THE QUALITATIVE DECLINE OF OBJECT-VERB ORDER IN LATE MIDDLE ENGLISH AND EARLY MODERN ENGLISH

HARUMASA MIYASHITA
University of Tokyo
harumasa@attglobal.net

1. INTRODUCTION

(1) OLD ENGLISH
þæt ic **þas boc** of   Ledenum gereorde to Engliscre spræce *awende*
that I this book from   Latin   language to English tongue translate
'that I translate this book from Latin language to the English tongue'
             (*AHTh*, I, pref, 6/ Kemenade (1987:16) cited in Roberts (1997: 400))

(2) EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH
þat   he **deaþ** <u>scolde</u> *þoliȝen*
that he death should suffer
'that he should suffer death'   (*Vices & V.* 113.21/ Fischer et al. (2000: 161))

(3) TABLE 1 --- QUANTITATIVE DECLINE OF OV ORDER

	c.1000	c.1200	c.1300	c.1400	c.1500
OV	52.5%	53.7%	40+%	14.3%	1.87%
VO	47.5%	46.3%	60–%	85.7%	98.13%

(Fries (1940: 201))

(4) *The OV order in the 15th century was on the decline in quality as well as in quantity.*
  a. i.   Ingham (2000), Morehout & Wurff (2000), Koma (2001)
         ⇒ Aux Neg-Obj V
     ii. Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000)
         ⇒ Aux Neg-Obj V
           Aux Q-Obj V
           Top-Obj Ø$_{Subj}$ (Aux) V
  b. Foster & Wurff (1995, 1997), Fischer (1992)
         ⇒ Aux Prn-Obj V

(5) AIMS OF THIS STUDY
  a. To clarify the facts of the OV order in the 15th century and afterwards.
  b. To give an adequate explanation on the qualitative decline of OV order.

2. BASIC FACTS

(6) OV ORDER IN THE 14TH CENTURY
   a. I <u>may</u> **my persone and myn hous** so *kepen and deffenden*
      I may   myself   and my house so keep and defend
      'I can keep and defend myself and myself in such a way'
                         (Chaucer *Melibee* 1334/ Fischer et al. (2000: 163))
   b. And Absolon **his gyterne** <u>hath</u> *ytake*
      and Absolon his guitar has taken
      'And Absolon has taken his guitar'
                         (Chaucer *Miller's Tale* 3353/ Wurff (1997: 490))

(7) OV ORDER IN THE 15TH CENTURY
   a. Aux Neg-Obj V   ⇒ (8)   (Ingham (2000), Koma (2001) among others)
   b. Aux Q-Obj V   ⇒ (9)   (Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000))
   c. Top-Obj $\emptyset_{\text{Subj}}$ (Aux) V   ⇒ (10)   (Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000))
   d. Aux Prn-Obj V   ⇒ (11) (Foster & Wurff (1995, 1997), Fischer (1992))

(8) AUX NEG-OBJ V
   I <u>will</u> **no thyng** *grawnt* with-out the vnder-shreves assent
   I will nothing   grant   without the undersheriff's assent
   'I will grant nothing without the undersheriff's assent'   (*PL* 59.15/ Ingham (2000: 20))

(9) AUX Q-OBJ V
   he haþ on vs mervy, for he <u>may</u> **al þynge** *do*
   he has on us mercy for he can all things do
   'he has mercy on us, for he can do everything'
                           (*Barlam* 2740/ Fischer et al. (2000: 163))

(10) TOP-OBJ $\emptyset_{\text{SUBJ}}$ (AUX) V
   a. *Relative Clause*
      al them [that **this litel werke** <u>shal</u> *see, here or rede* to have me excused]
      all them   that this little work shall see hear or rede to have me excused
      'all those that will see, hear or read this little work to forgive me'
                          (*Caxton* 46a.29/ Wurff (1999: 242))
   b. *Coordinated Clause (Second Conjunct)*
      þat here kynge dede such reuerence and worschyp vnto þe poore men,
      that their king   did such reverence and worship unto the poor men
      [and **such shame** *dede* vnto his dygnyte]
      and such shame did unto his dignity
      'that their king showed such reverence and respect to the poor people and caused
      such shame to his own dignity'   (*Barlam* 757/ op.cit.)

