1. INTRODUCTION

The Principles and Parameters (P&P) approach that took shape 30 years ago... opened the way to research of unprecedented scope and depth over a very wide typological range, revitalized psycholinguistic inquiry with highly productive exploration of acquisition and use of parametric values, and opened the way to new approaches to historical change. (Chomsky (2013: 38); e.g. Lightfoot (1979: 16ff))

(1) AIM

To demonstrate that two parametric changes are responsible for the historical change in the occurrence position(s) of personal pronouns (PPrns) functioning as objects in English.

---

2) PDE: I do not know him.

a. *Mikey looked it up.

b. Mikey looked it up.

(3) Shakespearean English: I know him not.

(King Henry V, III.vi.19 / Miyashita (2007a: 46))

(4) OE

a. PPRN OBJECT LEFT-ADJACENT TO THE FINITE V IN THE TOPIC-INITIAL V2 CLAUSE

[Fela spella] him sædon þa Beormas, ægþer ge of hiera agnum lande...

many stories him told the Permians both of their own country

‘The Permians told him many stories, both about their own country...’ (Oros, 14.27 / Kemenade (1987: 114))

b. PPRN OBJECT RIGHT-ADJACENT TO THE FINITE V IN THE OPERATOR-INITIAL V2 CLAUSE

[Ne] gesæah hine nan man nates-hwon yrre

NEG saw him no man so little angry

‘None ever saw him so little angry.’ (ÆLS, XXXI.306 / ibid.)

c. PPRN OBJECT RIGHT-ADJACENT TO THE COMPLEMENTIZER IN THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSE

þæt him his fiend weren æfterfylgende

that him his enemies were following

‘... that his enemies were chasing him.’ (Oros, 48.12 / ibid.: 113)

d. PPRN OBJECT IN THE WACKERNAGEL POSITION

þæt þa Denisecan him ne mehton þæs ripes forwiernan

so that the Danes them NEG could the harvest refuse

‘... so that the Danes could not refuse them the harvest.’ (ChronA, 89.10 (896) / Pintzuk (1999: 140))

5) THREE PARAMETERS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WORD ORDER CHANGE OF PPRN OBJECTS

a. t/CASE PARAMETER ON D

i. −uCase on D: DMax <tiθ> (= CPPm)

ii. +uCase on D: DMax <tiθ/uCase> (= WPPm) (Miyashita (2013: 100))
b. TENSE MORPHOLOGY PARAMETER
   i. rich tense morphology: formation of V+T compounds required
      \[ V \to T \] movement required
   ii. poor tense morphology: formation of V+T compounds impossible
      \[ V \to T \] movement impossible
      (ibid.: 195)

c. \( i \)DEF PARAMETER
   i. \( i \)Def = semantic feature: presence of a definite article
   ii. \( i \)Def = interpretable formal feature: absence of a definite article
      (ibid.: 203)

(6) ORGANIZATION:
§2 ☞ typology of PPrns
§3 ☞ basic facts on word order of PPrn objects
§4 ☞ discussion
§5 ☞ conclusion

2. TYPOLOGY OF PPRNS

(7) TYPOLOGY OF PPRNS
   a. clitic PPrn (CPPrn): \( D^{\text{Min/Max}} <i\phi> \)
   b. weak PPrn (WPPrn): \( D^{\text{Min/Max}} <i\phi/u\text{Case}> \)
   c. strong PPrn (SPPrn): \( DP = D^0 <i\phi/(u\text{Case})> + \) phonologically null \( N^0 <\text{Foc}> = \) full nominal (FN)

3. BASIC FACTS ON WORD ORDER OF PPRN OBJECTS

(8) SYNTACTICALLY ANNOTATED ELECTRONIC CORPORA
   c. EModE: Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English [PPCEME] (Kroch et al. (2004))
   d. LModE: Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English [PPCMBE] (Kroch et al. (2010))

