for instance, in PDE, where two conflicting theta-roles are able to be both subjects depending on the constructions they occur in, as with *grieve*:

(65) PDE *grieve*:

a. It grieved him that his mother had passed away.
b. He grieved that his mother had passed away.

As to the possible analysis of the *that*-clause as having an object function, there are some instances already in OE where a *that*-clause is correlated with oblique (genitive) case forms in impersonal constructions:

(66) An object status of the *that*-clause in OE:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hwæt, } & \text{we genog georne witan } \text{bæt } \text{nanne mon } \text{bæs} \\
\text{lo } & \text{we enough readily know that no man(ACC) that(GEN)} \\
\text{ne tweo } & \text{bæt se sic strong on his mægene ...} \\
\text{not doubt is } & \text{that eh is strong in his strength ...}
\end{align*}
\]

‘lo, we know readily enough that no one doubts (it) that he is strong in his power’

(Fischer & van der Leek 1983: 348: Bo 38)

Here the clausal complement is provisionally used in the genitive pronominal form and then further elaborated in the *that*-clause. Similar examples are found in ME too:

---

21 Allen (1986b: fn. 4) also takes the same position.

22 The example in which the *that*-clause is correlated with the genitive case form is also found in a personal construction too with an impersonal verb:

(i) *Huru, ðæs behofað heleða æghwylc \( \text{bæt he} \) indeed, that(GEN) behoove man every(NOM) that\( \text{he} \) his sawle sið sylfa geþence his soul’s journey self think

‘Indeed, [it] behooves every man that he himself ought to think about the fate of his soul.’

(C: Soul 1.1)
The *that*-clause with *of* is also found with the dummy *this* in ME:

(68) Object status of *that*-clause with a dummy in ME:

\[
\text{tiss bilimmpebb wel till Crist off \textit{pat} he comm to manne}
\]

‘*it* [lit: *this*] befits (to) Christ well that he came to people’ (Orm i. 252, 7274)

If the oblique Experiencer can be treated as subject in the absence of the dummy, we can explain why the dummy is seldom used when the Experiencer is present. Wahlen (1925: 10), as also cited by Allen (1986b), states that ‘whole categories of Impersonalia, with but few exceptions, never occur with this *hit*.’ This nearly complementary distribution of the dummy subject and the oblique Experiencer holds not only in the sentences with the Experiencer in initial position but also with the sentences with post-verbal Experiencer. We may explain the distribution by noting that because there is already a possible subject, oblique Experiencer, it is not necessary for another element to acquire subject function (see Allen (1986b: 469) for the same argument).

---

23 This usage of the *of*-that-clause is connected with the fact that an NP also often gets the preposition *of*:

(i) *gefe him punche* wunder & sullich of swuch ondswere easkiØ him hwet beo ordre

‘if such an answer seems strange and wonderful to them, ask them what an order is’ (AW i. 3a.4)

The *of*-that-clause is also found with * liken* in an example indeterminate between impersonal and personal constructions:

(ii) Som man mai lyke of that I wryte.

‘some man may like [the fact] that I write’ (M: 14c. Gower CA prol. 21)
Not all oblique Experiencers can have the equal potential of filling the role of subject. The Experiencers of the SEEM and HAPPEN verbs are different from those of other verbs. They are more likely to be in the oblique (dative) forms in all periods, as in the PDE counterparts:

(69) Oblique Experiencer of SEEM:

a. OE: Me seems that ...
b. ME: Me seems that ... / It seems to me that ...
c. PDE: It seems to me that ...

Again, we see here that not all the verbs grouped as impersonal verbs historically follow the same route of change.

5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have studied the history of the dummy pronoun it in impersonal constructions. By examining the behavior of impersonal verbs with regard to the dummy it and the clausal element, in particular as to whether those verbs take it in a certain historical stage, I have shown that the relevant change does not occur uniformly across all those verbs. According to those different patterns of change, at least four classes of verbs have been identified.

I have claimed that, despite the different patterns of change, we can account for which group of verbs can acquire (and then lose) the Dummy-Construction. Two syntactic conditions predict whether or not a verb is able to acquire dummy it: (i) ability of the verb

---

24 As discussed in chapter 3, a few sporadic exceptions are found in ME, where the Experiencer is used in the nominative, instead of the oblique, thus with the similar meaning to 'think':

(i) a. She semed Darel lusted wel. (OED: 15c. Syr Gener. (Roxb.) 8054)
b. Euer whan the bysshop loked on her he semed her so fayre...
   (OED: 15c. Festivall (W. de W. 1515) 57)
to take nominative-cause constructions, (ii) ability of the verb to take clausal complements. If either of these conditions is lacking, the Dummy-Construction is not newly acquired. When a verb comes to lack either of these conditions over time, then the verb begins to lose the Dummy-Construction.

As for the question why the acquisition of the dummy pronoun *it* was necessary to begin with, I have rejected two previous proposals, the Verb-Second Hypothesis and the Movement (Extraposition) Hypothesis. Instead, I have proposed an alternative account of the underlying motivation for the introduction of the dummy pronoun *it*. The dummy is introduced to fill in the subject function as the language begins to require a clear subject. One way to achieve the purpose is to have the clausal element in the pre-verbal position, and the other is to have an expletive subject, both of which are found in PDE. This PROTOTYPICAL SUBJECT REQUIREMENT HYPOTHESIS is confirmed by independent changes, e.g. the increase of the number of nominative-cause (type (ii)) and nominative Experiencer constructions (type (iii)). Additional independent evidence for the subject requirement is found from a general typological change, the loss of pro-drop phenomena, in the English language. This will be further discussed in chapter 7.

The study in this chapter also includes an important finding in historical linguistics. The notion that ‘synchronic transformational cycle may repeat the diachronic derivational history’ (Watkins 1963: 3) is incorrect. We have seen that the synchronic derivation of Extraposition in Modern English is opposite in direction to the actual change which occurred in English: the Extraposition construction occurs earlier than the construction with a subject clause in the initial position.
CHAPTER 6

THE HISTORY OF SUBJECT EQUI AND SUBJECT RAISING CONSTRUCTIONS

6.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter I investigated the development of the dummy pronoun \textit{it} with impersonal verbs. However, we saw that having a Dummy-Construction was just one path of the change with some verbs, as in (1b.i). The other path of the change was to acquire a personal Experiencer, as in (1b.ii):

(1) Historical divergence (from (64) in Chap. 5):

a. Stage 1: \textit{Me} likes to leave (= type (i-4))

b. Stage 2:
   i. \textit{It} likes me to leave
   ii. I like to leave (= type (iii-4))

When the clausal complement is an infinitival clause, this personal construction is in effect either a Subject-Equi-NP Deletion or Subject-to-Subject Raising construction. In this chapter, I examine the development of Equi-NP Deletion and Subject-to-Subject Raising construction in relation to their impersonal counterparts, e.g. type (i-4).
As observed already in chapters 2 and 3, some verbs attest type (i-4) in OE and ME, as in the translated examples in (2a). These are correlated to the constructions with the nominative subject in (2b):

\[(2)\]

\(\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{i. Him liked to leave.} \\
& \text{ii. Him happened to leave.} \\
\text{b.} & \text{i. He liked to leave.} \\
& \text{ii. He happened to leave.}
\end{array}\)

In PDE the two constructions in (2b) are distinguished by the well-known terms SUBJECT EQUI DELETION and SUBJECT RAISING constructions. In this paper, I refer to (2b.i) as a NOMINATIVE-EQUI construction and (2b.ii) as a NOMINATIVE RAISING construction in order to make the case relationship more explicit. In many cases, the reader will find that these two terms are used in the same meaning as Subject Equi and Subject Raising constructions. By contrast, I refer to the construction (2a.i) as an OBLIQUE-EQUI simply in the sense that it is superficially similar to the Nominative-Equi except for having the oblique form instead of the nominative in its counterpart (2b.i). In a similar way I refer to (2a.ii) as an OBLIQUE RAISING construction.

Some impersonal verbs we examine are now Subject Equi verbs in PDE: e.g. *like*, *long*. Others are now Subject Raising verbs: e.g. *seem* and *happen*. And some verbs now belong to neither of the two categories but once in their history behaved as Equi (e.g. *rue*) or Raising (e.g. *behoove*) verbs.

One of the goals of this chapter is to see the historical development of individual verbs which once were Equi or Raising verbs. First, his study confirms our assertion that different verbs change in different ways. Second, I account for the relationship between the Nominative-Equi construction and the Oblique-Equi construction from both a synchronic and a historical perspective. Third, I also account for the relationship between the Nominative Raising and the Oblique Raising construction. In so doing, I uphold the
claim that the Control construction synchronically coexisted for some time with the Raising construction for some of the PDE Raising verbs, e.g. *happen*, *behoove*, and that this Control property triggers a historical change partly similar to the Equi construction with these verbs. Fourth, I particularly attempt to explain the following idiosyncratic construction involving the verb *seem*, which appears mainly in the thirteenth century through fifteenth century in ME, as translated in:

(3) Him seems to V\textit{inf}. 'he seems to V\textit{inf}'

After reviewing previous accounts and discussing other options, I propose that many examples can in fact be explained by Raising, except for a few examples for which I propose an alternative account which explains why this example could occur but was short-lived.

In the following, I first survey the definitions of Equi and Raising constructions.

6.2 Subject Equi and Subject Raising constructions

In PDE examples in (4) below, the surface structures are same because they both take infinitival clause with the subject *John*:

(4) a. John wants to leave.
    b. John seems to leave.

---

1 Similarly, the following examples show the same surface structures, but distinguished as Object Equi Deletion and Subject-to-Object Raising:

(i) a. Mary persuaded John to leave.
    b. Mary believed John to be leaving.

This study, however, does not deal with these two types involving the object. Thus, in many places in this study, Equi simply refers to Subject Equi and Raising to Subject Raising.
However, the two constructions of (4) are distinguished respectively as the Subject Equi Deletion (or simply 'Equi') for (4a) and Subject-to-Subject Raising (or simply Raising) for (4b).

First, the Equi construction is semantically distinguished from Raising constructions. In (4a), the subject John has the Agentive (or Experience) role as a subject. By contrast, the subject John in (4b) does not have an Agentive (or Experience) role and the entity which has the active role of the verb seem is implied (e.g., the speaker). Thus, it is generally considered that the subject of the Raising verb does not have a semantic (or theta) role while that of the Equi verb has a semantic role. In other words, Equi verbs assign one more role than the Raising verbs. Second, related to their semantic properties, Equi constructions are distinguished from Raising constructions in their different syntactic behaviors. There are many works in the literature summarizing well these syntactic differences (see, e.g. Postal 1974, Pollard and Sag 1994). Raising verbs, for example, are able to have the dummy it or there and idiom chunks as derived subjects, while Equi verbs are not:

(5) Syntactic difference between Equi and Raising verbs:
   a. *It wants to be foggy in Ohio.
   b. *There wants to be thirty houses in this valley.
   c. *Tabs want to be kept on leftists.
   d. It seems to be foggy in Ohio.
   e. There seem to be thirty houses in this valley.
   f. Tabs seem to be kept on leftists.

Many seem sentences have an additional to-marked NP designating the Experiencer:
(i) It seems to me that corruption is increasing.

Postal (1974: 33, fn. 2) notes that this Experiencer NP must be a coreferent of a higher verb, the performative in (i), the superficial verb in (ii):

(ii) Jane said Melvin seemed to the upset.

---

2 Many seem sentences have an additional to-marked NP designating the Experiencer:
The traditional terms Equi and Raising derive from the names of the rules posited for the analysis of the two constructions within a transformational grammar. The transformation of Subject Equi Deletion was seen to create structures like \( [\text{John wants [to leave]]} \) from deep structures like \( [\text{John wants [John to leave]]} \) by deleting the subject of the embedded clause. By contrast, the transformation of Subject Raising, like (4b), mapped deep structures like \( [[[\text{for John to leave} \text{ seems}] ]} \) onto structures like \( [\text{John [seems to leave]}] \) by 'raising' the embedded subject into the subject position of the embedding clause. Variants of these analyses have been proposed under a variety of names, but the terminology adopted here has become a kind of lingua franca for discussions of these and related phenomena.\(^3\)

The term Control is often used to refer to the Equi construction. In this study, I use (Subject-)Equi to refer to the examples like (4) but Control in a broader sense to refer to the \( \text{it}\)-construction in PDE as well as the Equi, because both constructions involve the empty category PRO:\(^4\)

(6) Control in PDE:

a. It bothered John [PRO to have failed in the driving test]
b. John hates [PRO to fail in the driving test]

The infinitival clause, as in (4), is not the only complement-type that occurs with Equi and Raising verbs. There are also gerundives (e.g. \( \text{John tried taking pills (Equi); John kept going (Raising)} \)). In a broad sense, the sentences with predicative APs, NPs and PPs (e.g. \( \text{John felt sick (Equi); John seems sick, John became a teacher (Raising)} \)) can be also considered as Equi and Raising.

\(^3\) See Pollard and Sag (1994: 132-3) for this explanation and some examples cited here.

\(^4\) See Manzini (1983) for his treatment of these two types as Control structures.
If we include these predicative elements in the discussion of Raising, then there will be no debate on whether OE has a Raising construction because the following types of examples are already present and even very common in OE with *pyncan* ‘seem’, as we saw in chapter 2:^5

(7) *Seem* + predicative adjective:

(a) ðær him foldwegas fægere þuhton
   where them(DAT) earthways(NOM-PL) fair seemed(PL)
   ‘where the paths seemed beautiful to them’ (Denison 1993, 211: Beo 866)

(b) & ðyneð him swiðe leohht sio
   and seems(3-SG) them(DAT) very light(NOM) the
   byrðen þæs laereowdomes
   burden(NOM-SG) of-the teaching
   ‘and the burden of teaching seems very light to them’
   (Denison 1993, 211: CP 24.9)

These examples considered, it can be said that Subject-to-Subject Raising is already present in OE, as Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 366 fn. 18), Allen (1984: 464), and Anderson (1988: 14) assumed.