(11) Aux Prn-Obj V
      how hi <u>ssolle</u> **ham-zelue** *ssiriue*
      how they shall themselves shrive
      'how they must shrive themselves'   (*Ayenbite* 5.13/ Foster & Wurff (1995: 321))

(12) (7a-c) vs. (7d) --- conflicting observation ⇒ further investigation required

(13) Sources of Data (Kroch & Taylor (2000))
      2nd edition of *the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*
      ⇒ Texts: M4 (1420-1500) & MX4 (comp. date unknown; ms. date 1420-1500)

(14) Table 2 --- OV Order Attested in the Texts from M4 and MX4

	Sentences Searched	OV Tokens Found
cmaelr4	766	6 (0.78%)
cmcapchr	4175	10 (0.24%)
cmcapser	91	0 (0.00%)
cmedmund	300	0 (0.00%)
cmfitzja	228	9 (3.95%)
cmgregor	2631	6 (0.23%)
cminnoce	208	1 (0.48%)
cmkempe	3853	56 (1.45%)
cmmalory	4997	22 (0.44%)
cmreynar	740	12 (1.62 %)
cmreynes	703	27 (3.84%)
cmsiege	733	55 (7.50%)
cmthorn	674	2 (0.30%)
Total	20099	206 (1.02%)

(Miyashita (2001: 197))

(15) Table 3 --- Object Types Involved in the Attested OV Order

	FN-Obj	Prn-Obj	Neg-Obj	Q-Obj	Top-Obj	Total
cmaelr4	0	1	3	1	1	6
cmcapchr	1	1	3	1	4	10
cmcapser	0	0	0	0	0	0
cmedmund	0	0	0	0	0	0
cmfitzja	1	3	1	2	2	9
cmgregor	1	2	0	1	2	6
cminnoce	1	0	0	0	0	1
cmkempe	12	5	20	3	16	56
cmmalory	2	9	3	1	7	22
cmreynar	3	4	2	0	3	12
cmreynes	6	10	4	0	7	27
cmsiege	2	48	0	0	5	55
cmthorn	0	0	0	0	2	2
Total	29	83	36	9	49	206

(Miyashita (2001: 198) with slight modification)

3

(16) DOMINANT PATTERNS OF THE ATTESTED OV ORDER
    a. Aux Neg-Obj V   ⇒ (17)
    b. Aux Q-Obj V   ⇒ (18)
    c. Top-Obj Ø$_{Subj}$ (Aux) V   ⇒ (19)
    d. (Aux) Prn-Obj V   ⇒ (20)

(17) AUX NEG-OBJ V
þei woldyn han a-wey hyr mayden fro hir þat sche <u>xuld</u> **no strumpet** *be* in hyr
they would have away her maid from her that she should no strumpet be in her
cumpany
company
'they would take away her maid from her so that she should not be a prostitute in her
company'   (CMKEMPE, 62.1382/ PPCME2)

(18) AUX Q-OBJ V
I <u>may</u> **any-thyng** *suffyr* for hys lofe
I may anything suffer from his love
'I may suffer anything from his love'   (CMKEMPE, 123.2856/ PPCME2)

(19) TOP-OBJ Ø$_{SUBJ}$ (AUX) V
But he deied sone, [and **þe tresor** *left* þere]
But he died soon and the treasure left there
'But he died soon, and left the treasure there' (CMCAPCHR, 94.1893-1894/ PPCME2)

(20) (AUX) PRN-OBJ V
    a. and fro his enmyes I <u>schall</u> **hym** *defende*
       and from his enemies I shall him defend
       'and from his enemies, I shall defend him'   (CMREYNES, 266.509/ PPCME2)
    b. and I mekely **hit** *kyssyd* and allsoo þe heme of þe clothe þat he werryd
       and I meekly it kissed and also the hem of the cloth that he wore
       'and I meekly kissed it and also the hem of the clothes that he wore'
                                 (CMSIEGE, 78.225/ op.cit.)