3.1. CLITICIZATION

(9) EME
   a. PPRN OBJECT LEFT-ADJACENT TO THE FINITE V IN THE TOPIC-INITIAL V2 CLAUSE
      [berwið] us wite ure louerd ihesu crist...
      therewith us blame our lord Jesus Christ
      ‘Therewith, our lord Jesus Christ blames us...’ (CMTRINIT, 75.1042 / PPCME2 / Miyashita (2004: 116))
   b. PPRN OBJECT RIGHT-ADJACENT TO THE FINITE V IN THE OPERATOR-INITIAL V2 CLAUSE
      [Ne] mihte him nãðer befelen
      NEG might him no-other happen-to
      ‘No other might happen to him.’ (CMVICES1, 43.486 / PPCME2 / ibid.)
   c. PPRN OBJECT RIGHT-ADJACENT TO THE COMPLEMENTIZER IN THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSE
      [wel] him mon mote wið spoken
      that him one must speak-against
      ‘... that one must speak against him.’ (CMLAMBX1, 45.587 / PPCME2 / ibid.)
3.2. OS

(10) OS is an operation that displaces an object out of VP. Holmberg’s Generalization ---› (11)

(11) Holmberg’s Generalization
Object Shift cannot apply across a phonologically visible category asymmetrically c-commanding the object position except for adjuncts. (Holmberg (1999: 15))

Prerequisite for OS = Relocation of the phonological material (especially a main V) out of VP ---› (12)

(12) OS Configuration: … V … Obj … Neg/Adv … [tV \θ \[P/Prt/IO tObj]]

(13) Typology of OS

a. The Icelandic (Ic) type of OS moves a definite WPPrn obligatorily and a definite FN or a definite SPPrn optionally out of VP.

b. The Mainland Scandinavian (MSc) type allows only the obligatory OS of a definite WPPrn.

---› (14)

(14) IC Type of OS vs. MSc Type of OS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IC type</th>
<th>MSc type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPrn</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPPrn</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indefinite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRn</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(15) Definite FN OS vs. Definite WPPrn OS

a. Icelandic:
   i. Nemandinn las bókina/hana
   ii. Nemandinn las bókina/hana

b. Danish:
   i. Studenten læste *bogen/den
   ii. Studenten læste bogen/den

c. Norwegian:
   i. Studenten leste *boken/den
   ii. Studenten leste boken/den

d. Swedish:
   i. Studenten läste *boken/den
   ii. Studenten läste boken/den

e. Faroese:
   i. Næmingurin las *bókina/hana
   ii. Næmingurin las bókina/hana

The student didn’t read the book/it. (Thránsson (2001: 148, 150))
4. DÉFINITE SPPRn OS
a. Icelandic: Hún sá mig / [mig og þig] / [þennan á hjólinu]
   she saw ME me and you him on the-bike not
   ‘She didn’t see ME/me and you/him on the bike.’
   (Thráinsson (2001: 150))

b. Norwegian: *Hun så meg / [meg og deg] / [ham på sykkelen]
   ‘... that they do not require nor pray me of money,’
   (CMCTMELI, 235.C2.710 / PPCME2 / Miyashita (2008: 82))

(18) EModE
a. Anterior Half of the 16C
   ... bycause he sawe hym not.
   ‘... that he does not forgive himself,’”
   (CMVICES4, 112.299 / ibid.)

b. Posterior Half of the 16C & Anterior Half of the 17C
   If you grant me not this Favour.

(20) EMERGENCE AND DEMISE OF PRONOMINAL OS IN THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH [I]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>EME</th>
<th>LME</th>
<th>EModE</th>
<th>LModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14C</td>
<td>15C</td>
<td>16C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPRn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPPRn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IEEEGERENCE (39.80%)</td>
<td>DEMISE (3.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) DEFINITE SPPRn OS
a. Icelandic: Hún sá mig / [mig og þig] / [þennan á hjólinu]
   she saw ME me and you him on the-bike not
   ‘She didn’t see ME/me and you/him on the bike.’
   (Thráinsson (2001: 150))

b. Norwegian: *Hun så meg / [meg og deg] / [ham på sykkelen]
   ‘... that they do not require nor pray me of money,’
   (CMCTMELI, 235.C2.710 / PPCME2 / Miyashita (2008: 82))

(17) LME
a. Posterior Half of the 14C
   ... that they NE† requeren ne preyen me hat of pees,
   ‘... that they require nor pray me not of money
   ‘... that they do not require nor pray me of money.’
   (MERRYTAL-E1-H, 148.442 / PPCME / Miyashita (2008: 82))

b. 15C
   ... þat he forgue hym not.
   ‘... that he does not forgive himself,”
   (CMVICES4, 112.299 / ibid.)