However, this study has a focus on the Equi and Raising constructions occurring with infinitival complements. Also, note that the examples in (7) can be analyzed instead as type (ii) with a predicative, not different from copula + predicative, as discussed in chapter 2. The Subject Raising (or Nominative Raising) constructions involving infinitival complements, such as (4b), are relatively uncommon in OE. But the infinitival clause is found with *pyncan* ‘seem’ along with the predicative element, which is different from (4a):

---

^5 Therefore, it is clear that historically, Raising with adjectival complements preceded the infinitival construction, as noted by Ard (1975). Allen (1984: 464) notes that this presents a problem for any attempt to derive the adjectival construction from the infinitival one. Clearly this shows a difference between a diachronic derivation (change) and synchronic derivation.
(8) a. þonne þincð pis geleaffullum mannum swiþe
then seems(3-SG) this(NOM) faithful men(DAT) very
andrysnlicu wise to gehyrrenne
terrible way to hear(INF)

'Then this seems very terrible for faithful men to hear'
(C: HomS 10(BIHom 3) 106)

b. hit þincð ungelæredum mannun dyslic to gehyrrenne.
it(NOM) seems unlearned men(DAT) silly to hear(INF)

'It seems stupid to the ignorant men to hear' (C: ÆCHom I, 6.94.35)

The matrix subjects pis 'this' and hit 'it' are not raised from the subject of the infinitival clause, but they are from the object of the infinitival clause, which is known as the tough-construction (or Object-to-Subject Raising construction). However, this characteristic is not owing to the verb 'seem' but to the predicate adjectives and nouns following it. Thus, we exclude these types of examples from our discussion. Nominative Raising then can be said to be rare with 'seem' before the ME period (cf. Denison 1993: 221).6

6 Apart from 'seem', other verbs and adjectives considered as Raising predicates occur in OE, like 'begin', 'need', passive of perception verbs, 'about', etc.:

(i) þonne hit on morgene ærest dagian onginneð
when it in morning first dawn(Bare-INF) begins

'when dawn first begins to break in the morning' (Denison 1993, 234: HomS 25.96 (DOE))

(ii) þaet he wes gesewen Criste þeowian & eac deofelgeldum
that he was seen Christ(DAT) serve(Bare-INF) and also devil-images

Lat. 116. 7 Christo seruire uideretur et diis

'that he seemed to serve both Christ and images of the devil'
(Denison 1993, 225: Bede 1 12.142.4)

(iii) we eac witon þaet he is toeward to demenne. & þas world
we also know that he is about to judge and this world
to geendenne
to end

'we also know that he is about to judge and this world is about to end'
(Denison 1993, 227: BIHom 81.35)

Therefore, not all PDE Raising verbs have developed the Raising construction at the same time. In a broad sense, the modals can be also considered as Raising verbs. We discussed the problem with these unclear division between modal auxiliaries and Raising verbs in chapter 4. Therefore, the various discussions about whether Raising verbs occurred in OE hinge on different assumptions about what constitutes a Raising verb.
As for Equi, the Subject Equi (or Nominative-Equi) construction is well attested in OE:7

(9) Nominative-Equi Deletion:

peah de hlaford us pis ellenweorc ana aðohte
although lord to-us this courageous alone intended
to gefremmanne
to perform(INF)

‘although our lord intended to perform this courageous work alone’ (Beo 2462)

In the above, I have delimited the domain of our present study to the putative Subject Equi and Subject Raising constructions of impersonal verbs occurring with infinitival clauses. Now, let’s see the historical development of each individual verb which is, or once was, an Equi and Raising verb.

6.3 Development of Subject Equi constructions

We start with those which once were Equi verbs. Those are like, list (up to 19c.), long (PLEASE verbs), shame and rue (RUE verbs). Each verb is individually examined to see to what extent their historical developments were same or different.

---

7 The Object-Equi NP Deletion is also well attested in OE:

(i) & leot him locon þa gewrite þe
and let him(DAT) look-at(Bare-INF) the writings that
ær waron gefunden
earlier were found
‘and had him look at the writs which had been found’ (Denison 1993, 172: ChronE 116.10 (963))

(ii) þe forbead petre mid wæpnum to winnenne
who forbade Peter with weapons to fight
‘who forbade Peter to fight with weapons’ (Denison 1993, 177: ÆLS II 32. 104)
6.3.1 The PLEASE verbs

Among three verbs of the PLEASE class, only *list* is attested as taking Equi constructions with the nominative subject in OE:

(10) Nominative-Equi Deletion of *lystan* in OE:

| manige men hine geornlice lystan geseon of       |
| many men(PL) him eagerly wanted(PL) see(Bare-INF) from |
| manigum boldgetaum.                             |

'many people from many counties eagerly wanted to see him' (C: GD 1(C) 5.45.19)

But the potential Equi construction with an oblique Experiencer is found in the verbs *lician* and *lystan* in OE:

(11) Oblique-Equi Deletion in OE:

a. **Lician**: (= (22) in Chap. 2)
   
   | be lico mid him to beonne |
   | thee(DAT/ACC) liked(SG) with them to be |
   
   'You liked to be with them.' (C: Ps 43.5)

b. **Lystan**:
   
   | dam menn ne lyst on his life nan god don |
   | the man(DAT) not wants(SG) in his life no good do |
   
   'the man wants to do no good in his life' (C: ÆLS (Memory of Saints) 297)

In ME, all three of the PLEASE verbs are found in both types of Equi constructions:

(12) Nominative-Equi Deletion in ME:

a. **Likin**:
   
   | Men lykyn lestis for to here |
   
   'Men(NOM-PL) like(PL) to hear Gestes' (Elmer 1981, 108)

b. **Longen**: (= (31b) in Chap. 3)
   
   | on a day she gan so sore longe to sen hire sister... |
   
   'on a day she began to yearn so sorely to see her sister'

(M: 15c. Chaucer LGW 2260)
c. *Listen*: (= (37b) in Chap. 3)  
Who list to have joie and mirth also of love  
‘who(NOM) wishes to have joy and mirth of love’ (M: 15c. *RRose* 5028)

(13) Oblique-Equi Deletion in ME:

a. *Likien*: (= (20a) in Chap. 3)  
Hym likiþ ... for to lovuen Him  
‘he likes ... to love Him’ (M: 15c. *Hilton SP* 1.29.18a)

b. *Longen*:  
sore me longis launcelot to se  
‘sorely I long to see Lancelot’ (M: 15c. *Morte Arth. (2)* 543)

c. *Listen*: (= (35b) in Chap. 3)  
For wher as evere him lest to sette, ther is no myht which him may lette  
‘For where he(OBL) ever wishes to remain, there is no power which may hinder him’ (M: 14c. Gower *CA* 1.37)

The Oblique-Equi constructions in (13) are lost approximately in the sixteenth century for *like* and *long* (see Elmer’s survey (1981: 108, 119)). But the verb *list*, now obsolete, is attested as being used in both of the types of Equi constructions until nineteenth century, as in:

(14) ModE Nominative-Equi Deletion of *list*:

a. I list not boast in acts of chiualrie. (OED: c. 1590, Greene *Orl. Fur.* (1599) A4 b)
b. If they list to try Conjecture. (OED: c. 1667, Milton *P. L.* VIII 75)
c. If you list to taste our cheer. (OED: c. 1814, Scott *Ld. of Isles* III. xx)
d. We little listed think of him. (OED: c. 1814, Scott *Ld. of Isles* III. xxiii)

(15) ModE Oblique-Equi Deletion of *list*:

a. When him list the prouder lookes subdew. (OED: 1590 Spenser F. Q. I. vii. 35)
b. When me list to sadder tunes apply me. (OED: 1633 P. Fletcher *Poet. Misc.*. 64)
c. When at need Him listed ease his battle-steed. (OED: 1808 Scott *Marm.* I. viii)
6.3.2 The RUE verbs

The verbs *shame* and *rue*, but not *ail*, were once used as Equi constructions. They are first attested as taking Nominative-Equi Deletion in ME:

(16) Nominative-Equi Deletion in ME:

a. *Shamen:* (= (14a) in Chap. 3)

I shamed to asken of þe king foote men & horsemen in felashipe of grace
‘I am ashamed to ask of the king the footmen and horsemen in the fellowship of grace.’
(M: 14c. Wbible (1) (Bod 959) 3 Esd.8.52)

b. *Reuen:*

let us plesyn hym tyl þat he rewe in hell to hangyn hye
‘let us please him until he regrets to be hanging high in hell’
(M: 15c. Castle Persev.723)

A potential Equi construction with the oblique Experiencer is found in OE through ME for *shame*, but not for *rue*:

(17) Oblique-Equi Deletion of *shame*:

a. OE:

swa þat us sceamað hit nu mare
to tellanne.
‘so that we are ashamed to mention it more now’
(C: ChronD (Classen-Harm) 1050.1.47)

b. ME: (= (9a) in Chap. 3)

Me shameþ for to begge
‘I am ashamed to beg’
(M: 15c. Wycl.Serm, 1.22)

This Oblique-Equi construction is not found after the fifteenth century (cf. Elmer (1981: 88)). As for the Nominative-Equi construction, *shame*, now rare, is attested in ModE until the nineteenth century:
(18) Nominative-Equi Deletion of shame in ModE:

a. Now shames he not on me for to complain
   (OED: c. 1541 Wyatt Compl. upon Love in Tottel's Misc. (Arb.) 48)

b. Clergie who shame not ... to maintain... their Popish and oft refuted positions.
   (OED: c. 1659 Milton Hirelings Pref.)

c. I shame to say that (OED: c. 1862 Miss Mulock Dom. Stories 210)

For the verb rue, the Nominative-Equi construction is short-lived from late ME until the seventeenth century:

(19) Nominative-Equi Deletion of rue in ModE:

a. I rew to thinke it (OED: c. 1583 Babinton Commandm.)

b. This church, the ruins whereof I rue to behold even in wryting theis lynes.
   (OED: c. 1607 Harington's Nuga Ant. (1804) II.138)

6.3.3 Summary

We have found some common properties of the potential Equi verbs. Although the attested periods of the Equi construction are different, most Nominative-Equi constructions, except for rue, occur either prior to or simultaneously with their counterparts with the oblique Experiencer which we referred to an Oblique-Equi construction. For rue, it is indeterminate whether the Nominative-Equi construction of this verb is an analogical development from other semantically related verbs or whether the absence of the Oblique-Equi is simply an accidental gap. The historical development of Equi verbs we have examined is illustrated in the following Figure 6.1:
6.4 Development of Subject Raising constructions

Next, I examine the verbs which once were (or now are) Nominative Raising verbs. These are *seem, happen* and *behoove*.

6.4.1 The SEEM verbs

It can be said that OE *pyncan* 'seem' rarely occurs in Raising constructions with an infinitival clause, although there has been disagreement about it. Warner (1992: 196, 1993: 130) cites the following examples, from Callaway (1913), as Raising constructions for *pyncan*:

Figure 6.1: Development of Subject Equi verbs.
OE Nominative-Raising constructions (?):

a. swa þæt me þyne þ of gemynde beon
   so that me(DAT/ACC) seems out-of memory to-be(Bare-INF)
Paulines wundor Nolane burge biscopes ...
Paulinus’s miracle(NOM) Nola city bishop’s

Lat. ita ut Paulini miraculum, Nolanæ urbis episcopi, ... memoriae defuisse videatur

‘s othat the miracle of Paulinus, bishop of the city of Nola, seems to me to have been forgotten’ (GD 179.8)

b. hwilc cæft þe gepuht betwux
   which(NOM) occupation you(DAT/ACC) seem(Past PTCP) between
þas furþra wesan?8
these prior to-be(Bare-INF)

Lat. Que ars tibi uidetur inter istas prior esse?

‘Which occupation among these seems to you to be superior?’ (ÆColl 211)

Denison (1993: 221) denies this, noting that Warner’s example (20a) is from the text with a fairly close adherence to its Latin original. Even more so is the example (20b). Also, Traugott (1972), Kageyama (1975) and Lightfoot (1979), for example, deny the existence of Nominative Raising in OE.

In ME, however, the Nominative Raising construction with the meaning ‘seem’ is indisputably well attested, as in:

---

8 The past participle of OE gepuht ‘seem’ corresponds to the Latin finite present passive uidetur, which implies that the OE phrase is an over-literal gloss (A. Brown, p.c.)
ME Nominative Raising constructions:9

a. My said Lord of Gloucestre remytteth hit ... unto ye Kyng ... ye Kyng to demene hit ... as hym yenketh to be done.
   'My aforementioned Lord of Gloucester remits it ... to the King... the King to judge it ... as seems to him to be done' (M: 15c. RParl. 4.297b)

b. A yongman ... semed to be an egyptcian.
   'A youth... seemed to be an egyptian' (M: 14c. Cursor 5698)

c. He semeth to be tellere of newe fendis.
   'He seems to be a proclaimer of foreign gods' (M: 15c. WBible (2) Deeds 17.18)

The raised subject, as in PDE, is not same as the Experiencer. Thus, it seems that since ME, there is little change with 'seem' in respect to its capability of occurring in Raising constructions.10

Interestingly, however, in ME the verb seem is found in a usage which was not found in OE, in which the oblique case is used instead of nominative case, as in:

2 0 2

9 A majority of Raising examples occur with the £-infinitive. But bare-infinitives and for-to-infinitive are also found:

(i) Som tyme hath semed come a grym leoun.
   'sometimes a grim lion has seemed to come' (M: 14c. Chaucer CT.Fkl. F. 1146)

(ii) Wel a lord he semede for to be
   'he almost seemed to be a lord' (M: 14c. Chaucer LGW 1074)

10 Note also that the SEEM verbs could have the finite clause throughout their history, with or without the dummy it.

(i) OE:
   op þæt þam abbode ðince þæt hi fulbet hebben
   until the abbot(DAT) seem that they made-full-amends have
   'until [it] may seem to the abbot that they have made full amends' (C: BenR 44.5)

(ii) ME:
   (a) For as it semeth that a belle lik to the wordes that men telle answerth
       'For as it seems that a bell answers to the words that men speak' (CA 1. 1949)

   (b) Me semeth that thou tharst noght care
       'it seems to me that you ought not to care' (CA 4. 1774)
(22) Oblique Raising in ME:

a. Hire(OBL) semes curteys forto be, For she(NOM) is fayr so flour on tre:
   'She(lit. her) seems to be courteous, for she is fair as flower on the tree'
   (Denison 1993, 224: 13c. Havelok 2917)

b. By hys semblant and feyre beryng Hym(OBL) semed weyl to be a lordyng.
   'By his appearance and fine bearing he(lit.: him) seemed well to be a lord'
   (14c. Mannyng, HS 10641)

c. Knyghte aunterus, The(OBL) semys to be envyous
   'Valiant knight, you(lit. thee) seems to be envious' (15c. Degrev. 422)

These types of examples are apparently counter to the Raising hypothesis. If a Raising has actually happened by transformation, it is difficult to explain why the case of the putative subject is not nominative. In section 6.6.3, I propose a new explanation of this phenomenon.

6.4.2 The HAPPEN verbs

In PDE, the verb with the meaning 'happen' is considered as a Raising verb (Postal 1974, Denison 1993, Pollard & Sag 1994). Like seem, happen can take the dummy pronoun it or there as subject, and occur with derived subjects that are chunks of idioms:

(23) Happen as Raising verbs in PDE:

a. It happened to snow in Ohio.

b. There happened to be corruption in government.

c. If tempers happen to flare, ...

---

11 Also about the same time, syntactic constructions opposite to examples (22) are found. In the following example, the Experiencer is in the nominative, instead of the oblique, thus can be glossed as 'think' instead of 'seem':

(i) Experiencer = Nominative:
   Seem ye(NOM) hit right to don me lyue aloon ... in suche aduersite?
   'Does it seem to you right to make me live alone ... in such adversity?' (or)
   'Do you think it right to make me live alone... in such adversity?'
   (M: 15c. ?C.d'Orl. Poems 200/5962)
As seen in chapter 2, the HAPPEN verbs share some similarity with the SEEM verbs. They both occur with the type (i-3), i.e. impersonal construction with the finite clause. They are both attested with the dummy in the same construction already in OE.