(21) OV ORDER IN THE FORMER HALF OF THE 16TH CENTURY
    i. The final demise of productive use of OV order in prose texts [= (7a-c)] takes place
      in the first half of the 16th century.   (Fischer et al. (2000: 164))
    ii. The pronominal object is occasionally found between the auxiliary and the non-
      finite form of a verb...   (Rissanen (1999: 267))
    ↓
    a. Aux Q-Obj V   ⇒ (22)
    b. Top-Obj Ø$_{Subj}$ (Aux) V   ⇒ (23)
    c. Aux Prn-Obj V   ⇒ (24)

(22) AUX Q-OBJ V
Mine own good cousin, I <u>cannot</u> **much** *say*
             (1534 More *Dialogue of Comfort* 144.9/ Fischer et al. (2000: 164))

(23) TOP-OBJ Ø$_{SUBJ}$ (AUX) V
Some are there also [that **such tales** *tell* them for consideration of another fear]
                    (1534 More *Dialogue of Comfort* 181.25/ Fischer et al. (2000: 164))

(24) AUX PRN-OBJ V
The drab she kepes away my good, the deuil he <u>might</u> **her** *snare*
                    (c.1550 *Gammer Gurton's Needle* 59/ Rissanen (1999: 268))

(25) OV ORDER IN THE LATTER HALF OF THE 16TH CENTURY
    i. ... 42% of all pronominal objects occur in the Mod/Aux O V pattern...
                    (Wurff & Foster (1997: 448))
    ii. The placing of the object after the subject but before the verb is not infrequent,
        particularly when it is a pronoun...   (Blake (1983: 120))
    ↓
    (Aux) Prn-Obj V   ⇒   (26)

(26) (AUX) PRN-OBJ V
    a. 'Conuay', the wise **it** *call*!
                    (1597 Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* I.iii/ Rissanen (1999: 267))
    b. Where plaine none <u>might</u> **her** *see*, nor she see any plaine
                    (c.1580 Spencer *Faerie Queen* I.I.16/ Wurff & Foster (1997: 447))
    c. I <u>might</u> not **this** *beleeue*
                    (1600-1601 Shakespeare *Hamlet* I.i.56/ Blake (1983: 120))

(27) TABLE 4 --- SUMMARY OF OV FACTS

		OBJECT TYPES	SYNTACTIC ENVIRONMENTS
14TH CENTURY		any object	anywhere
15TH CENTURY		negated/quantified object	Aux Obj V
		topicalized object (any object)	relative/coordinate S w/ Ø$_{Subj}$
		pronominal object	(Aux) Obj V
16TH CENTURY	FORMER	quantified object	Aux Obj V
		topicalized object (any object)	relative/coordinate S w/ Ø$_{Subj}$
		pronominal object	(Aux) Obj V
	LATTER	pronominal object	(Aux) Obj V

3. PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS (UNDER THE UNIVERSAL BASE HYPOTHESIS)

(28) OV ORDER IN THE 14TH CENTURY
    i. OV order = VO base order + Object Shift (= leftward movement)
    ii. Object Shift driven by feature checking

                  (Wurff (1997), Fischer et al. (2000))

(29) a. $[_{\text{AgrSP}}$ I $[_{\text{AgrS'}}$ AgrS $[_{\text{AgrOP}}$ AgrO $[_{\text{TP}}$ <u>may</u> $[_{\text{AgrOP}}$ **my persone and myn hous**

        $[_{\text{AgrO'}}$ AgrO $[_{\text{AuxP}}$ t_{may} $[_{\text{VP}}$ so t_{I} *kepen and deffenden* $t_{\text{my persone and myn hous}}$]]]]]]]]
              OS   (cf. (6a))

  b. $[_{\text{AgrSP}}$ Absolon $[_{\text{AgrS'}}$ AgrS $[_{\text{AgrOP}}$ **his gyterne** $[_{\text{AgrO'}}$ AgrO $[_{\text{TP}}$ <u>hath</u>

        $[_{\text{AgrOP}}$ AgrO $[_{\text{AuxP}}$ t_{hath} $[_{\text{VP}}$ t_{Absolon} *ytake* $t_{\text{his gyterne}}$]]]]]]]]
              OS   (cf. (6b))