(21) MECHANISMS INDUCING OS:
   a. typology of PPrns ---+ (7)
   b. decomposition of OS ---+ (22)
   c. principles governing OS ---+ (23)

(22) OS = Case Shift (CS) + Dislocation Rule (Disl)

(19) LModE
a. 1700-1769
   but all my Hopes are, that he sees me not.
   (STEVENS-1745, 20.65 / PPCMBE / Miyashita (2011: 6))

b. 1770-1839
   or if one has it not, go to another.
   (CARLYLE-1835, 2, 260.93 / PPCMBE / ibid.)

c. 1840-1914
   and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be like unto you, a liar:
   (ERV-NEW-1881, 8, 40J.758 / PPCMBE / ibid.)

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. TWO FACTORS WHICH ENABLE (PRONOMINAL) OS

(21) MECHANISMS INDUCING OS:
   a. typology of PPrns ---+ (7)
   b. decomposition of OS ---+ (22)
   c. principles governing OS ---+ (23)

(22) OS = Case Shift (CS) + Dislocation Rule (Disl)

(cf. Svenonius (2001: 272); pace Hiraiwa (2001: 296ff))
(23) **Principles (& A Parameter) Proposed by Chomsky (2001)**

a. $v^*$ is assigned an EPP feature only if that has an effect on outcome.

b. The EPP position [i.e. phonological edge / outer Spec $v^*P$] of $v^*$ is assigned Int. ----> (24)

c. At the phonological border of $v^*P$, XP is assigned Int'.

(Chomsky (2001: 35))

(24)  $[\text{TP} \ldots [\text{T} \ldots \text{V-[\text{w}^*P]}] \ldots [\text{vP} \text{Obj} [\ldots \text{Subj} [\ldots t_v [\ldots t_y \text{Obj} ]]]] ]$

**PHONOLOGICAL EDGE**

**PHONOLOGICAL BORDER**

(Chomsky (2001: 34))

(25) **Probe-Goal System**

[T]here is a relation Agree holding between probe P and goal G, which deletes [= values] uninterpretable features if P and G are appropriately related.


(26)  

\[ \text{Spec} \hspace{1cm} v^*P \hspace{1cm} \text{Subj} \hspace{1cm} v^* \hspace{1cm} \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{V} \hspace{1cm} \text{[\text{w}/EPP]} \hspace{1cm} t_v \]

\[ \text{Obj} \hspace{1cm} [\phi/\text{Case}] \]

\[ \text{AGREE} \]

**SATISFACTION OF AN EPP-FEATURE (CS)**

(27) **Claim:** The (MSc type of) OS is rendered possible by the following two parametric factors:

--->(28)

a. presence/absence of WPPrs,

b. presence/absence of main verb movement out of $v^*P$, and

c. presence/absence of a definite article within DP.)

(28) **Parametric Factors Enabling Pronominal CS/OS (LME/EMode)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. WPPRN</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. V-MOVEMENT OUT OF $v^*P$</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DEFINITE ARTICLE WITHIN A DEFINITE DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ (MSc type of) OS possible

(29) **Parametric Factors Enabling Pronominal CS/OS (OE/EME)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. WPPRN</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. V-MOVEMENT OUT OF $v^*P$</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DEFINITE ARTICLE WITHIN A DEFINITE DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ MSc type of OS impossible (Cliticization possible)

(30) **Parametric Factors Enabling Pronominal CS/OS (LMode)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. WPPRN</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. V-MOVEMENT OUT OF $v^*P$</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DEFINITE ARTICLE WITHIN A DEFINITE DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Any type of OS impossible
4.2. **The Two Factors Fine-Tuned**