Like the SEEM verbs, the Raising examples of the HAPPEN verbs with infinitival clause are very rare in OE. The apparent examples of Nominative Raising constructions are attested in ME:

(24) ME Nominative Raising with 'happen':

a. (= (43b) in Chap. 3)
   May we(NOM) noght lympe ... to couer?
   ‘May we not happen to cover...?’ (M: 15c. Wars Alex. (Dub) 2162)

b. for I may happyn to ascape
   ‘for I may happen to escape’ (15c. Malory, Wks. 1046.19)

c. ofte tymes alle ßese causis happen to come togiders.
   ‘often times all these causes happen to come together’
   (Denison 1993, 233: 14c. Lanfranc 100.10)

In the above examples, (24a) and (24b) are different from (24c). First, in (24a) and (24b), the raised subject is a personal pronominal and thus shows clear nominative marking, but in (24c) the raised subject is not pronominal and thus we can only judge its being subject only in terms of its position in the sentence, by assuming that the subject position at this time has been fixed since the fourteenth century. Second, a more interesting difference is that in (24a) and (24b), the raised subject is not distinguished from the oblique Experiencer of the matrix verb.

Examples of the oblique Experiencer used along with the infinitival clause, possible candidates for Raising constructions, are attested but rare in OE, to judge from Ogura’s (1986) examination (Denison 1993: 231):
(25) Oblique Raising in OE (= (36) in Chap. 2):

a. þa gelamp him semninga mid gife þære godcundan
then happened him(DAT) suddenly with gift of-the divine
arfæstnesse þurh reliquias ðæs halgan fæder Cuðbryhtes
faith through relics of-the holy father Cuthbert
geheæledne beon.
healed to-be(Bare-INF)

Lat. contigit eum subito divinæ pietatis gratia per sanctissimi Patris Cudbercti reliquias sanari

'then suddenly with the gift of divine faith he happened to be healed by means of relics of the holy father Cuthbert' (Bede 4 33.382.11)

b. ac þam cilde ne becymd næfre into heofonan
but the child(DAT) not happens never into heaven’s
rice becuman
kingdom come(INF)

‘but the child will never manage to get into the kingdom of heaven’
(HomU 51 154.10)

(25b) with becuman, its meaning similar to gelimpan, is also found in the same construction.

In ME, these kinds of examples are continually found:

(26) Oblique Raising in ME:

a. Ful oft hym happeth to mysusen it
'very often he[lit. him] happens to misuse it' (M: 14c. Chaucer, CT.CK 8.649)

b. (= (45b) in Chap. 3)
Hym happend to mete with ane abbott
‘he(OBL) happened to meet with an abbot’ (M: 15c. Alph.Tales 2/10)

Note that the oblique Experiencer is a logical subject of the infinitival clause. Thus, the HAPPEN verbs show a line of development similar to the SEEM verbs. A difference is that the HAPPEN verbs show the Oblique Raising earlier than the SEEM verbs.
6.4.3 The BEHOOVE verbs

In PDE the verb *behoove* can occur in a very limited type of construction, the *it*-construction with the infinitival clause:

(27) PDE *behoove*:
   It behooves me to pass these points swiftly.\(^\text{12}\)

However, this verb was once a Raising verb meaning 'happen'. The Nominative Raising is not found in OE but is in ME:\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^{12}\) In the nineteenth century, a *that*-clause is also used in the dummy-construction (see (29) in Chap. 5). The Webster's dictionary (1961) lists type (ii) examples like the following as possible:

(i) ??he played the piano well as behooved the son of a musical father.

But many American speakers do not consider this as good. Also the dictionary lists the type (iii) found in Scots:

(ii) we behove to rejoice at it.

\(^{13}\) There are other verbs, although they are no longer used in PDE, which have similar meaning to *behoove*. They also occur in potential Raising constructions with the oblique Experiencer (i.e. type (i-4)) from OE:

(i) hu flæsclicum monnum gedafonode on hira burcotum & on how carnal men(DAT-PL) behooved(3-SG) in their chambers and in hiera beddum to donne their beds to do 'what was proper for carnal men to do in their chambers and beds' (Denison 232: CP 99.19)

(ii) & us ne gebyrað to ameldigenne δα scylðigan and us(DAT/ACC) not behoves(3-SG) to make-known the guilty 'and [it] is not proper for us to reveal the guilty ones' (Denison 232: ÆCHom II 33.284.168)

(iii) & hu pe birþ uppo þin fend All hatenn woh and how thee(DAT/ACC) behoves in your enemy all hate crime & sinne and sin 'and how [it] behoves you wholly to hate crime and sin in your enemy' (Denison 232: 12c. *Orm.* 5554)
(28) ME Nominative Raising (Type (iii-4)) (= (66) in Chap. 3)

a. he to he lewes bud say somwhat
   'he(NOM) ought to say something to the Jews' (M: 14c. NHom.(3) Pass. 1566)

b. He behoued to lete Bedyuer ly stille
   'he(NOM) ought to let Bedyuer lie still' (M: 15c. Merlin 661)

Also, instead of the nominative Experiencer above, the oblique Experiencer is found too:

(29) ME Oblique Raising (Type (i-4)) (= (63) in Chap. 3)

a. bihoueð us to rennen to cristes quike welle
   'we(OBL) ought to run to Christ's living spring'  (M: 13c. Bestiary 252)

b. ous bihoueþ selle our asse oway
   'we(OBL) ought to sell our ass away'  (M: 14c. Amis 1808)

Since the fifteenth century the Raising construction of the nominative subject is used only
in Scots English. The following examples are from the OED:

(30) ModE Raising examples of behoove:

a. We behufit fyrst to reueil it. (c. 1549, Compl. Scot. xv. 131)

b. He behooved to offend the lewes.
   (c. 1637, Gillespie Eng. Pop. Cerem. II. ix. 522)

c. They behoved to esteem them traitors. (c. 1759, Robertson, Hist. Scot. II. viii. 45)

d. He behoved ... clearly to determine the value of the principal terms.
   (c. 1832, Sir W. Hamilton Disc. (1853) 101)

6.4.4 Summary

Raising verbs also show some common properties. Although the times of attestation
of potential Raising constructions are different, they all share a similar line of historical
development, which is illustrated in the following:
### Figure 6.2: Development of Subject Raising verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>13c.</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>15c.</th>
<th>ModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEEM</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NOM-Raising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OBL-Raising</td>
<td>- (15c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOM-Raising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OBL-Raising</td>
<td>- x (15c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHOOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOM-Raising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OBL-Raising</td>
<td>- x (15c.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.5 An account of the development of Subject Equi constructions

##### 6.5.1 Oblique-Equi to Nominative-Equi constructions

It seems that historically Nominative-Equi (or Subject Equi) constructions have developed from the Oblique-Equi constructions. This is evident from the fact that the Oblique-Equi construction in general historically precedes the Nominative-Equi. And the transition from the oblique to the nominative Experiencer is consistent with the general development of impersonal verbs in other syntactic frames, e.g. the sentences with nominal arguments or the finite complement.

Some verbs develop the Nominative-Equi earlier than the other verbs. For example, for *lystan* it is attested earlier than other verbs. However, ME is the stage in which both the Oblique-Equi and Nominative-Equi constructions are used synonymously for most verbs (e.g. *list, like, long, shame*), as in the following translated examples:¹⁴

(31) a. Me likes to leave.
   b. I like to leave.

¹⁴ In many examples in this section, I use the examples glossed in PDE for the sake of simple explanation, when the actual data already have been presented.
Up to this point I have used the term Oblique-Equi for (31a) only on the basis of its surface similarity with the Subject Equi, without justifying why it is considered as an Equi construction at all. As noted in chapter 5, (31a) can be analyzed in two ways. One is the analysis of the to-infinitive as a clausal subject with no occurrence of the dummy. The other is the analysis of me as a subject, thus leading to a Subject-Equi-NP Deletion construction. This double analysis may be what the speakers at that period had in mind, and therefore both paths of change, both in the direction of having a clear subject, are attested.\textsuperscript{15} The first analysis gave way to development of a dummy-construction, as in the following translated example:\textsuperscript{16}

(32) It likes me to leave.

Without the dummy it, me is normally preposed to the verb: i.e. *likes me to leave. The NP in the initial position is eligible to be interpreted as subject, since the word order was pretty much fixed as SVO in the fourteenth century.

This account is reminiscent of Jespersen's (1909-49: III 208-220) PERSONALIZATION hypothesis. About this transition, there are two possible viewpoints. According to Jespersen, the ambiguity in a construction such as (31a) will be possible only via the full NP where the inflectional ending does not distinguish between nominative and objective. By contrast, Allen (1986) claims that the preverbal Experiencer always had the role of subject even if it is in the oblique form. But my view is different from the other two in that the oblique form in the examples like (31a) is indeterminate and thus can be analyzed as both subject and object. Thus, the constructions (31a), (31b) and (32) are in free variation at this period. The subject interpretation of the oblique form must have been

\textsuperscript{15} Hankamer (1977: 601) claims that one of the most instrumental factors in syntactic change is the existence of multiple analyses in the grammars even of adult speakers of any language.

\textsuperscript{16} See real ME examples in chapter 5.
reinforced when the preverbal Experiencer is a full NP, as Jespersen suggested, until only the nominative can eventually occur in that position, as in (31b).

My account of the transition from (31a) to (31b) by reference to the ambiguous structures of (31a) does not cause a paradoxical change, as in Jespersen and Lightfoot (1979), whereby the object in the previous stage becomes a subject and vice versa. Moreover, the ambiguity is understandable, considering that both examples in (31), and (32), share a common syntactic characteristic: a Control construction involving PRO as the empty subject of the lower verb. In the analysis of either Equi construction or Extraposition, the PRO can be anaphoric to the matrix Experiencer NP, regardless of whether the NP has a nominative or the oblique form, as shown in the following PDE example:

(33) a. John$_i$ likes [PRO$_i$ to dress himself$_i$]
    b. It pleases John$_j$ [PRO$_j$ to dress himself$_j$]

Thus, the (31a) type is also one of the Control constructions.

Therefore, the historical transition from (31a) to (31b) (or to the transitory (32) in case of the verb like) is not as dramatic a change as it seemed at first glance. In other words, the generations of speakers risk few cognitive problems by this transition. This may be the reason in part why such a change is even possible.

6.5.2 An account of the Oblique-Equi construction by syntactic theories.

It is not difficult to conduct an analysis of the ambiguity of (31a), i.e. the presence of the oblique-subject in the Equi construction, within formal frameworks. The Government and Binding (henceforth GB) theory, for example, can accommodate this QUIRKY subject
by Lexical Case marking. The case of the subject can be lexically (or inherently) marked because the subject of the Equi verb is present at the D-structure, as in:

(34)  [ Johni likes [ PROi to leave]]

Thus, we can posit the Lexical Case of the Experiencer, for example, of *like* in the lexical item, as in the following:

(35) 'like'  <EXPERIENCER, CAUSE>\(^{17}\)
    <EXPERIENCER: dative, CAUSE>

This representation does not add any more complexity because, as we saw in preceding chapters, *like* takes both nominative and dative cases as an Experiencer in other syntactic frames (or syntactic types).

The concept of the oblique subject for Equi constructions can be accommodated in other syntactic theories too. In the syntactic framework of the Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (henceforth HPSG), for example, we can accommodate the oblique subject. This is fulfilled simply by marking the case of the element in the SUBJ (i.e. SUBJECT) list of a lexical sign of the matrix verb:\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\) The nominative case of the Experiencer is not assigned here because nominative case is not a Lexical case and can only be assigned structurally.

\(^{18}\) The feature structure here is from Pollard and Sag (1994: 135) with a modification: I use the features SUBJ and COMPs, instead of SUBCAT alone, following the revision in chapter 9 in Pollard and Sag (*ibid.*), to differentiate the subject and complement information.
(36) Partial feature structure of a lexical sign of *like*:

```
```

In this sign of an Equi verb, the VP complement's unexpressed subject (its SUBJ member) is coindexed with the matrix verb's subject (its SUBJ member). And all subcategorized dependents of Equi verbs are assigned a semantic role. Thus, the index of the role-assigned subject should be referential (represented by *ref*), not a dummy.

6.6 An account of the development of Subject Raising constructions

6.6.1 Different properties of the HAPPEN and SEEM verbs

The development of Raising verbs with 'happen' and 'behoove' is different from that of 'seem'. For 'happen' and 'behoove', it is possible for the Experiencer of the matrix verb to be a raised subject. Therefore, in (37) literally translated from (24b) and (28b), the matrix subject synchronically corresponds to the oblique Experiencer object in the *it*-construction in (38):

(37) ME Nominative Raising with *happen* and *behoove*:

a. I may happen to escape.
b. He behooved to let Bedyuer lie still.

(38) ME *it*-construction with *happen* and *behoove*:

a. Yet it happens (to/for) me to go. (translated from (53d) in Chap. 5)
b. It behooves (to/for) him to go.19

---

19 The actual example of this construction is:

(i) To whom it hadde bihouid me to seeue mede. (OED: 14c. Wyclif 2 Sam. iv.10)
For *happen* and *behoove*, the semantic role of the Experiencer is same whether it is used as a subject or an object. The event which happens is experienced by the same entity, i.e. *I* in (37a) and *me* in (38a). Similarly, the action is fitting to the same (Experiencer) entity, i.e. *he* in (37b) and *him* in (38b). When the Experiencer is expressed in a nominative form, as in (37b), the meaning of *behoove* naturally becomes 'need; must'.

The verb *seem* has different properties. With the meaning 'appear to be', as in PDE, it is not possible for the Experiencer of the matrix verb to be a raised subject for *seem*. In (39a) below the matrix subject is not the Experiencer of the matrix predicate because the Experiencer can be expressed as *to NP*, as in (39b).

(39)  
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. He seems to be handsome.} \\
\text{b. He seems to John to be handsome.}
\end{align*} \]

6.6.2 Synchronic and Diachronic account of the HAPPEN and BEHOOVE verbs

Let's first survey previous studies. Most of the previous studies of the Subject Raising deal with verbs with the meaning 'happen', e.g. *happen* or *chance*.

6.6.2.1 Previous studies of Subject Raising with the HAPPEN verbs

Jespersen (1909-49: III 208-213) treats the change with *happen* in the same way that he treats other impersonal verbs, i.e. as the subjectification (or personalization) of the former object. A defect of Jespersen's account is that he does not notice the different status of the Experiencer argument between *happen* and *seem*. Thus, he simply states,

---

20 Except for an example from Charles d'Orleans, a Frenchman (see footnote 11 in this chapter).
'With seem the shifting [object to subject -- HK] has not taken place in Standard English.'

Kageyama (1975) argues that the personalization of the dative did not take place. As the counterexamples to personalization, Kageyama provides the examples like in the sea they happened to meet' (14c. Chaucer, LGW 634:V). Since the dative Experiencer and the embedded subject are coreferential in this example, it will have the underlying structure of it happened that they met. This encounters a problem, according to Kageyama, because the subject of I happened to come is underlyingly either the dative or the embedded subject. As another problem with accounting for the change by personalization, Kageyama points out that in the sentences where the dative and the embedded subjects are not coreferential, e.g. It chanced him that the scholars picked a quarrel (Reconstructed from p.173 -- HK), it is not possible to apply personalization to the dative, since if it applied, ungrammatical sentences like *he chanced that the scholars picked a quarrel would be derived.