(30) OV ORDER IN THE 15TH CENTURY
    a. Aux Neg-Obj V = VO base order + Neg-movement $\Rightarrow$ (32)
                (Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000), Ingham (2000))
    b. Aux Q-Obj V = VO base order + overt Quantifier Raising $\Rightarrow$ (33)
                      (Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000))
    c. Top-Obj Ø$_{\text{Subj}}$ (Aux) V = VO base order + Topicalization $\Rightarrow$ (34)
                      (Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000))
    d. Aux Prn-Obj V = related to definiteness, givenness or specificity
                        (Foster & Wurff (1997))

(31) NEG-CRITERION
    A Neg head must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator and vice versa.
                       (Ingham (2000: 24))

(32) $[_{\text{TP}}$ I $[_{\text{T'}}$ <u>will</u> $[_{\text{NegP}}$ **no thyng** $[_{\text{Neg'}}$ Neg $[_{\text{AuxP}}$ t_{will} $[_{\text{VP}}$ t_{I} *grawnt* $t_{\text{no thyng}}$ ...]]]]]]
                          NM   (cf. (8))

(33) $[_{\text{TP}}$ he $[_{\text{T'}}$ <u>may</u> $[_{\text{AuxP}}$ t_{may} $[_{\text{VP}}$ **al þynge** $[_{\text{VP}}$ t_{he} *do* $t_{\text{al þynge}}$]]]]]
                    OQR   (cf. (9))

(34) a. $[_{\text{CP}}$ that $[_{\text{TopP}}$ **this litel werke** $[_{\text{Top'}}$ Top $[_{\text{TP}}$ Ø$_{\text{Subj}}$ $[_{\text{T'}}$ <u>shal</u> $[_{\text{AuxP}}$ t_{shal}

        $[_{\text{VP}}$ $t_{Ø}$ *see, here or rede* $t_{\text{this litel werke}}$ to have me excused]]]]]]
                Topicalization   (cf. (10a))

  b. and $[_{\text{CP}}$ C $[_{\text{TopP}}$ **such shame** $[_{\text{Top'}}$ $[_{\text{TP}}$ Ø$_{\text{Subj}}$ $[_{\text{T'}}$ *dede*

        $[_{\text{VP}}$ $t_{Ø}$ t_{dede} $t_{\text{such shame}}$ vnto his dygnyte]]]]]]
                Topicalization   (cf. (10b))

4. ANALYSIS: OV ORDER = OS+DISL/A'-MOVEMENT

(35) AGREE

There is a relation *Agree* holding between probe P and goal G, which deletes [= values] uninterpretable features if P and G are appropriately related.   (Chomsky (2001b: 12))

(35')

P
[*u*F₁]
G
[+interpretable F₁]
[*u*F₂]
AGREE
⇒   HEAD–HEAD RELATION

(36) PHASE IMPENETRABILITY CONDITION
   a. [_ZP_ Z ... [_HP_ **XP** [**H** YP]]]
   b. The domain of H is not accessible to operations at ZP, the smallest strong phase; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

(Chomsky (2001a: 14))

(37) OS must take place when the object is moved higher than Spec *v*P.

(37') [_CP_ C ... [_vP_ **Obj** [_v'_ Subj [_v'_ V-*v* [_VP_ *t*_V *t*_Obj]]]]]
ACCESSIBLE
INACCESSIBLE

(38) DEFECTIVE INTERVENTION CONSTRAINT

α > β > γ, where > is c-command, β and γ match the probe α, but β is inactive so that the effects of matching are blocked.   (Chomsky (2000: 123))

(38') [_TP_ T̲ [_vP_ **Obj** [_v'_ S̲u̲b̲j̲ [_v'_ V-*v* [_VP_ *t*_V *t*_Obj]]]]]
PROBE   GOAL
AGREE PREVENTED

(39) OS must be accompanied by A'-movement or DISL (i.e. language-particular PF dislocation rule).