(31) **Emergence and Demise of Pronominal OS in the History of English [II]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Grammar Type</th>
<th>WPPrn</th>
<th>V-movement</th>
<th>Definite Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE/EME (latter 14C)</td>
<td>Non-OS Grammar</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>(absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME/EModE (latter 14C – latter 17C)</td>
<td>WPPRN OS Grammar</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>PRONOMINAL OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LModE (latter 17C – 20C)</td>
<td>WPPRN OS Grammar</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>sporadic</td>
<td>PRONOMINAL OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE (20C –)</td>
<td>Non-OS Grammar</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Miyashita (2011: 7))

(32) **Locus of Parametric Variations**

a. UG is concerned with the invariant principles of $S_0$ (= the initial state) and the range of permissible variation… [V]ariation is limited to nonsubstantive parts of the lexicon and general properties of lexical items.  

(Chomsky (1993: 3))

b. Language differences and typology should be reducible to choice of values of parameters… One proposal is that parameters are restricted to *formal features* with no interpretation at the interface. A still stronger one is that they are restricted to formal features of functional categories…  

(Chomsky (1995a: 6))

c. There are universal principles and finite array of options as to how they apply (parameters). Furthermore, it may be that Jespersen’s intuition about syntax-morphology can be captured, with parameters limited to the lexicon, indeed to a narrow part of it: functional categories.  

(Chomsky (1995b: 54))

d. Take each item of the lexicon to be some complex of semantic, phonetic, and formal features. Languages may differ not only in choice and association of features, but also in the ways formal features are eliminated by PHON (= the phonological component).  

(Chomsky (1998: 122f))

e. [A]cquiring language involves at least selections of features [F], constructions of lexical items Lex, and refinement of $C_{16}$ (= the computational procedure for human language) in one of the possible ways — parameter setting.  

(Chomsky (2000: 100))

f. L (= each particular language) assembles [F] to lexical items LI of a lexicon Lex… In the simplest case, the entry LI is a once-and-for-all collection (perhaps structured) of (A) phonological, (B) semantic, and (C) formal features.  

(Chomsky (2001: 10))

g. $S_0$ (= a genetically determined initial state) determines the set {F} of properties (“features”) available for languages. Each L (= possible (I)-language) makes a one-time selection of a subset [F] of {F} and a one-time assembly of elements of [F] as its lexicon LEX…  

(Chomsky (2004: 107))

h. A particular language is identified at least by valuation of parameters and selection from the store of features made available by UG, and a listing of combinations of these features in LIs (the lexicon), satisfying further conditions that we put aside here.  

(Chomsky (2007: 6f))

i. Adopting the P&P framework, I will assume that one element of parameter-setting is assembly of features into lexical items (LIs), which we can take to be atoms for further computation and the locus of parameters, sweeping many complicated and important questions under the rug.  

(Chomsky (2008: 135))

j. There is by now substantial evidence that narrow syntax may also allow only limited variety, virtually none if parametric variation is restricted to the lexicon, or even to functional elements of the lexicon.  

(Chomsky (2012: 12))

☞ LEXICON / LEXICAL ITEMS
(33) **TWO PARAMETERS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WORD ORDER CHANGE OF PPRN OBJECTS (= (5))**

a. **uCase Parameter on D**
   i. -uCase on D: \( \text{D}^{\text{Min/Max}} < \text{i} \phi > \) (= CPPrn)
   ii. +uCase on D: \( \text{D}^{\text{Min/Max}} < \text{i} \phi /u\text{Case} > \) (= WPPrn)  
     (Miyashita (2013: 100))

b. **Tense Morphology Parameter**
   i. rich tense morphology: formation of V+T compounds required
      \( \Rightarrow \) V-to-T movement required
   ii. poor tense morphology: formation of V+T compounds impossible
      \( \Rightarrow \) V-to-T movement impossible

   (ibid.: 195)

rich “tense” morphology (rather than rich “agreement” morphology) \( \Rightarrow \) (36)

\( \Rightarrow \) **Lexical Requirement for the Formation of a V+T Compound in the Numeration**

\( \Rightarrow \) **Trigger for “Reprojective” V-to-T Movement \( \Rightarrow \) (35)**