However, note that the two problems that Kageyama pointed out against Jespersen's personalization will be resolved if we consider that happen could work in both Control and Raising sentences. This will be further discussed in the following section. Kageyama makes his points on the assumption that happen is only a Raising verb in ME. On the assumption of Raising, we have no way to explain the existence of the Extrapolation construction it happened me to come. If only Raising is involved here, Kageyama's example he chanced that the scholars picked a quarrel will be ungrammatical.

Lightfoot (1979) follows Kageyama (1975) and Traugott (1972) in assuming that Subject Raising is rare. He states, 'The development of John happened to leave was part of the demise of the impersonal verbs' (p. 300).21 This statement is the same as

---

21 In their review of Lightfoot (1979), Fischer and van der Leek (1981: 337) remark that it is not very clear what Lightfoot means when he states this, 'unless all he means is that the SR [Subject Raising --HK] construction could not have arisen if the impersonal construction had not 'demised'. But I would interpret it as meaning that Lightfoot simply shared with Jespersen's view that the subjectification of the dative
Jespersen’s view as discussed above. Lightfoot also claims, ‘if John happened to leave results from the application of NP Preposing, John must be moved not from the dative position but from the subject of the lower clause’. In the latter claim, Lightfoot seems to be confusing diachronic and synchronic accounts. In the former statement, the implication that the subject John came from the dative position is a diachronic account. His latter claim that John came from the subject of the lower clause, a Raising account, is rather a synchronic account. Therefore, if we assume that synchronic and diachronic processes are not necessarily the same, there is no need for his latter claim. Lightfoot follows Kageyama (1975), discussed above, for the evidence for the (synchronic) claim of Raising for the sentence John happened to leave.

Denison (1990: 135-136) notes that the two patterns him happened to be tall and the building happened to be tall coexisted for quite some time before older one disappeared. He remarks that an account which enforces a rigid distinction between the two constructions cannot do justice to the surface structure relationship like such a person happens to see this book, where an animate but non-case-marked NP represents a surface overlap between two different constructions. He claims that this surface overlap must play an important part. Denison, however, does not go on to pursue (i) whether and when Subject Raising entered the syntax of English, and (ii) whether or not Subject Raising examples derive historically by reanalysis of oblique Experiencer examples.

6.6.2.2 Account of the HAPPEN verbs

It seems that the syntactic properties of happen are not different from those of the Equi verbs discussed in 6.5. Both groups of verbs occur in types (i-4) (e.g. him happens

---

Experiencer, found in other impersonal verbs, resulted in the nominative (subject) raising from the form Him happened to leave.
to leave), (iii-4) (e.g. he happens to leave) and the it-construction with to-infinitive (e.g. it happens him to leave). Ard (1975: 60) treats I happened to win at this period as Equi-NP Deletion, though he does so without giving any evidence for it.

However, happen-like verbs are different from the Equi verbs in that it is also attested in Raising examples:

(40) Raising constructions with the meaning 'happen':
   a. And oft in astronamy hit aunts to falle, pat domes and often in astronomy it happens to befall that fate men dessauis and in doute brings.
      men deceives and in fear brings
      (Denison 1993, 233: 15c. Destr. Troy 742)
   b. There chaunsed ... to come to my handes, a shiete of printed paper.
      (Denison 1993, 233: c. 1553 Eden Treat.New Ind. (Arb.) 5 (OED))

Here the expletive pronouns it and there are used as raised subjects.

I want to argue that happen could synchronically take both Control and Raising constructions in ME. The evidence for the Control structure is found in (41):

(41) Evidence for the Control structure of happen:
   a. (= (49) in Chap. 3)
      yf pou happ ... pat bow hitte on clergie
      'if it happens that you choose the clergy' (M: 14c. PPL.C (Hnt) 12.114)
   b. and after she happed she died
      'and afterwards it happened that she died'
      (Denison 246: 15c. Knt. Tour-L 29.1)

In (41) we see that the subject of the matrix verb is present with the finite complementation having the coreferential subject. This shows that the subject of the matrix verb happen is an argument position. Note also that these are counterexamples to Kageyama (1975), discussed above, who claims that such sentences will be ungrammatical in ME.
In fact, ME is the stage which uses both Control and Raising structures more than other periods until the Control structure goes out of use with the meaning 'happen' in ModE. It is in ME, rather than in OE, that Control examples like *it happens me to leave* and the evidence for the Equi-NP Deletion (41) appear for the first time.

Treating *happen*-like verbs (or the HAPPEN verbs) as having a Control structure is not new. Fischer and van der Leek (1981: 339) argue that the dative NP of *happen* has been first reanalyzed as subject (i.e. similar to Jespersen’s personalization), and because of this reanalysis, *happen*, originally a control verb, is consequently reanalyzed as a Raising verb. However, my view is different from Fischer and van der Leek’s. They claim that the meaning of *happen* does not permit an object interpretation of the complement clause and in this respect *happen* differs from the PURE OE impersonal verbs. Thus, according to them, once the dative has become reanalyzed as surface subject, the complement clause must be reanalyzed as a Subject Raising complement. However, (41) shows that the object interpretation of the complement clause is possible, which is not different from the syntactic behavior of Equi verbs.

Also, it is difficult to believe that *happen* is originally a Control verb before taking Raising properties. There is no evidence that HAPPEN was a Control verb in OE. In OE no Control examples other than totally indeterminate type (i-4) are attested with the HAPPEN verbs. In fact, the Control examples — *it*-construction — and the evidence that HAPPEN may be an Equi-NP Deletion (Control) verb — (41) — begin to be attested as late as ME in which the Raising examples are also simultaneously attested.

Remember that Subject Equi-NP Deletion and Subject Raising structures are non-distinct at the surface structure, as seen in (4). Both have a nominative NP as matrix subject which is coreferential to the empty subject of the lower verb. Thus, as *happen*-like verbs came to take a nominative subject as matrix subject with an infinitival complement, both referential and non-referential NPs (e.g. *it, there*) were used. And some speakers at
that period analyzed the structure with a referential NP as a Control structure because the Control verbs (e.g. like) also had the same surface structure and another Control structure, Extraposition, was available with happen-like verbs. Those speakers thus produced the examples like (41).

6.6.2.3 Account of the BEHOOVE verbs

All the previous studies discussed in 6.6.2.1 focus on the change with the HAPPEN verbs but none mention the change with the BEHOOVE verbs. It seems that the following examples of behoove should be treated as Subject Raising because the subject is inanimate and thus cannot be in an Agent role:

(42) Raising constructions with behoove:

a. The grace of the holy gast, In whom all gudnes behoues to be gyn.  
   ‘The grace of the holy ghost, in whom all goodness ought to begin’  
   (M: 15c. MOTest. 6)

b. þe happe bude fall on cuthbert cutte.  
   ‘the hap must fall on Cuthbert’s cutt’ (M: 15c. St.Cuth. 1150)

c. all þis buse be fulfilled.  
   ‘all this must be fulfilled’ (M: 15c. PLAlex. 32/10)

Note also the verb’s auxiliary-like characteristics. They are found not only in its meaning but in the morphologically contracted forms found in northern dialects: bos(e), bus(e) (PRESENT), bod(e), bude(e), bust(e) (PAST). The MED states that the past form bust(e) was formed on the present bus, which is taken as an uninflected third person singular, like other auxiliaries can, mai.

The historical development of the BEHOOVE verbs is very different from that of the HAPPEN verbs. For the latter, while types (i-4), e.g. (literally translated) me happens to leave, and (i-3), e.g. me happens that I leave, are well attested in OE, their personal
counterparts (iii-4), e.g. *I happen to leave*, and (iii-3), e.g. *I happen that I leave*, are not. In ME the Raising construction competes with the Control structure for some time and Raising wins over eventually in ModE.

*Behoove*, by contrast, took personal constructions (or type (iii)) more commonly than type (i) in OE. But the infinitival clause did not occur with either of these two types. It is only in ME that the potential Raising construction, type (iii-4) (e.g. *I behoove to leave*), newly arises alongside of type (i-4) (e.g. *me behooves to leave*). Presumably, the *to*-infinitive in these two types historically replaces the *that*-clause in OE: (ME) *me behooves to leave* < (OE) *me behooves that I leave*; (ME) *I behoove to leave* < (OE) *I behoove that I leave*.

The ME example such as *I behoove to leave* then diachronically comes from *I behoove that I leave* by the process of Equi-NP Deletion (Control). Synchronically, however, there is no evidence for the Equi-NP Deletion (Control) transformation either in OE or in ME, for these two constructions are not found at the same time. The comparison of the verbs *happen* and *behoove* is illustrated in the following summary:

(43) Development of Control and Subject Raising constructions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HAPPEN</th>
<th>BEHOOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (OE):</td>
<td>No synchronic evidence of Control or Raising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject-Equi-NP Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (ME):</td>
<td>Control (in <em>it</em>-construction, Subject-Equi-NP Deletion &amp; Subject Raising)</td>
<td>Control (in <em>it</em>-construction) &amp; Subject Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Standard PDE): Subject Raising</td>
<td>Control (only <em>it</em>-construction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6.3 Idiosyncrasy of the Raising construction of *seem*

As explained before, the Raising construction with *seem* is different from *happen* and *behoove*. For the meaning "seem = appear to be", the raised subject cannot be the argument of the matrix verb but only that of the lower verb. The Subject (Nominative) Raising begins to be attested once the verb comes into common use after being borrowed in the fourteenth century.

The most interesting construction with the meaning "seem" is such as in (22) above, given again in a translated example:

(44) Him seems to be honorable 'he seems to be honorable'

Here, *him* is not the Experiencer of the matrix verb.

None of the previous studies mentioned in section 6.6.2 has tried to explain this sentence.

There would be three different ways to treat this problem: (i) *seem* is not a

---

22 Warner (1982: 71-74) deals with the complement clauses with *seem*. His account focuses on synchronic data found in the *Wyclifte Sermons* (c.1400). All he does is to posit two possible underlying structures for *siche men semen to do yvel* 'such men seem to do evil' (i.167.28):

(i) (ii)

The structure (i) with subject clause in subject position is not realized in actual examples. He notes that this might be regarded as a deficiency in the data. He further notes (correctly) that it might rather be a systematic gap (as in PDE) and may be dealt with by supposing a deep structure with post-verbal clause, as in (ii).
Raising verb at this period, but (44) is an Extraposition (Control) construction with the meaning 'bepit' of the verb, (ii) the example (44) is the result of an ANALOGICAL EXTENSION of the construction of the other meaning of the same verb or of other verbs, (iii) Many examples of the surface structure (44) are in fact Raising constructions and the grammatical case inherently marked by the lower verb is realized as the subject of the matrix verb after Raising; a few exceptions are explained by a different kind of process, called UPGRADING, due to DOUBLE STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS. In this study I propose that the third account can correctly explain the phenomenon.

6.6.3.1 Hypothesis 1: Extraposition

Let's first consider the first alternative: seem at this period is not a Raising verb but is a Control verb. This hypothesis is partially true because the verb seem is found in ME with the meaning 'bepit', an Extraposition verb (see chapter 5):23

(45) Extraposition (Control) with seem:

a. It sesmes a kynge to haue discrescioun.
   (OED: c.1400 Secreta. Secret., Gov. Lordsh. xx. 58)

b. But ill it seem'd me them to blame, though I Censur'd myselfe like mine owne enemy. (OED: 1601 Weever Af/rr. Mart. A viii)

However, the meaning of 'appear to be' like PDE seem is clearly found too, as given in (22) above. Moreover, evidence of the clear Raising construction is found with the verb seem meaning 'seem; appear to be' at the same period:

23 This old meaning is preserved in derived forms like unseemly, while the basic form seem no longer has this meaning. This shows that morphologically derived forms are more resistant to a (semantic) change than the basic forms. In Kim (1993, 1995c), I showed that compared to simple verbs, compound verbs were more resistant to not only a semantic change but also morphosyntactic change involving case-marking.
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The examples in (46) go against any claim that *seem* in ME is not a used as a raising verb. Moreover, because the meaning and the syntax of the examples in (45) are different from those of the examples in (46), it seems better to treat them as two separate verbs.

### 6.6.3.2 Hypothesis 2: Analogical extension

An analogical change or contamination may be a possible answer. This account has been pursued by Ard (1975) and Denison (1993). Ard (1975:62-63) claims that the sense of *seem* = *appear to be* could have developed spontaneously but was probably influenced by the phonologically similar Old French *sembler* which has this meaning. For the example like (44) where the meaning of *seem* is ‘seem’ rather than ‘befit’, he explains that it is possibly a witness of the influence of the pattern of the meaning ‘befit’ of *seem* originating from Old Norse (ON) form *sóma* ‘befit’, in which subjectification has not taken place. In this sense, Ard’s account can be said to be based on an analogical change, because it involves the extension of a certain pattern (e.g. the syntactic type of the meaning ‘befit’ of *seem*) to the other (e.g. the syntactic type of the meaning ‘appear’ of the same verb).

---

24 There has been a claim that the Subject Raising is a recent development in ModE. Based on Ard’s study, Dowty (1978) suggests that English has recently moved from ‘semantic’ raising to NP-movement (‘syntactic raising’). If the advent of raised dummy subjects is to be taken as evidence of a shift from lexical to transformational raising, this change clearly took place in earlier than ModE (see Allen’s (1984) criticism on Dowty (1978), but her examples are even later than those given here).
Denison (1993: 224) ascribes such examples to blending or contamination, which may be compared to a similar pattern occurring with HAPPEN verbs. We saw in the above that with HAPPEN the raised animate element can be same as the Experiencer, a difference from seem.

Ard's and Denison's claims come from the OED. The OED s.v. seem v. 8b annotates the usage by CONFUSION:

(47) The prefixed dative sometimes was used (? by confusion) with reference to the subject of the appearance, so that the impersonal him, her seems = he, she seems.

The account based on an analogical change may not be false. But the problem with this kind of account is that it is basically conjectural. It is hard to prove or disprove that such analogical change has actually happened. Therefore, an analogical change should be considered as the last resort for the explanation of any kind of historical change.

6.6.3.3 Hypothesis 3: Raising and Double analysis

6.6.3.3.1 Raising

In the following, I give an alternative account of the oblique matrix subject with seem meaning 'seem; appear to be' without resorting to an analogical change. I want to propose that many examples with the surface structure of (44) can be in fact explained by Raising. In other words, the oblique form in (44) is actually the raised subject from the subject of the lower verb and the oblique case comes from the properties of the lower verb.

In chapter 4, we saw that raising verbs were TRANSPARENT to the impersonal construction (see Warner 1993). Suppose that the lower verb in (44) is an impersonal verb which can take the oblique form as a subject, then the oblique subject can be raised
transparently (i.e. without changing the case). This phenomenon is found in other Germanic languages too. In German, not all Raising verbs are transparent to the impersonal construction (Kathol 1992: 7), but at least scheinen ‘seem’ is:

(48) German scheinen (Subject-to-Subject Raising):

a. i. Ihm wird schlecht.
   him(DAT) get sick
   ‘He got sick.’

   ii. Ihm schien schlecht zu sein.
       him(DAT) seemed sick to be
       ‘He seemed to be sick.’

b. i. Mich friert.
    me(ACC) freezes
    ‘I am cold.’

   ii. Mich schien zu frieren.
       me(ACC) seemed to freeze
       ‘I seemed to freeze.’