(40) DERIVATION OF THE 14TH CENTURY OV ORDER (WITH AN FN-OBJ)
   i. Aux Obj V   ⇒   OS+DISL
   ii. Obj Aux V   ⇒   OS+DISL

(41) FULL CLAUSE STRUCTURE

[_TopP_ Top [_TP_ T [_ShareP_ Share [_NegP_ Neg [_AuxP_ Aux [_vP_ Subj [_v'_ *v* [_VP_ V Obj]]]]]]]]
(cf. Beghelli & Stowell (1997), Szabolcsi (1997), Haegeman (1995), Rizzi (1997))

(42) a. PF allows 'tucking in' in the sense of Richards (1997).
    b. DISL targets any existing functional projection.

(43) a. $[_{TP}$ I $[_{T'}$ <u>may</u> $[_{ShareP}$ **my persone and myn hous** $[_{Share'}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg

  $[_{vP}$ $t_{my\ persone...}$ $[_{v'}$ t_I $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ so *kepen and deffenden* $t_{my\ persone...}$ $]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (6a))

  b. $[_{TP}$ Absolon $[_{T'}$ **his gyterne** $[_{T'}$ <u>hath</u> $[_{ShareP}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg

  $[_{vP}$ $t_{his\ gyterne}$ $[_{v'}$ $t_{Absolon}$ $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *ytake* $t_{his\ gyterne}$ $]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (6b))

(44) FEATURES INVOLVED IN OS (Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b))
  i. Probe (*v*): $[u\phi]$
  ii. Goal (Obj): A. $[\phi]$
        B. $[u$Case$]$

(45) DERIVATION OF THE 15TH CENTURY OV ORDER
  a. Aux Neg-Obj V ⟹ OS+NM
  b. Aux Q-Obj V ⟹ OS+OQR
  c. Top-Obj Ø$_{Subj}$ (Aux) V ⟹ OS+Topicalization
  d. (Aux) Prn-Obj ⟹ OS+DISL (weakened)

(46) OS+NM
  $[_{TP}$ I $[_{T'}$ <u>will</u> $[_{ShareP}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ **no thyng** $[_{Neg'}$ Neg $[_{AuxP}$ t_{will}

  $[_{vP}$ $t_{no\ thyng}$ $[_{v'}$ t_I $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *grawnt* $t_{no\ thyng}$ ... $]]]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (8))

(47) OS+OQR
  $[_{TP}$ he $[_{T'}$ <u>may</u> $[_{ShareP}$ **al þynge** $[_{Share'}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg $[_{AuxP}$ t_{may}

  $[_{vP}$ $t_{al\ þynge}$ $[_{v'}$ t_{he} $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *do* $t_{al\ þynge}$ $]]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (9))

(48) OS+TOPICALIZATION
  $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TopP}$ **this litel werke** $[_{Top'}$ Top $[_{TP}$ Ø$_{Subj}$ $[_{T'}$ <u>shal</u> $[_{ShareP}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg $[_{AuxP}$ t_{shal}

  $[_{vP}$ $t_{this\ litel\ werke}$ $[_{v'}$ $t_{Ø}$ $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *see, here or rede* $t_{this\ litel\ werke}$ to ... $]]]]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (10a))

(49) OS+DISL
  a. $[_{TP}$ I $[_{T'}$ <u>schall</u> $[_{ShareP}$ **hym** $[_{Share'}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg $[_{AuxP}$ t_{schall}

  $[_{vP}$ t_{hym} $[_{v'}$ t_I $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *defende* t_{hym} $]]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (20a))

  b. $[_{TP}$ I $[_{T'}$ T $[_{ShareP}$ mekely $[_{Share'}$ **hit** $[_{Share'}$ Share $[_{NegP}$ Neg

  $[_{vP}$ t_{hit} $[_{v'}$ t_I $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ *kyssyd* t_{hit} and ... $]]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (20b))