(35) **“Reprojective” V-to-T Movement**

a. **External Merge of the V+T Compound and its Complement (Formation of VP)**

\[ \text{External Merge} \]

\[ \text{V+T} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \]

b. **Formation of V*P (External Merge of V* and VP & External Merge of Subj and V*) & Internal Merge of the V+T Compound and V* (Internal Merge)**

\[ \text{Subj} \rightarrow \text{V}* \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \]

\[ \text{Internal Merge} \]

\[ \text{V+T} \rightarrow \text{v*P} \rightarrow \text{Subj} \rightarrow \text{v*} \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \]

c. **Internal Merge of the V+T Compound (+ V*) and its Complement (Formation of TP)**

\[ \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{Subj} \rightarrow \text{v*} \rightarrow \text{V+T} \rightarrow \text{v*P} \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \]

\[ \text{Internal Merge} \]

\[ \text{Subj} \rightarrow \text{v*} \rightarrow \text{v*P} \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{Compl} \]

THE V+T COMPOUND PROJECTS TP.
### 5. Conclusion: Syntactic Change Captured in Terms of the Minimalist Program

(38) **Principled Explanation of Language under the Minimalist Program**

a. Insofar as properties of L [= a possible (I-)language] can be accounted in terms of IC [= an interface condition] and general properties of computational efficiency and the like, they have a principled explanation: we will have validated Galilean intuition of perfection of nature in this domain.  
   (Chomsky (2004: 106))

b. We can regard an explanation of properties of language as *principled* insofar as it can be reduced to properties of the interface systems and general considerations of computational efficiency and the like.  
   (Chomsky (2005: 10))

c. We can regard an account of some linguistic phenomena as *principled* insofar as it derives them by efficient computation satisfying interface conditions.  
   (Chomsky (2007: 5))

d. We can regard an explanation of some property of language as *principled*... insofar as it can be reduced to the third factor [= principles of structural architecture and developmental constraints that are not specific to the organ under investigation, and may be organism-independent] and to conditions that language must meet to be usable at all — specifically, conditions coded in UG that are imposed by organism-internal systems with which FL [= faculty of language] interacts.  
   (Chomsky (2008: 134))

e. We can regard an account of some linguistic phenomena as *principled* insofar as it drives them by efficient computation satisfying interface conditions.  
   (Chomsky (2010: 51))

(39) **Strong Minimalist Thesis: Interfaces + Merge = Language**  
   (Chomsky (2010: 52))

---

### (36) Tense Morphology Paradigms: Romance vs. Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romance</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>parle (present indicative/subjunctive) / parlerai (future) / parlerais (conditional) / parlais (imperfect) / parlaï (preterit) / parlassa (past subjunctive)</td>
<td>spreche (present indicative/subjunctive) / sprach (past) / spräche (past subjunctive)</td>
<td>speak (present) / spoke (past)</td>
<td>snakker (present) / snakket (past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>parlo (present) / parlerô (future) / parlerëi (conditional) / parlavo (imperfect) / parli (preterit) / parli (present subjunctive) / parlassi (past subjunctive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>hablo (present) / hablær (future) / hablæra (conditional) / hablæ (imperfect) / hablè (preterit) / hable (present subjunctive) / hablæse (past subjunctive I) / hablæra (past subjunctive II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Biberauer & Roberts (2010: 266), Roberts (2010: 163))
(40) **INERTIAL THEORY**  

a. [S]yntax, by itself, is diachronically completely inert. 
   (Longobardi (2001: 277f))

b. [L]inguistic change proper may only originate as an interface phenomenon…  
   (op.cit.: 278)

c. [S]yntactic change should not arise, unless it can be shown to be *caused* — that is, a well-motivated consequence of other types of change (phonological changes and semantic changes, including the appearance/disappearance of whole lexical items) or, recursively of other syntactic changes…  
   (op.cit.: 278)

☞ The word order change in the history of English exemplifies (40c).


Dictionaries


Syntactically Annotated Electronic Corpora


[http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCEME-RELEASE-2/index.html]


[http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCMBE-RELEASE-1/index.html]


[http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCME2-RELEASE-3/index.html]


[http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YcoeHome1.htm]