In German the adjective schlecht ‘sick’ and the verb frieren ‘freeze’ take the dative and accusative arguments respectively. Such case relationship is preserved if the Raising verb intervenes. Similar phenomena are found in Icelandic (Andrews 1982: 461-465):

(49) Icelandic

a. i. Drengina vantar mat.
    the-boys(ACC) lacks food(ACC)

   ii. Hana viðist vanta peninga.
       her(ACC) seems to lack money(ACC)

b. i. Baminu batnaði veikin.
    the-child(DAT) recovered-from the-disease(NOM)

   ii. Baminu viðist hafa batnað veikin.
       the-child(DAT) seems to have recovered-from the-disease(NOM)

c. i. verkjanna gætir ekki.
    the-pains(GEN) is noticeable not

   ii. verkjanna viðist ekki gæta.
       the-pains(GEN) seems not to be noticeable
A syntactic theory like HPSG will be able to deal with this phenomenon by the following representation of the lexical sign of *seem*:

(50) Partial feature structure of a lexical sign of *seem*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CAT} & \begin{bmatrix}
\text{SUBJ} & <1> \\
\text{COMPS} & \text{VP} [\text{inf}, \text{SUBJ} <1>]; \text{[2]} > \\
\text{CONTENT} & \text{RELATION seem} \\
\text{SOA-ARG} & \text{[2]}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

The lexical sign of the raising verb *seem* is different from that of the Equi verb *like* in (36), in that the entire SYNSEM value of the subject of the VP complement is structure-shared with that of the subject of the matrix verb. Thus, any syntactic and semantic(SYNSEM) information of the unexpressed subject of the lower verb will be provided as the SYNSEM value of the raised element. This in turn means that if the lower verb is in itself an impersonal verb taking the dative subject, this case information will be shared by the raising controller.

Now, let’s turn to the actual examples in (22), which is repeated below:

(22’) Oblique Raising in ME:

a. Hire(OBL) semes curteys forto be, For she(NOM) is fayr so flour on tre:
‘She(lit. her) seems to be courteous, for she is fair as flower on the tree’
(Denison 1993, 224: 13c. Havelok 2917)

b. By hys semblant and feyre beryng Hym(OBL) semed weyl to be a lordyng.
‘By his appearance and fine bearing he(lit. him) seemed well to be a lord’
(14c. Mannyng, HS 10641)

c. Knyghte aunterus, The(OBL) semys to be envyous
‘Valiant knight, you(lit. thee) seems to be envious’ (15c. Degrev. 422)
The three examples in (22) have the lower verb \textit{be} + ADJ/N. As explained in chapter 1, the \textit{be} + ADJ/N can be considered as an impersonal predicate taking an oblique (subject) in OE and ME. Suppose that all three lower verbs are impersonal predicates, then the oblique case form can be neatly explained.

Unfortunately, there are a few exceptions which cannot be explained by this Raising process. Consider the following examples, similar in the surface structure to those in (22 '):

(51) Hir semede to have the jaunyce.
    'she(OBL) seemed to have the jaundice' (Denison 1993, 224: 15c. \textit{RRose} 305)

There is no independent evidence that the lower verb \textit{have} is ever used as an impersonal verb. It is then clear that the dative case is not the property of the lower verb.

If this is true, this fact cannot be accommodated by the HPSG framework because the element in the SUBJ list of the matrix Raising verb is not referential and thus cannot be marked with a (lexical) case. Moreover, this fact apparently violates Chomsky's (1986: 194) Inherent Case Condition:

(52) Inherent Case Condition

If A is an inherent case assignor, then A assigns case to an NP if and only if A theta-marks the NP.

In the GB theory, the position of subject \textit{John} of the Raising verb in (53a) cannot be given a Lexical (or Inherent) Case by the matrix verb \textit{seem}, because \textit{seem} does not theta-mark (or assign a theta role to) the matrix subject at the d-structure: as (53c) shows, \textit{seem} assigns theta roles only to the Experiencer NP and the complement clause.
Instead, John gets a theta role (Agent) from the lower verb leave at the D-structure, as in (53b). But the subject of the infinitival clause does not get the CASE and thus moves to the subject position of the matrix verb because of Case Filter.26

Therefore, considering (51) as a Raising construction would contradict the assumptions of these syntactic theories: unlike the case of Equi verbs which can theta-mark their subjects, we cannot explain the oblique (or dative) Agent of Raising verbs in terms of the Lexical Case of the matrix verb.

6.6.3.3.2 Upgrading due to Double analysis of the surface structure

Since example (51) is an exceptional case to the account by Raising, we need another account to explain at least such an example. One simple account may be (again) by resorting to an analogical extension: since seem can take an oblique matrix subject after all even in the case of Raising with the meaning 'seem; to appear to be', as in (22'), the pattern may have been extended to examples like (51) which in principle cannot take the oblique subject. The only difference between (22') and (51) is the properties of the lower verb. The language learners exposed to examples like (22') may have lost the sense of the impersonal properties of the lower verb and have simply (mis-)interpreted that the verb seem can take the oblique case whatever the lower verb is.


26 The Case Filter in GB is as follows:

The Case Filter:
*NP, where NP has a phonological matrix but no case.
Another account possible is that the oblique form in (51) is the result of a DOUBLE ANALYSIS due to surface structural ambiguity. First, take Fischer's (1988, 1992) account of the following *it*-construction type into consideration:

(54) a. It is time for you to go.
    b. It is intolerable for John to get away with this.

This construction is frequent in PDE but new at the ME period.

In Fischer (1988, 1992), it is noted that when the *for NP to V* construction first makes its appearance in ME (in the sixteenth century according to Fischer 1992: 331), *for* is a preposition and the development to a complementizer is of later date. Fischer's claim runs as follows. In ME, the construction takes the place of the OE construction in which the Benefactive (i.e. Experiencer) function was expressed by the dative case. With the loss of inflections, this dative was slowly replaced in the course of the ME period by a prepositional phrase, in Early ME usually *to*+NP, later *for*+NP.\(^\text{27}\) This benefactive dative is especially frequent after SEMI-IMPERSONAL constructions such as *it is good/bad/shameful* etc. However, in addition to the prepositional phrase, the dative (or oblique) NP is also still found in ME. Fischer (1988: 72; 1992: 331) proposes a change from preposition to complementizer by the following reanalysis:

(55) Reanalysis of *for NP to V* constructions (Fischer 1988, 1992):
    a. *for* = preposition: NP \(V_{\text{fin}}\) for NP \([s \text{ PRO}_{i} \text{ to } V]\)
    b. *for* = complementizer: NP \(V_{\text{fin}}\) \([\text{for } [s \text{ NP to } V]]\)

\(^{27}\) Some linguists (Stoffel 1894, Lightfoot 1981b; but cf. Fischer 1988) have explained the rise of the complementizer *for* as being due to the spread of the so-called accusative and infinitive construction. It has also been related (Lightfoot 1979) to the disappearance of the *for to* infinitives.
Fischer also claims that the older construction without *for* was reanalyzed in a similar way and this occurred earlier than the corresponding *for NP to V* constructions. The following is the Reanalysis pattern of *NP to V*, reconstructed from (55):\(^{28}\)

(56) **Reanalysis of NP to V constructions:**

a. NP \( V_\text{fin} \) \( NP_i \) \([s\ \text{PRO}_i\ \text{to\ } V]\)  
b. NP \( V_\text{fin} \) \([E\ [s \ \text{NP\ to\ } V]]\) (\(E = \) empty complementizer)

Fischer's account of the transition from (56a) to (56b) is a diachronic perspective. Diachronic reanalysis, however, presupposes a double analysis (or interpretation) of the same construction at a certain synchronic stage. If the simultaneous interpretations of (56a) and (56b) is possible at that stage, the reanalysis in the reverse direction in (56) will be also possible. It is possible for such a reverse reanalysis to have happened for *seem* too. This reanalysis was optional and occurred in the same stage (approximately 13c.-15c.) as the reanalysis in (55) and (56). The double analysis frame for *seem* is given in (57) below. (57a) structurally corresponds to (56b) and (57b) to (56a).

(57) **Synchronic double analysis of the structure of seem:**

a. ... *seem* \([s \ \text{NP}_{\text{obl}}\ \text{to\ } V]\)  
b. ... *seem* \( \text{NP}_{\text{obl}} \ [s\ \text{to\ } V]\)

In a sense, (57a) represents the logical structure for a theta-role assignment. The NP is located as the subject of the infinitival complement but takes the oblique case form, not because of the property of the lower verb, but because it is the object of the (empty) complementizer. If rebracketing occurs, the NP is **UPGRADED** to the higher clause, as in

---

\(^{28}\) Fischer does not provide this and thus I reconstructed it from (55) which she provides. The view of the shift from *for you* as benefactive-to-the-matrix-predicate to subject-of-the-infinitive is not new. Visser (1963-73: 968) explains that this can be explained by 'the frequent occurrence in other kinds of context of "inorganic" for'.
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(57b). The oblique case then becomes preposed in order to avoid positing the verb in the initial position. Preposing the light pronominal argument before the verb, as in (c), is well founded (we previously saw a similar preposition occurring with many other verbs too.) The resulting structure, then, will be (58) below:

(58) NPobl V \text{fin} [s \to V]

This upgrading is different from the Raising transformation in the GB analysis, because Raising will not allow for the subject NP in the lower clause to get a case before movement. The structures in (57a), the \textit{NP to V} structure, are in effect the same as the Extraposition (Control) structure. This means that \textit{seem} could occur in both Raising and Control structures (like the HAPPEN and BEHOOVE verbs), although Control is more sporadic and simply a transitory phenomenon as a result of double analysis. In fact in this period, the mix-up of Raising and Control is found in other examples too. For example, a similar type of construction occurs with modal auxiliaries:

(59) Modals in impersonal constructions:

a. Us moste putte oure good in aventure (14c. Chaucer CT. CY. viii.946)
   b. and if he have taken grace, to use it noght als hym aghit.
      ‘if he have received grace, not to use as he[li: him] ought’
      (15c. Rolle, \textit{FLiving} 99.83)

Note that the modals are also potentially Raising verbs as mentioned in chapter 4. In (59a) the lower (or main) verb ‘put’ is not an impersonal verb. In (59b) the lower verb in ellipsis ‘use’ is not an impersonal verb either. Therefore, taking the oblique form in the matrix sentence is not the property of the lower verb, and thus the whole construction cannot be explained by Raising.

As another example, we find idiosyncratic structures of \textit{(im-)possible} at this period. In PDE \textit{(im-)possible} is not a Subject-to-Subject Raising adjective, as in (60a),
but instead takes a subject in the lower clause (i.e. Extraposition), as in (60b). It also allows an Object-to-Subject Raising (or tough-construction), as in (60c):

(60) PDE (im-possible):
   a. *John is impossible to pass that exam.
   b. It is impossible for John to pass that exam.
   c. That exam is impossible for John to pass.

In ME, however, the Subject-to-Subject Raising apparently occurs:29

(61) ME (im-possible):
   a. he come by a depe water, þat was impossible to be passid.
      (Denison 1993, 230: 15c. *GRom*. 88.31)
   b. Yf ye be able and possible to reedifie the churches of God.
      (OED: 1512 *Helyas* in Thoms *Prose Rom.* (1828) iii.131)

Also at the same period, the NP to V structure, i.e. the Control structure, ambiguous between (57a) and (57b) occurs:

(62) Hit es impossible any man to plese god wythouten feyth.
   'it is impossible for any man to please god' (M: 15c. *Spec. Chr.* (2) 10/5)

This example indicates that it is possible and actually attested at least at this time that the apparent Raising construction, such as (61), synchronically coexists with the NP to V construction, such as (62), the Control (Extraposition) structure, having the same core meaning.30

A question arises whether the verb with the meaning 'seem; appear to be' can really occur in the structure (57a) at this period. In PDE, it cannot occur in the structure (57a):

29 Denison (1993: 229-230) treats (im-)possible e as a Subject Raising predicate.

30 What I mean by the same core meaning is that in case of seem, the meaning 'seem; appear to be' can be preserved by either interpretation, rather than having the meaning 'befit' for one interpretation and 'seem; appear to be' for the other.
e.g. *It seems (for) him to leave; *It is likely (for) him to leave. The actual examples corresponding to (57a) are not very common but the following example is a probable candidate:31

(63) hit semyth not you to spede thereas all thes othir knyghtes have fayled.
‘it is not likely that you should succeed where all these other knights have failed’

As another example, consider the following example:

(64) Wordes tho That hadden pris, now wonder nyce and straunge us thinketh [vr: thinkethem] hem.
‘Words, though they had price, now they[lit: them] seem to us marvelously nice and strange’ (M: 15c. Chaucer TC 2.25)

In (64), the oblique hem ‘them’ is a logical subject of the predicative element wonder nyce and straunge which is preposed, and us is an oblique Experiencer. This example is significant because the sentence contains both the dative Experiencer (us) of the matrix verb and the logical subject of the lower clause (hem). Moreover, the matrix verb is not seem but the native word thinken. Ard’s account that the construction in question arises as the influence of the meaning ‘bfit’ of the verb seem originated from Old Norse does not apply to thinken, because thinken is never attested as having the meaning ‘bfit’ otherwise.

6.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have accounted for the historical development of the once Equi-NP Deletion and Raising verbs. The constructions involved are types (i-4) and (iii-4)

31 Warner (1982: 71) sees this seem as a Raising meaning ‘appear to be’ but the meaning ‘bfit’ may be perhaps possible.
surveyed in the preceding chapters. I have argued that the Subject Equi-NP Deletion construction has developed from the Oblique Equi-NP Deletion (type (i-4)) in the earlier stage by the personalization of the Experiencer. Such a change does not cause a great deal of cognitive problems to the speaker at the transition period as it might appear at first glance, for both the input and output structures of the historical change are basically Control constructions.

As regards Raising, I have first noted that the HAPPEN (e.g. (ge-)limpan, happen) and the BEHOOVE verbs are syntactically different from the SEEM verbs (e.g. thinken, semen) in that the Experiencer cannot be a Raised subject for the SEEM verbs. However, they show a similarity in that both Control and Raising were possible sometime in ME, although Control is more sporadic for the SEEM verbs. Here, we again confirm lexical differences (as well as similarities) in historical changes which we have observed in the preceding chapters.

As for the SEEM verbs with the meaning 'seem; appear to be', OE seldom could occur in the Raising construction as far as the infinitival complement is concerned, and it is in ME that Raising is commonly used with the infinitival complement. However, the Raising constructions with predicative ADJ/N were very common with the SEEM verbs already in OE. This means, as noted by Allen (1984), that the derivation of the adjectival construction from the infinitival one in a Raising construction does not apply to diachronic developments. As claimed in chapter 5, therefore, the notion that synchronic derivation may recapitulate diachronic developments is incorrect.