(50) FEATURES INVOLVED IN A'-MOVEMENT UNDER CONSIDERATION
  a. NM (cf. Nishioka (1999), Watanabe (2001a, 2002a, 2002c))
    i. Probe (Neg):   [uNeg]
    ii. Goal (Neg-Obj): A. [Neg]
             B. [uFoc]
  b. OQR (cf. Beghelli & Stowell (1997), Watanabe (2002c))
    i. Probe (Share): [uGRef]
    ii. Goal (Q-Obj): A. [GRef]
             B. [uFoc]
  c. Topicalization (cf. Ishikawa (2001), Watanabe (2002c); contra Watanabe (2001b))
    i. Probe (Top):   [uTop]
    ii. Goal (Top-Obj): A. [Top]
             B. [uFoc]

5. CHANGES IN THE 15TH CENTURY AND AFTERWARDS

(51) a. ... [B]yond PF options and lexical arbitrariness, variation is limited to non-substantive parts of lexicon and general properties of lexical items.
                      (Chomsky (1993: 3))
  b. ... [P]arameters are restricted to *formal features* with no interpretation at the interface... [T]hey are restricted to formal features of functional categories.
                     (Chomsky (1995a: 6))

(52) ... [C]hange can be described simply as the reorganization of the featural content of the lexical items of the language.   (Pintzuk et al. (2000: 7))

(53) FORMATION OF THE LEXICON (Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b))
  a. From a universal set of features, [F], a particular language L selects a subset of [F], namely {F}.
  b. L then assembles {F} to lexical items.
  ⇓
  LANGUAGE CHANGE TAKES PLACE IN THE COURSE OF LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.

(54) The OV order had been attested with any object type since OE until the 14th century.
  ⇓
  It was not derived by a sole operation (i.e. OS+DISL), but by the following set of operations:
  a. OS+NM
  b. OS+OQR
  c. OS+Topicalization
  d. OS+DISL

(55)	Grammar Change in the End of the 14th Century --- weakening of DISL
	a.	OS+NM
	b.	OS+OQR
	c.	OS+Topicalization
	d.	OS+DISL (weakened)

(55')	Resultant Language Change --- OV order qualitatively restricted
	a.	Aux Neg-Obj V
	b.	Aux Q-Obj V
	c.	Top-Obj ØSubj (Aux) V
	d.	(Aux) Prn-Obj V

(56)	Grammar Change in the End of the 15th Century
	--- loss of [*u*Neg] on Neg and [*u*Foc] on Neg-Obj
	a.	OS+OQR
	b.	OS+Topicalization
	c.	OS+DISL (weakened)

(56')	Resultant Language Change
	a.	Aux Q-Obj V
	b.	Top-Obj ØSubj (Aux) V
	c.	(Aux) Prn-Obj V

(57)	Grammar Change in the End of the Former Half of the 16th Century
	---	loss of [*u*GRef] on Share and [*u*Foc] on Q-Obj
		loss of [*u*Top] on Top and [*u*Foc] on Top-Obj in embedded contexts
	OS+DISL (weakened)

(57')	Resultant Language Change
	(Aux) Prn-Obj V

(58)	Grammar Change Sometime after the 16th Century --- loss of DISL

(58')	Resultant Language Change
	no OV order

(59) TABLE 5 --- SUMMARY OF CHANGE

	GRAMMAR CHANGE	LANGUAGE CHANGE
1300 - 1400	weakening of DISL	Obj-Aux-V (any object) Aux-Obj-V (any object) Obj-V (any object)
1400 - 1500	loss of [*u*Neg] on Neg and [*u*Foc] on Neg-Obj	Obj-Aux-V (Top-Obj) Aux-Obj-V (Neg-Obj, Q-Obj & Prn-Obj) Obj-V (Top-Obj & Prn-Obj)
1500 - 1550	loss of [*u*GRef] on Share and [*u*Foc] on Q-Obj & loss of [*u*Top] on Top and [*u*Foc] on Top-Obj in embedded contexts	Obj-Aux-V (Top-Obj) Aux-Obj-V (Q-Obj & Prn-Obj) Obj-V (Top-Obj & Prn-Obj)
1550 - ?	loss of DISL	(Aux-)Obj-V (Prn-Obj)
? - PE		no OV order

6. CONCLUSION

(60) RESIDUAL ISSUES
    a. identification of the period where the Aux Prn-Obj V order was lost
        ⇒ SOMETIME AFTER THE 16TH CENTURY?
    b. syntactic behavior of the OV order in earlier English (especially OE and EME)
        ⇒ DISTRIBUTIONAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OBJECT TYPES?