Finally, I have attempted to explain the idiosyncratic construction with semen, e.g. me seems to V. I have proposed that many examples having this surface structure can in fact be explained neatly by the Raising process accommodated by syntactic theories such as HPSG. For a few examples which cannot be explained by Raising, I have proposed an alternative account based on double analyses.
CHAPTER 7

EXPLAINING THE LOSS OF IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

7.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, I have examined various syntactic constructions involving impersonal verbs from both synchronic and historical perspectives. I have first examined how each verb behaves with regard to nine syntactic frames of three basic types, Non-nominative (or impersonal) constructions (= type (i)), Nominative-Cause construction (= type (ii)) and Nominative-Experiencer construction (= type (iii)). Type (i) was completely lost by the sixteenth century for all verbs and types (ii) and (iii) are the only constructions used now in English. We have seen that when a verb subcategorizes for two noun phrases, the dative Experiencer has some syntactic properties of normal subject. These subject properties of the Experiencer, though not prototypical properties, are in fact a forerunner of the subsequent change which turns the dative to the nominative subject. We have also seen an object property of the dative Experiencer, which is revealed in the history of the Dummy-Construction. However, an ultimate question has been left unexplained: what causes (or triggers) the loss of type (i) and the acquisition of type (iii)? In chapters 5 and 6, I have introduced the PROTOTYPEAL SUBJECT REQUIREMENT as a trigger to the changes leading to a Dummy-Construction and the Subject-Equi and Subject Raising constructions.
In this chapter I pursue this question more in detail and defend the Prototypical Subject Requirement as an explanation of the loss of the impersonal construction.

In explaining the underlying cause of the loss of impersonal constructions, one possible account may hinge on language contact. Loan words from other languages with a similar meaning may be in a competition with native words. For example, we may account for the loss of the causative meaning of like as being affected by please, borrowed from French in the fourteenth century. Thus, while please ordinarily requires its Experiencer to be the object, as in (1a), like (gradually) requires its Experiencer to be the subject, as in (1b):

(1) a. The result pleased the parents.
   b. The parents liked the result.

This is a sort of "devision of labor" between the inherited verb and the newly borrowed verb. However, the probable examples for the influence of loan words are limited to a few impersonal verbs. Moreover, even with this pair please-like, the meanings and their relevant syntactic constructions do not show a definite complementary division. In a limited syntax, they can have overlapping syntactic constructions:

(2) a. I'll do as I please.
   b. I'll do as I like.

In some examples, moreover, loan words simply take over the syntactic constructions of the competing native words. For seem vs. think, for example, the loan word seem did not cause a syntactic change to the native word but rather replaced the usage of the native word, as think eventually disappears except for frozen forms like me thinks. Above all, the hypothesis for the influence of loan words shown above is more relevant to the meaning (or syntactic type) changes of the native impersonal verbs, e.g. from causative

---

1 Remember that the PDE verb think has a different source in OE, pencan, not dyncan.
(type (ii)) to receptive meaning (type (iii)) for like, rather than to the loss of impersonal constructions.

A more convincing account of the loss of impersonal constructions can be derived from morphosyntactic motivations, for there are other syntactic changes approximately at the same period which may be considered as related as far as the causation of those changes are concerned. In the following section, I first survey how previous historical studies accounted for the causation of the changes in concern.

7.2 Previous studies: the role of case marking distinctions

7.2.1 Ambiguity (opacity) as a result of the loss of case marking

In chapter 1, I outlined some previous works which explained the loss of impersonal constructions and the introduction of their personal counterparts. Some researchers, e.g. Jespersen (1909-49, III), Lightfoot (1979), have treated these changes as REANALYSIS caused by surface ambiguity which resulted from the loss of case marking, an independent change, in the history of the language.

The basic concept is as follows. The oblique (mostly dative) Experiencer was historically an object. Once case marking distinction which would have made clear the dative case, and thus the object status of the NP, were lost, the Experiencer, usually preposed, is reanalyzed as a subject. For example, Jespersen's (1909-49, III: 209) well-known scenario of reanalysis explains that the nominal NP the king, originally an object, in the hypothetical sentence (3c) is ambiguously analyzable as either object or subject at one point.

(3) a. þam cynge licodon peran  
    b. the king liceden peares  
    c. the king liked pears  
    d. he liked pears
Then the NP is finally analyzed as subject as the word order becomes fixed as SVO in the language (see chapter 1 for the details and the problems of this account).

Lightfoot (1979) sees opacity (i.e. ambiguity) as an important factor for the changes in concern (as well as for other syntactic changes), whereby he claims that the Transparency Principle (applied to eliminate the opacity) is a driving force behind the changes. Similarly, Fischer and van der Leek (1987: 113) claim that the loss of certain OE non-nominative constructions is due to the LME syntactic loss of adverbial Case on bare (i.e. non-prepositional) NPs, a loss in its turn due to the morphological loss of oblique Case inflections, which worked in combination with the change in word order from SOV to SVO.

The researchers using this kind of account see preverbal, ambiguously marked, Experiencers as the most commonly occurring type, as stated by van der Gaaf (1904: 142), "The declinable pronouns formed a minority, i.e. they were used less frequently than nouns or uninflected pronouns." He also comments that Experiencers were reanalyzed as nominative the more easily 'because their usual place was before the verb' (the emphasis is van der Gaaf's).

According to Allen's investigation (pp. 302-303), however, the texts indicate that the declinable pronouns were in fact in a majority with at least some impersonal verbs in the late fourteenth century, which is about the time the case marking distinction has been greatly reduced. Moreover, as pointed out by Allen (1995: 3), van der Gaaf's account requires an assumption which most of the other historical studies conducted on these constructions have also incorporated, the assumption of an extremely close relationship between case marking and grammatical relations. Within traditional grammar, it is assumed that the case marking of an NP can be predicted from its grammatical relation and vice versa; a subject will have nominative case, a direct object will have accusative case, and an indirect object will have dative case. However, many current studies of various languages
report that there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between grammatical cases and grammatical relations. Based on these findings in current linguistics, we saw in chapter 4 that one of the two oblique arguments, in fact, can play the role of subject syntactically, thus leading to the later change to a nominative construction. Note, however, the oblique subject is not a prototypical subject because its case marking (dative mostly) does not correspond to that of a prototypical subject.

7.2.2 Abrupt vs. gradual change

According to the previously proposed reanalysis accounts, the personal construction is an immediate, necessary result of the loss of nominal case marking. For example, Fischer and van der Leek (1983), Lightfoot (1979, 1981a & b, 1988, 1991) assume that the nominative constructions rather abruptly became the only possibilities as children became unable to generate impersonal constructions. For such an abrupt death of impersonal constructions, Lightfoot (1979, 1981b, 1988) answers that it is due to the change in a crucial PARAMETER in which the basic verb phrase order shifted from OV to VO. Fischer and van der Leek (1987) consider a DEARTH OF EVIDENCE for the impersonal construction as the reason for the abrupt reanalysis.² They say (p. 113-114), 'The re-analysis of both active and passive impersonal verbs as personal, apparently led to such a reduction in the occurrence of non-nominative constructions that the language learner adopted the new pattern, positive pieces of evidence to the contrary being too far and few between to lead her/him to different conclusions.'³

A difference between Allen’s (1995: 292) account and the others mentioned above is the view that the loss of case marking distinctions did not make the impersonal

² See Allen (1995: 308-315) for a more detailed discussion

³ See Allen (1995: 308-310), pointing out problems with this hypothesis, e.g., that the frequency of evidence for the construction has little to do with whether it would be learned or not.
constructions impossible but rather paved the way for their loss by introducing a rival construction more in keeping with the trend towards structural case marking.

7.2.3 Change in Lexical vs. Structural case marking

Fischer and van der Leek (1983) argue that the historical development of impersonal verbs in English did not include a syntactic re-analysis from OVS into SVO and a concomitant change of the meaning of the verb into its converse. Due to the breakdown of the morphological case system and its ability to assign Lexical Case in the base, the three different construction types could no longer be systematically related to each other by means of a single lexical entry in LME (p.362-3). One change directly following from the loss of Lexical Case is that only one of the two NPs that impersonal verbs subcategorized for in OE/ME can now receive Case (i.e. Structural Case) from its verbs through Government. In other words, the impersonal verb can no longer accommodate two NP arguments as far as Case assignment is concerned.

Lightfoot (1991) incorporates Fischer and van der Leek's (1983) idea that the loss of the impersonal construction is triggered by the loss of Lexical Case marking. But he notes that although Fischer and van der Leek provided a good account of the loss of the impersonal verbs in terms of the loss of morphological dative case, the account tried to put too much information into individual lexical entries, thus attributing the loss of the impersonal form of any particular verb too directly to a change in that lexical entry, and thereby sacrificing any kind of explanation. In order to explain the coexistence of types (i), (ii) and (iii), Lightfoot treats the situation as diglossic, instead of Fischer and van der Leek's property of optional assignment of Lexical Case: two grammars coexisted in the

---

4 Similar claims for the loss of impersonal constructions as the result of the loss of oblique cases have been made by Roberts (1985), Allen (1986), Fischer and van der Leek (1987), Brody (1989).
speech community, one with lexical entries with dative and other cases and the other with no such inherent case specifications for the verbs under discussion. He states that the existence of Lexical Cases is triggered by the occurrence of oblique morphological cases and that this notion predicts that grammars manifesting a dative case would not manifest impersonal verbs with structural objective case (and conversely, grammars manifesting no dative case morphologically are expected to show impersonal verbs with structural objective cases, PPs instead of former genitives, etc.). The ME period witnessed a coexistence of conservative grammars with Lexical Cases and innovative grammars with no cases assigned inherently at D-structure.

All the attempts to explain the historical change by means of the loss of Lexical Case seem to be simply a notational variant of a descriptive statement, ‘particular verbs in OE which could assign their own specified cases to their arguments (thus, Lexical Case) have lost these specified cases, and one of the arguments came to have a nominative case due to the decay of oblique case system’. It seems to add no explanatory adequacy to introduce the concept of Lexical and Structural cases in the account of such diachronic changes.

7.3 The role of the loss of case marking

Like the scenario in (3), most studies of these constructions, whether they attribute the changes to reanalysis or not, somehow resort to the loss of case marking, with a subsidiary change of basic word order at times, as responsible for the changes in concern. It is true that extensive changes in morphology occurred in late OE and ME, apparently chronologically parallel to the changes in concern. Naturally, then, it will be important to examine at what point ambiguity of case marking became serious enough to cause the reanalysis as is explained above.
7.3.1 Preliminaries

The loss of case marking is in fact very gradual. Given the system of eight cases (nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, ablative, locative, instrumental, vocative) in Proto-Indo-European (PIE), where endings are all differentiated, according to the reconstruction of Prokosch (1938), we must say that a loss of case marking had already occurred even in Pre-OE.

According to Allen's (1995) study of the development of case marking in English in general, the morphological evidence for a separate category of dative disappeared by the mid-twelfth century in Peterborough, on the northern edge of the south Midlands area; the evidence of the *Ormulum* demonstrates that this category distinction was completely gone by the beginning of the thirteenth century. Further south, the morphological evidence for a dative/accusative distinction persisted well into the thirteenth century. Although this category distinction remained in Kent well into the early fourteenth century, it disappeared considerably earlier in the London and East Midland dialects from which ModE is primarily descended. The available evidence suggests that in these dialects the disappearance of the dative category cannot be dated later than the end of the thirteenth century at the latest (p. 213). Apparent late survivals of dative case, Allen claims, are best analyzed as either fixed expressions or prepositional case which is assigned structurally, rather than lexically.

Allen (pp. 217) notes that there is a clear relationship between the loss of the dative/accusative distinction and the loss of genitive objects. According to her, in the dialects in which there is a clear evidence of the retention of a dative/accusative distinction, genitive objects are still found. However, she also states (p. 217-218) that genitive objects were already beginning to disappear in EME even in those dialects in which the dative/accusative distinction was rigorously maintained. In chapter 3 we saw that accusative Cause object has increased in ME, compared to OE in which the genitive case is more
common. Allen sees this fact as the replacement of Lexical Case (e.g. genitive) by Structural Case (e.g. accusative) which is more frequently realized as the (ambiguous) bare object.

7.3.2 Problems

It is generally assumed that the personal construction is a later development than the impersonal construction in the history of English, although OE shows both types of constructions with some verbs. The reason is that the personal construction has increased over time and survived until now while its impersonal contestant had died out eventually. As noted above, the most widely held explanation of why nominative Experiencers were first introduced is that the development was a result of the loss of case distinctions.

The reanalysis scenario, as in (3), naturally regards the loss of impersonal constructions as being a change simultaneous with the introduction of personal constructions, that is, a transition from the former constructions to the latter, which occurred in stage (3c). In preceding chapters, however, we saw that the nominative constructions, either causative (type (ii)) or personal (type (iii)), already began to occur in OE at least with some verbs. This means that those advocating this reanalysis scenario must say that the transition had occurred in OE. However, as we saw above, the serious reduction of case marking did not occur until EME. This fact causes a serious problem for the scenario in which the loss of case marking plays a crucial role for the changes, that is, the cause of the change, i.e. the loss of case marking, is later than the result, i.e. the transition from impersonal to personal. It cannot be said, then, that the loss of case marking is the cause of the reanalysis.

Another problem is found in the late loss of the impersonal construction, as noted by Allen (1995: 286-287, 304). In EME in which important case marking distinctions had
either recently been lost or were in the process of disappearing, the tendency to assign non-
nominative case to an Experiencer seems to have increased, rather than to have decreased.
Although nominal case marking was lost in most dialects by the middle of the thirteenth
century, the general introduction of nominative Experiencers does not take place until the
late fourteenth century.® But it is not until the fifteenth century that the impersonal
constructions are clearly losing ground.

Thus, it is clear that the tendency for previously oblique Experiencers to have shifted to
nominative subjects did not begin with the loss of the case marking distinctions. In order
for the reanalysis as in (3) to work as the result of the loss of case distinction, the only
solution is to assume that the reanalysis in question occurs AFTER, not BEFORE, a number
of surface changes. In section 7.5, I explain that this account is inappropriate on account of
the definition of reanalysis.

7.4 An alternative account: the Prototypical Subject Requirement

I want to claim that the acquisition of the personal construction should not be treated as
a TRANSITION from the impersonal construction. It was evident from the above discussion
that the use of personal constructions with some impersonal verbs was too early to be
considered as the replacement of impersonals caused by the loss of case marking
distinction. Rather, I want to propose that the personal construction began to be used as
early as OE as the result of a newly acquired requirement in the language, namely
PROTOTYPICAL SUBJECT REQUIREMENT (hereafter PSR). This requirement is certainly a
language-specific constraint.

5 Allen (p. 304) states that it is quite implausible to regard the lack of nominative Experiencers in the
thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries as a data gap, at least with some of the more commonly occurring
verbs.
In the following I first show that the PSR account I propose is not an arbitrary, unmotivated hypothesis which explains only the changes in concern. Rather, it is a well-motivated constraint, underlying other syntactic changes apparently independent of the changes in concern. Some examples of those independent changes are the loss of pro-drop and of the Conjunction Reduction of the oblique NP and the acquisition of That-trace Effects.