11

APPENDIX 1: SOURCES OF DATA (PPCME2)

 a. M4 (1420-1500)
   i. *Aelred of Rivaulx's De Institutione Inclusarum in Bodley ms.* (cmaelr4)
   ii. *Capgrave's Chronicle* (cmcapchr)
   iii. *Capgrave's Sermon* (cmcapser)
   iv. *Life of St. Edmund* (cmedmund)
   v. *Fitzjames' Sermo die Lune* (cmfitzja)
   vi. *Gregory's Chronicle* (cmgregor)
   vii. *In Die Innocencium* (cminnoce)
   viii. *The Book of Margery Kempe* (cmkempe)
   ix. *Malory's Morte Darthur* (cmmalory)
   x. *Caxton's History of Reynard the Fox* (cmreynar)
   xi. *The Commonplace Book of Robert Reynes* (cmreynes)
   xii. *The Siege of Jerusalem* (cmsiege)
 b. MX4 (comp. date unknown; ms. date 1420-1500)
   i. *The 'Liber de Diversis Medicinis' in Thornton ms.* (cmthorn)

 I. northern dialect: (b-i)
 II. southern dialect: (a-vi)
 III. West Midland dialect: (a-ix) & (a-xii)
 IV. East Midland dialect: the rest of the texts above
 ⇒ NO MAJOR DIALECTAL DIFFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO OV ORDER
 (CONTRA THE DIALECTAL DIFFERENCE IN V2)

(cf. Kroch & Taylor (1997), Haeberli (2000))

APPENDIX 2: OPTIONALITY OF OS

(I) HOLMBERG'S GENERALIZATION: OS is contingent on V-raising (out of VP).

(II) a. *v* is assigned an EPP feature only if that has a semantic effect on outcome.
   b. The EPP position (i.e. phonological edge) of *v* is assigned INT.
   c. At the phonological border of *v*P, XP is assigned INT'.

(Chomsky (2001a: 35))

(III) INT
"INT is an interpretive complex which consists of specificity/definiteness, [old] information, focus, etc. (Chomsky (2001a: 31))." This is the semantic interpretation that the shifted object receives.

(IV) PHONOLOGICAL BORDER
The phonological border of a phrase is a position not c-commanded by phonological material in that phrase. (Chomsky (2001a: 34))

(IV') $[_{TP} ... [_T [_v \text{V-}v]\text{-T}] ... [_{vP} \textbf{Obj} [_{v'} \text{Subj} [_{v'} t_v [_{VP} t_V \textbf{Obj}]]]]]$
   PHONOLOGICAL EDGE   PHONOLOGICAL BOARDER

REFERENCES

荒木一雄・宇賀治正朋 (1984) 『英語史ⅢＡ：英語学体系第 10 巻』, 大修館書店, 東京.

Beghelli, Filippo & Tim Stowell (1997) "Distributivity and Negation: The Syntax of *Each* and *Every*," *Ways of Scope Taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 71-107, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Blake, Norman F. (1983) *Shakespeare's Language: An Introduction*, Macmillan, London.

Chomsky, Noam (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger,* ed. by Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser, 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, Noam (1995a) "Introduction," *The Minimalist Program*, 1-11, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, Noam (1995b) "Categories and Transformations in a Minimalist Framework," *The Minimalist Program*, 219-394, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, Noam (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka, 89-155, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, Noam (2001a) "Derivation by Phase," *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, Noam (2001b) "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy," *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20, MIT, Cambridge Mass.

Fischer, Olga (1992) "Syntax," *The Cambridge History of the Englsih Language Vol. II: 1066-1476*, ed. by Norman Blake, 207-408, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman & Wim van der Wurff (2000) *The Syntax of Early English*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Foster, Tony & Wim van der Wurff (1995) "The Survival of Object-Verb Order in Middle English: Some Data," *Neophilologus* 79, 309-327.