7.4.1 Loss of pro-drop

In a few places in the preceding chapters, I have pointed out that OE is one of the PRO-DROP languages. The pro-drop phenomenon is also commonly referred to as NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER, whereby finite declarative sentences occur with a phonetically null subject. Perlmutter (1971, Chap. 4) suggested a typological distinction among the world's languages. Type A languages, like French, provide all verbs inflected for tense with subjects in surface structure; type B languages, like Italian, can dispense with subjects. Null subject (or type B) languages seem to be much more common than languages which require the subject (Lightfoot 1991:12).

The following examples in OE show two types of null subjects, referential and nonreferential NPs:

(4) Pro-drop phenomena in OE
a. Pro-drop of referential NP:

\[ \begin{array}{llll}
\text{Het} & \text{hi} & \text{ba} & \text{swingan} \\
\text{bade} & \text{her(ACC)} & \text{then} & \text{scourge (bare-INF)} \\
\end{array} \]

' (The father) ordered her then to be scourged' (Juliana, 142)
b. Pro-drop of nonreferential NP:

Nap nihtscua, norðan [e] sniwde.
grew-dark night-shadow from-north snowed
The shadow of night grew dark, it snowed from the north’ (Seafarer 31)

cf. And hit rine and sniwe and styrme ute
And it rains and snows and storms outside (Bede 134.28)

Here, we mainly focus on the pro-drop of a referential NP, as in (4a). As mentioned in chapter 4, the pro-drop of a referential NP is different from the situation of impersonal constructions we are concerned with. In the former the subject argument is missing (or non-expressed), while in the latter all arguments required by the verb are expressed, either in two oblique NPs, or in an oblique NP and a clausal complement. Thus, the changes with the pro-drop of a referential NP are phenomena that are independent of the changes with the impersonal verb.

Mitchell (1985: 628) notes that a non-expressed subject can be supplied from a noun or pronoun in the same clause, or in a neighboring principle or subordinate clause, or (in extreme cases) in a distant clause in OE. Ohlander (1943-4: 107) also agrees with the view that in OE the subject-pronoun was seldom necessary, although he (incorrectly) ascribes the reason to the fact that the subject was generally sufficiently indicated by the personal ending of the predicate verb.

ME also attests the pro-drop of a referential NP, as in:

(5) Pro-drop of a referential NP in ME:

a. for he hadde power of confessioun, As seyde hem self,...
‘for he had power of confession, as [he] said himself ...’
(Mustanoja 1960, 143: Ch. CT A Prol. 219)

---

6 Another non-referential NP involved in pro-drop is the dummy it with impersonal verbs. Since we are dealing with those verbs in the present study, we do not include the Dummy-Construction in our discussion of pro-drop, for it would be a circular explanation.
b. 'this is ynogh, Grisilde myn,' quod he, '... Now knowe I, dere wyf, thy stedfastnesse.' And hire in armes took and gan hire kesse.

"this is enough, my Grisild" said he, "... Now I know, dear wife, thy steadfastness." And [he] took her in arms and began to kiss her' (Mustanoja 1960, 142: Ch.CE E Cl. 1057)

Mustanoja (1960: 138) notes that non-expression of the subject-pronoun of the third person singular and plural is quite frequent in ME while that of the first person and the second (except in the imperative) is uncommon. He also notes that practically all the OE types of non-expression of the subject-pronoun are found in ME, stating (pp. 138-139), 'The phenomenon occurs in all types of literary works, although its frequency varies a great deal from writer to writer. It is rare in *Ormulum* and in Chaucer’s prose, comparatively rare in the *Proverbs of Alfred, Handlyng Synne*, and *Pearl*, and comparatively frequent, e.g. in the *Trinity College Homilies, Ancrene Riwle, Havelok, Cursor Mundi, Piers Plowman*, Chaucer’s poetry and Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*.‘ In general, the non-expression of the subject-pronoun becomes less and less frequent towards the end of the ME period (Mustanoja 1960: 139). Present-Day English (PDE) in general is not a pro-drop language.7

7 However, Joseph (1996) notes that PDE also has subject-less predicates that suggest pro-drop with finite tensed verbs. First, the idiomatic expression *beats me* (meaning ‘I don’t know’) typically shows absence of subject, but not with preceding heavy adverbial, despite presence of tense/agreement:

(i) A: Do you know what the answer to question 20 is?
   B: Beats me!/*That/??It beats me!/*(That/?It) sure beats me!/*Right now beats me!

Second, the *ain’t no X* construction of nonstandard English, but used even by some speakers of standard English for emphasis, is a subject-less construction. An expletive subject is possible but is not usual:

(ii) a. Ain’t no way I can finish this paper in time / There ain’t no way ...
    b. Ain’t nobody who can play dead like me. Ernest (Meryl Streep, *Death Becomes Her*)

Similarly, the pro-drop character of the non-pro-drop language French has been noted in deictic predicates *voici/voilà* ‘here is/are; there is/are!’ (Morin 1985; for a different analysis, see Bouchard 1988, countered by Morin 1988):

(iii) Voilà une preuve d’intelligence
     Voilà a proof of intelligence
     ‘Here is a sign of intelligence’

246
The development from a pro-drop to a non-pro-drop language is well-attested in other European languages too. Latin was a pro-drop language as are other Romance languages such as Italian and Spanish. Thus the case of Modern French shows a change in such a constraint. Swedish has developed from a pro-drop language to a language with obligatory subjects. Old Swedish shows the dropping of both referential and nonreferential subjects. It has been shown that the subject became obligatory during the Early Modern Swedish period (1526-1732) (Falk 1992-3: 116). Icelandic shows slightly different change. Old Icelandic shows the dropping of both referential (at least in poetry) and non-referential subjects. But Modern Icelandic, like German, does not allow the dropping of referential subjects (in this sense Icelandic changed from type B to type A), while the dropping of non-referential subjects is grammatical.

It has often been suggested that even the loss of pro-drop may be related to the demise of morphology, more specifically, of rich verbal inflection in English. However, rich inflection is not a sufficient condition for null subjects: German does not have null (referential) subjects, although its verbal inflection involves number, person, and gender as does that of Spanish and Italian, which do allow null subjects (Lightfoot 1991: 12). Chinese has null subjects, although it is typologically an ANALYTIC language in which morphology seldom plays an important role (Arnold Zwicky, p.c.). Therefore, explaining the loss of pro-drop in terms of morphology does not work as a universal principle.

(iv) La voilà
her(OBJ) voilà
‘Here she is’

Based on distributional facts and parallel behavior between finite verbs and voiçi/voilà, these two examples can be analyzed as subjectless finite verbs. Thus, Joseph claims that pro-drop may be relativized over different predicates, suggesting some lexical conditioning of the parameter setting for pro-drop or at least construction-specific setting.

8 Haiman (1974: 93) sees Icelandic as a type A (non-pro-drop) language at all periods, because the pro-drop of referential subjects is all that matters for the classification and the dropping of these subjects is found only in poetry in Old Icelandic. By contrast, Falk sees it differently, saying (p. 122), ‘Icelandic lost the possibility to drop referential subjects with no corresponding decline in the subject-verb agreement system’.
7.4.2 The effect of the new constraint

7.4.2.1 Conjunction Reduction

In chapter 4 we discussed Conjunction Reduction as a possible test for subjecthood, as proposed by Allen (1986, 1995). The basic assumption is that the subject of a coordinated clause is deleted under identity with only the subject of the preceding conjunct clause. Lightfoot (1979), Butler (1980), Elmer (1981), and Bynon (1985) also proposed that the oblique Experiencer NP behaves like a subject because the coreferential Experiencer can be deleted in a second conjunct clause occurring with ordinary verbs taking NP[NOM] as a subject:

(5) Conjunction Reduction with impersonal verbs:

a. Gode ofhreow þa and hraþe [e] cwæþ to þam engle...
   God(DAT) rued then and quickly said to the angel...
   'God had pity then, and quickly said to the angel..'  
   (Elmer 1981, 49: Lives 1, 300, 255)

b. þa wearp him ærest ege ... and [e] gefor on Brutti þæt lond
   then was him(DAT) first afraid ... and proceed in Bruti that land.
   'Then he was first afraid and went to the land of the Bruti'
   (Elmer 1981, 49: Or. 198, 32)

However, we saw that this test was not good for subjecthood, because a clear non-subject with the ordinary verb in the preceding clause could also be omitted in the second conjunct clause in OE and ME. The following examples, given in chapter 4, show this:

(6) a. OE Conjunction Reduction (= (9) in Chap. 4):

   Hisi forme gefeohhte wæs wið Atheniense & ... i
   his first fight was against Athens
   hie oferwonn.
   them over-won
   'his first fight was against Athens and [he] overcame them.'
   (Mitchell 1985, 630: Or 114.8; Or 110:31)
b. ME Conjunction Reduction (= (8c) in Chap. 4):

that knyght smote down sir Trystramus frome hys horse, and ___ i had
a grete falle.
'that knight smote down sir Tristramus from his horse and [he] had a great fall.'
(Visser 6: 15c. Malory, M.d.'A. 482.22)

These examples can be explained in terms of pro-drop phenomena. The subject NP, which would have a nominative case form if it occurred, can be non-expressed because it can be recovered by a preceding NP which is not necessarily a subject in the sentence where it belongs. The reason why PDE no longer has this type of construction is in turn due to the setting of the PSR constraint. PDE now has a strong restriction of the PSR, so that only the subject which has a nominative referent in the preceding conjunct clause can be deleted.

In fact, similar Conjunction Reduction phenomena are attested in other Germanic languages such as Old Norse which was a pro-drop language.9

(7) Old Norse Conjunction Reduction (Faarlund 1980: 70):

a. pa bra hann sverðinu har ok titt ok hjop [e] i stofuna. (NOM - NOM)
b. pa let Óinn bera inn i hollina sverð, ok varu [e] sva björt. (ACC - NOM)
c. Siðan fluttu þeir þorgils likit upp með anni ok grofu [e] ar niðr. (ACC - ACC)
d. Honum var lengin leynilega harpa, ok varu [e] með tanum. (NOM - ACC)
e. Einarr þambarskefðir for með like Magnus konungs ok fluttu [e] til Niðaross. (DAT - ACC)

9 From a universalist viewpoint, we can also find from other pro-drop, but unrelated, languages, such as Korean, that not only subjects but also complements in the preceding clause can be coreferential to the deleted subject in the following conjunct clause:

(i) [Sunhi-eykey/ Sunhi-ka ton-i manh-ciman] [e]i hayngpokha-ci-anh-ta. Sunhi-DAT / Sunhi-NOM money-Nom much-but happy-not-be 'Sunhi has a lot of money but is not happy'

(ii) [Sunhi-lul/-nun Chelswu-ka [e] coaha-ciman] [e]i mossayngkye-ss-ta. Sunhi-Acc/-TOP Chelswu-NOM like-but ugly-be 'Sunhi, Chelswu like, but (she) is ugly'

(iii) [ku cip-eyseZ-unj Chelswu-ka sala-ss-ciman] [e]i cikum-un hwangphycha-ta. the house-LOC/-TOP Chelswu-NOM lived now desolate-be 'in the house, Chelswu lived, but (it) is now desolate'
Therefore, the ability of Conjunction Reduction of the subject which refers to an oblique NP in the preceding conjunct is in fact a part of the grammar before the setting of the PSR which allows the pro-drop of a referential NP.

7.4.2.2 That-trace effects

Another syntactic change due to the new setting of the PSR is the acquisition of the so-called That-Trace Effects. In PDE the extraction of a subject out of that-clause is prohibited, as in (8a.iv) and (8b.iv):

(8) a. Question:
   i. Who do you think John talked to ___?
   ii. Who do you think ___ talked to Bill?
   iii. Who do you think that John talked to ___?
   iv. *Who do you think that ___ talked to Bill?

b. Relativization:
   i. the man that he said John talked to ___.
   ii. the man that he said ___ talked to Bill.
   iii. the man that he said that John talked to ___.
   iv. *the man that he said that ___ talked to Bill.

This phenomenon shows that while that and its zero variant are in free variation in other types of extraction, zero is the only possible variant in subject extraction.

From a diachronic view, however, the that-trace sequence in subject extraction has not always been ungrammatical in English, as noted by Allen (1980) and Bergh and Seppänen (1992). This construction was a natural and statistically predominant variant in OE (Bergh and Seppänen 1992: 132). The following are the examples of the that-trace sequence in OE and ME respectively:
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(9) a. Subject Extraction in OE:

\[
\text{Ac ic wolde witan hu } \delta e \text{ } \delta uhte be } \delta e m e n \text{ that we earlier said that us seemed that}
\]

\[
\text{were } \text{were wild-beasts like-er than men}
\]

‘But I would like to know how it seemed to you about the men that we said earlier

were more like wild beasts than men’ (Allen 1980, 264: Boeth. 28.5 p.122.13)

b. Subject Extraction in ME:

\[
\text{Mochel is grat godes myldenesse. huanne zuyche men } \text{pet much is great god’s mildness when such men that}
\]

\[
\text{zueriep of pingei } \text{pet hi wytep wel: } \text{pet } \text{not}\]

\[
\text{is nakt zoep. is not true}
\]

(Bergh and Seppänen 1992, 132: Ayenbite of Inwyt (14c.))

This fact implies that a change that prohibits that-trace took place at some time in the

history of English. Bergh and Seppänen (1992) examine the instances of the subject

extraction in a corpus of texts from the ninth century to the present day. They find that the

that-trace sequence began to fall into disfavor from EME, reaching its peak in early ModE

— E1 (1501-1570) according to Bergh and Seppänen — as indicated in the following

Table 7.1 of theirs and Figure 7.1 (based on their table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>OE (%)</th>
<th>ME (%)</th>
<th>EModE (%)</th>
<th>LModE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that-trace</td>
<td>27 (87%)</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero-trace</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>23 (70%)</td>
<td>72 (96%)</td>
<td>81 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>33 (100%)</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>81 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Incidence of the that-trace and zero-trace sequences. (Bergh and Seppänen 1992: 134)
We can explain this historical phenomenon in terms of the introduction of the PSR. PDE requires a subject in a sentence. According to Perlmutter (1971: Chap. 4), English, like French, has a surface constraint such as follows:

(10) Perlmutter (1971: 100)

Any sentence other than an Imperative in which there is an S that does not contain a subject in surface structure is ungrammatical.

This constraint, according to Perlmutter, can explain why French (non-pro-drop language) cannot have a subject extraction while Spanish (pro-drop language) can. In French, one may extract any object or adverbial constituent of a subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer que, while it is impossible to extract the subject of such a subordinate clause, as in (11a.ii) and (11b.ii):
(11) French
a. Question:
i. Qui a-t-il dit que Martin avait envie de voir?
   'Who did he say that Martin felt like seeing ___?'
ii. *Qui a-t-il dit que s’est évanoui?
   'Who did he say that ___ fainted?'

b. Relativization:
i. la speakerine qu’il a dit que Martin avait envie de voir
   'the announcer that he said that Martin felt like seeing ___'
ii. *la speakerine qu’il a dit que s’est évanouie
   'the announcer that he said that ___ fainted'

However, in Spanish the subject extraction out of the same subordinate clause is grammatical:

(12) Spanish:
  a. Question:
i. Quién dijiste que salió temprano?
   'Who did you say that __ left early?'
ii. Qué dijiste que pasó?
   'What did you say that __ happened?'

  b. Relativization:
i. el tipo que dijiste que salió temprano
   'the guy that you said that __ left early'
ii. las cosas que dijiste que pasaron
   'the things that you said that __ happened'

English has the same restriction as French if the subordinate clause is introduced by the complementizer that. Note that English and French are non-pro-drop languages while Spanish is a pro-drop language.

Given that historically English acquired the PSR and ModE is the period that the actualization of this constraint has been completed, we can explain why subject extraction was possible in earlier English but is not in PDE. In fact, we see a close chronological

---

10 How to treat the construction without that is not our concern. See Perlmutter(1971: 108-114) for this discussion.

11 It has been noted that Dutch is an exception: although Dutch is a non-pro-drop language, subject extraction is allowed.
relationship between the loss of pro-drop phenomena and the loss of the subject extraction out of *that*-clause. They are both in decline in ME and seriously reduced by EModE.

7.4.3 The Prototypical Subject Requirement as a trigger for the changes

The setting of the PSR restriction in the language is not only the trigger of the shift from pro-drop to non-pro-drop of the referential NP and the related changes, but also that of the changes with impersonal verbs. In chapter 4 we saw that when an impersonal verb subcategorizes for two oblique NPs, the dative Experiencer had syntactic properties of subject which are found with normal subjects of ordinary verbs. However, the dative case is not a prototypical subject, since English (and many other languages with case system) already has the nominative case as a prototypical subject in other types of constructions. The PSR is introduced already in OE. Thus, we find non-pro-drop characteristics already in OE: the weather *it* is attested alongside of the constructions without *it*; the non-expression of the referential subject is found alongside of the constructions with subjects. Since the restriction taking a prototypical subject (i.e. nominative as subject) was under way in OE, the impersonal verb having its Experiencer with the syntactic properties of subject came to take a nominative Experiencer already in OE for some verbs; for other verbs such a change occurred later in ME.

Similarly, the introduction of the dummy *it*, discussed in chapter 5, is also explained in the same way. When an impersonal verb subcategorizes for a dative Experiencer along with a clausal complement, subjecthood is totally ambiguous. Due to the PSR, one of the two should have a prototypical subject: either the dative Experiencer should take a nominative form or the clausal complement should be marked for its subjecthood. One, earlier, way to mark the subjecthood of the clausal complement is to introduce a grammatical (or formal) subject to precede (in many cases, but not necessarily, in the initial position of the sentence)
the clausal complement in the sentence. The other, later, way, is to move the clausal complement to the initial position of the sentence to mark its subjecthood, as the language becomes established for the subject to be marked by word order. Thus, the clausal complement, which was never found in the initial position earlier, came to be used in that position. This scenario is roughly summarized in Table 7.2 (remember that different verbs show different changes):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE (PSR introduced)</th>
<th>Changes with impersonal verbs</th>
<th>Changes with ordinary verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Depending on verbs)</td>
<td>• 2NPs</td>
<td>• Both pro-drop and non-pro-drop properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impersonal constr. (type i)</td>
<td>- with referential NP &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NOM-Cause constr. (type ii)</td>
<td>- weather it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NOM-Experiencer constr.</td>
<td>• Conjunction Reduction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(type iii) (with hreowan,</td>
<td>oblique NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sceamian, lystan, behofian</td>
<td>• Free subject extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and HUNGER verbs)</td>
<td>from <em>that</em>-clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1NP-S' [FIN]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type (i/ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type (iii) (with sceamian,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behofian only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>it</em>-construction (with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class I verbs only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1NP-S' [INF]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type (i/ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type (iii) (with lystan only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: The effect of Prototypical Subject Requirement constraint (to be continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes with impersonal verbs</th>
<th>Changes with ordinary verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ME**
(PSR in progress)           | (depending on verbs)        | • both pro-drop and non-pro-drop properties |
| •2NPs                         | - Impersonal constr. (type i) | - with referential NP & |
| - NOM-Cause constr. (type ii) |                             | - weather it |
| - NOM-Experiencer constr.     | (type iii) (with all verbs except longen(?), happen(?), thinken) | (decreasing tendency of pro-drop over time) |
| •1NP-S'[FIN]                 | - Type (i/ii)               | • Conjunction Reduction of |
| - Type (i/ii)                | - Type (iii) (with sceamian, | oblique NP |
| - it-construction (with Class I, | liken, happen, semen)      | (decreasing tendency over time) |
| II, IIIa verbs)             |                             | • Free subject extraction from |
| •1NP-S'[INF]                | - Type (i/ii)               | that-clause |
| - Type (i/ii)                | - Type (iii) (with all verbs | (decreasing tendency over time) |
| - it-construction (with shamen, | except eilen, SEEM, | |
| liken, listen, happen,       | HUNGER verbs)              | |
| bihoven)                    |                             | |
| • both pro-drop and non-pro-drop properties | with referential NP & | |
| • (almost) no type (i)      | - weather it                | |
| • NOM-Cause constr. (type ii) |                             | • Subject extraction from that-clause (almost prohibited |
| • NOM-Experiencer constr.    | (decreasing tendency over time) | (that-trace effect established) |
| (type iii) (with all verbs except |                             | |
| longen(?), happen(?), thinken) |                             | |
| •1NP-S'[FIN]                | - Type (i/ii)               | |
| - (almost) no type (i/ii)   | - Type (iii)                | |
| - it-construction (with Class I, | (Equi and Raising | |
| II verbs)                   | with happen; not with seem)) | |
| •1NP-S'[INF]                | - Type (i/ii)               | |
| - (almost) no type (i/ii)   | - Type (iii)                | |
| - it-construction (with Class II | (Equi and Raising | |
| verbs)                      | with happen; not with seem)) | |

Table 7.2: The effect of Prototypical Subject Requirement constraint (continued)
See in Table 7.2 how the changes with impersonal verbs go along with the other changes triggered by the PSR constraint. OE had some impersonal verbs which could occur in one or more subtypes of type (iii), e.g. *hreowan, sceamian, lystan, behofian,* HUNGER verbs, but more verbs joined in having type (iii) with a prototypical subject in ME, e.g. *eilen, liken, longen, limpen, happen, semen* (in fact all verbs that we are examining, except for *thinken*), although the productivity of type (iii) in relation to type (ii) differs for different verbs. In chapter 3, we saw that type (ii), another type with a prototypical subject, did not get lost for any verb: type (ii) is either continually used from OE to ME or newly acquired (e.g. *listen, bhoven* (?)) in ME. The later loss of type (ii) at the end of ME or in ModE is due to the competition with type (iii) because, as explained in chapter 3, they cause a semantic conflict with each other.

7.5 Reanalysis and actualization

In the previous section I introduced the PSR as a new constraint in OE which triggers the changes in question. I have also presented the problems with transition accounts of reanalysis theories due to the loss of case marking distinctions. Allen (1986: 375) ascribes these problems to the reanalysis hypothesis itself, saying ‘The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that no reanalysis of a structure has taken place; rather, a new subcategorization frame has been introduced and gradually ousted the old one.’ Allen (1995) also seems to have the same idea, as seen in the statement (p. 289) ‘the loss of the ‘impersonal’ construction was the result of the gradual favouring of one option over another, rather than of sudden and wholesale reanalysis of PDEs [Preposed Dative Experiencer constructions -- HK] or the sudden loss of a grammatical possibility.’ However, a better understanding of reanalysis allows us to treat the changes with
impersonal verbs as another reanalysis mechanism, one of the most well-motivated mechanisms cross-linguistically.

7.5.1 Understanding the mechanism of Reanalysis

In their theory of language change, Harris and Campbell (1995) suggest three, and only three, mechanisms of language change: Reanalysis, Extension, Borrowing. According to their account of the mechanism of a reanalysis, surface ambiguity (or opacity) is not necessary for reanalysis to take place (p. 71). This view is contrasted with Timberlake (1977) and Lightfoot (1979, 1981c, 1988) which sees that ambiguity is prerequisite to reanalysis. From the study of the changes with impersonal verbs, I agree with Harris and Campbell, because, as we already saw, the ambiguity of case marking did not play a crucial role for the introduction of personal constructions. Instead, Harris and Campbell (1995: 72) claim 'the patterns which have the potential for multiple structural analyses' to be a basis of reanalysis. The idea of the potential for multiple structural analyses to become a motivation of historical changes is not new: see Hankamer (1977).

It is well known that reanalysis is distinguished from actualization of the change. Timberlake (1977: 141) defines reanalysis as 'the formulation of a novel set of underlying relationships and rules' and actualization as 'the gradual mapping out of the consequences of the reanalysis'. Actualization is thus by its nature gradual, as mentioned by Chung (1977: 38):

(13) Syntactic change must be actualized gradually.

---

12 According to Harris and Campbell (1995: 81-88), the period of actualization typically have multiple reflexes and variation and conflicting data; sometimes the actualization period continues to be available and the completion of actualization never occurs.
This is contrasted with the widely held assumption in generative historical linguistics that syntactic change is not gradual but discrete (King 1969: 115; implicitly in Klima 1964, Traugott 1965). However, if we distinguish reanalysis from actualization, the gradualness of the changes is not a problem with reanalysis itself.

In section 7.3.2, I pointed out that the transition account of the changes as the result of the loss of case marking is anachronistic, because the tendency for previously oblique Experiencers to have shifted to nominative subjects did not begin with the loss of the case marking distinctions. The only solution for these problems with the transition account as in (3) is to assume that the reanalysis in question occurs AFTER, not BEFORE, a number of surface changes (i.e. actualization). However, this cannot be so, because, as Timberlake pointed out, if it is assumed that reanalysis applies AFTER a number of surface changes, those surface changes are themselves unmotivated. Therefore, reanalysis should always PRECEDE the surface changes (i.e. actualization).

By the Harris-Campbell definition of reanalysis, the process of Grammaticalization is simply one type of macro-change, consisting minimally of one process of reanalysis, but frequently involving more than one reanalysis. Thus, by explaining a change in terms of the mechanism of reanalysis, it will not be necessary to introduce the process of Grammaticalization in the investigation of language change.

7.5.2 An account of the changes with the mechanism of Reanalysis

Now that we have a definition of reanalysis, we can explain the changes with impersonal verbs in terms of a mechanism of reanalysis. Reanalysis is simply one of the

---

13 Grammaticalization typically involves two related kinds of processes (see Traugott and Heine 1991, Hopper and Traugott 1993). One is the lexical-item-to-grammatical-morpheme model, which usually involves some kind of phonological reduction and often a change in status from an independent word to a clitic and/or affix. The second is the discourse-structure-to-morphosyntactic-marking model, which deals with the fixing of discourse strategies in syntactic and morphological structure. Grammaticalization is often associated with SEMANTIC BLEACHING. (Harris and Campbell 1995: 92)
mechanisms of change, not the cause by itself. We have explained above the PSR restriction as a causation of the reanalysis mechanism. In OE the impersonal construction has the potential for multiple analyses: when a verb subcategorizes for two arguments, either argument may be analyzed as subject regardless of its surface case. Then an innovative structure (e.g. personal construction, it-construction), triggered by the PSR, is introduced, competing with the old (impersonal) structure. Thus, reanalysis has already taken place in OE. OE now has multiple reflexes. Late OE and ME are the periods of actualization of the change. The new structures slowly extend across lexical items. This is why we see different verbs having different syntactic frames from a synchronic perspective and showing different pace of change (i.e. gradual change) from a diachronic perspective.

In the case of the constructions with a clausal complement, the two innovative structures, personal and it-construction, compete again with each other, which induces a subsequent micro-change. Some verbs show both structures for some time (just like *grieve* in PDE; see chapter 5) and they eventually (in ModE) adopt one of the two: so, *like*, for example, takes a personal structure; *shame* takes an it-construction. In the case of the construction with two NPs, the two nominative construction types compete with each other, which induces another subsequent micro-change. Some verbs show both of them for some time and eventually a few verbs adopt the Nominative-Cause constructions, while others adopt the Nominative-Experiencer construction. EModE is the period when the macro-change, the loss of impersonal constructions, has been completed, as the PSR becomes a strong constraint (but with some residue). But the micro-changes, such as competition between Nominative-Cause and Nominative-Experiencer constructions, and between it-construction and personal (with a nominative Experiencer) construction, has still been under way with some verbs — e.g. *shame, behoove* where both the it-construction and the personal construction have been rival structures until the nineteenth century.
By way of conclusion, I mention an unsolved mystery: why the PSR was introduced in the English language to begin with. Probably, there is no way to give a complete answer to this question. As noted in section 1.7, we may not predict whether or when a certain change will take place or which language will undergo which change. The PSR restriction is certainly a language-specific phenomenon which English happened to choose, while some other Germanic languages did not completely do so.

However, we can still seek an answer by looking at some general tendencies found in linguistic change, for we find similar patterns of changes in other components of grammar, such as morphological change. Although the two components of grammar, morphology and syntax, are different and the surface changes in those components must be different, there is a common denominator shared by both. It is human beings who cause the changes to both components, however unconscious or involuntary their participation is. Many morphological changes involve some kind of ANALOGY commonly used by the speaker. The well-known morphological change of PARADIGM LEVELING is one of the analogical changes to remove the allomorphy of the same stem. See the following examples of Paradigm Leveling from English and German (examples taken from Hock 1991: 168):

(14) Paradigm Leveling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Modern German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>PDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>ceozan</td>
<td>choose [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST SG</td>
<td>ceas</td>
<td>chose [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST PL</td>
<td>curon</td>
<td>chose [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST PTCP</td>
<td>(ge-)coren</td>
<td>chosen [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>kiusan</td>
<td>küren ‘choose’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST SG</td>
<td>kos</td>
<td>kor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST PL</td>
<td>kurun</td>
<td>koren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST PTCP</td>
<td>(gi-)koran</td>
<td>gekoren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The underlying motivation for this development has been plausibly captured by the slogan 'one meaning — one form' (Hock 1991: 168). Alternations which do not seem to signal important differences in meaning therefore tend to be eliminated.

The change from a dative subject to a nominative subject seems to have the same motivation. Since OE already has the nominative case as a default subject case, the coexistence of dative and nominative subjects results in one-to-many correspondence between function and form, and thus one remedy would be for one form, here the dative subject, not to be tolerated and to die out eventually. In a sense, the direction of this change is toward a simplification of grammar, as many linguistic changes show.

Another motivation for the changes involved is to remove the ambiguity of functions. The clausal complement is ambiguous in its grammatical function (or relation). Such a vague connection between form and function is not tolerated and one way toward a clear mapping between form and function is to introduce a formal subject or to posit the clausal complement in the subject position.

In these ways, then, the changes in English impersonal constructions represent particular instantiations of well-recognized forces in linguistic change.
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