Foster, Tony & Wim van der Wurff (1997) "From Syntax to Discourse: The Function of Object-Verb Order in Late Middle English," *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 135-156, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Fries, Charles C. (1940) "On the Development of the Structural Use of Word-Order in Modern English," *Language 16*, 199-208.

Haeberli, Eric (2000) "Adjuncts and the Syntax of Subjects in Old and Middle English," *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, ed. by Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner, 109-131, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Haegeman, Liliane (1995) *The Syntax of Negation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Holmberg, Anders (1999) "Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization," *Studia Linguistica* 53, 1-39.

Ingham, Richard (2000) "Negation and OV Order in Late Middle English," *Journal of Linguistics* 36, 13-38.

Ishikawa, Kazuhisa (2001) "On the Decline of V2 Phenomena in English," Talk given at the Symposium at the 19th National Conference of English Linguistic Society of Japan held at University of Tokyo, Komaba.

Kayne, Richard S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Kemenade, Ans van (1987) *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Koma, Osamu (2001) "OV Order in LME: Embraciated Negative Object Constructions in the *Paston Letters*," Talk given at the Workshop at the 19th National Conference of English Linguistic Society of Japan held at University of Tokyo, Komaba.

Kroch, Anthony & Ann Taylor (1997) "Verb Movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact," *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent, 297-325, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kroch, Anthony & Ann Taylor (2000) *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, 2nd edition, University of Pennsylvania.

Miyashita, Harumasa (2000) "A Note on the Object DP Movement in Late Middle English and Early Modern English," *Linguistic Research* 17, 175-184, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association.

Miyashita, Harumasa (2001) "Some Observations on Object-Verb Order in 15th Century English," *Linguistic Research* 18, 195-206, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association.

Moerenhout, Mike & Wim van der Wurff (2000) "Remnants of the Old Order: OV in the *Paston Letters*," *English Studies* 6, 513-530.

中尾俊夫 (1972) 『英語史Ⅱ：英語学体系第 9 巻』，大修館書店，東京.

Nishioka, Nobuaki (1999) "On Sentential Negation and the Licensing of Negative Polarity Items in English and Japanese: A Minimalist Approach," *English Linguistics* 16, 25-54.

Pintzuk, Susan, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner (2000) "Syntactic Change: Theory and Method," *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, ed. by Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner, 1-22, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Richards, Norvin (1997) *What Moves Where When in Which Language?* Ph.D dissertation, MIT.

Rissanen, Matti (1999) "Syntax," *The Cambridge History of the Englsih Language Vol. III: 1476-1776*, ed. by Roger Lass, 187-331, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Roberts, Ian (1997) "Directionality and Word Order Change in the History of English," *Parameters and Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent, 397-426, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Szabolcsi, Anna (1997) "Strategies for Scope Taking," *Ways of Scope Taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 109-154, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Watanabe, Akira (2001a) "Decomposing the Neg-Criterion," *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 1999: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' 1999*, ed. by Yves D'Hulst, Johan Rooryck & Jan Schroten, 383-406, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Watanabe, Akira (2001b) "WH and Operator Constructions in Japanese," Ms., University of Tokyo.

Watanabe, Akira (2002a) "Feature Checking and Neg-Factorization in Negative Concord," *Proceedings of the Sophia Symposium on Negation*, ed. by Yasuhiko Kato, 51-77, Sophia University, Tokyo.

Watanabe, Akira (2002b) "Loss of Overt Wh-movement in Old Japanese," *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, ed. by David Lightfoot, 179-195, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Watanabe, Akira (2002c) "The Genesis of Negative Concord," Ms., University of Tokyo.

Wurff, Wim van der (1997) "Deriving Object-Verb Order in Late Middle English," *Journal of Linguistics* 33, 485-509.

Wurff, Wim van der (1999) "Objects and Verbs in Modern Icelandic and Fifteenth-Century English: A Word Order Parallel and Its Causes," *Lingua* 109, 237-265.

Wurff, Wim van der & Tony Foster (1997) "Object-Verb Order in 16th Century English: A Study of Its Frequency and Status," *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on His 60th Birthday*, Vol. I, ed. by Raymond Hickey & Stanislaw Puppel, 439-453, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.