

---

---

## DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

---

---

### Historical Change in the Formal Licensing Conditions of Personal Pronominal Objects in English: A View from Intra-syntactically Driven Language Change

Harumasa Miyashita  
Tsurumi University  
miyashita-h@tsurumi-u.ac.jp

*Ph.D. Received: September 27, 2013, University of Tokyo*

This dissertation empirically investigates the historical change in the occurrence position(s) of personal pronouns (henceforth, PPrns) functioning as objects in English, with the aid of syntactically annotated electronic corpora, and theoretically considers the historical change in question under the basic tenets of the Principles and Parameters (henceforth, P&P) approach to Universal Grammar (henceforth, UG).

In Present-day English (henceforth, PDE), the occurrence position of PPrn objects in a clause is restricted to the post-verbal position following a negative marker (e.g. *I do not know **him***). It is well known, however, that the PPrn objects occur relatively freely in widespread positions in earlier English (i.e. Old English, Early Middle English, Late Middle English, Early Modern English, and Late Modern English (henceforth, OE, EME, LME, EModE, and LModE, respectively)), where finite verb (henceforth, V) movement is possible. In OE, for instance, a PPrn object can appear where a full nominal (henceforth, FN) object cannot; it can appear to the immediate left of the finite V in the main topic-initial verb-second (henceforth, V2) clause, to the immediate right of the finite V in the main *wh*-/neg-/þa-initial (henceforth, operator-initial) V2 clause, to the immediate right of the complementizer in the subordinate clause, and in the post-subject/pre-auxiliary position at the left margin of the middle field (a.k.a. Wackernagel position) in the subordinate clause:

- (1) a. PPRN OBJECT LEFT-ADJACENT TO THE FINITE V IN THE TOPIC-INITIAL V2 CLAUSE IN OE  
[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 IN OE  
[Ne] geseah **hine** nan man nates-hwon yire  
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 IN OE  
þæt **him** his fiend wæren 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 IN OE  
þæt þa Deniscan **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))

In EModE such as Shakespearean English, moreover, the occurrence of PPrn objects becomes restricted to the position immediately following the finite V, but they can still precede a negative marker:

(2) SHAKESPEAREAN ENGLISH: I know him not.

(*King Henry V*, III.vi.19)

Thus, diachronic change is attested in the history of English with respect to the occurrence position of PPrn objects. Cross-linguistic variation is also attested when human language is considered from a synchronic perspective. For instance, Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) point out that PPrns are classified into three different classes (i.e. strong PPrns, weak PPrns, and clitic PPrns (henceforth, SPPrns, WPPrns, and CPPrns, respectively)) on the basis of their distributional properties, and that their realization differs cross-linguistically. In light of the tripartite classification of PPrns, the diachronic change in the occurrence position of PPrns in the history of English can also be captured as an issue of which class of PPrns and how many of them are realized in each period of English. This dissertation presents the empirical facts of the occurrence of PPrn objects in the history of English, capturing the overall picture of the historical change in the formal licensing conditions (henceforth, FLCs) on them, and attempts to provide such historical change with a principled explanation. The following are the outlines of the investigation and consideration made in the six chapters that constitute this dissertation.

Chapter 1 establishes theoretical foundations for the analyses presented in this dissertation by introducing the cue-based model of language acquisition and language change advanced by Lightfoot (1999) and the Inertial Theory constructed on the basis of the Minimalist Program (henceforth, MP), a recent development from the P&P approach to UG. Under the P&P approach, general properties of human language are ascribed to universal principles of UG, and cross-linguistic diversities to different values of parameters. Moreover, the MP restricts the locus of the parametric variations to the formal features that constitute lexical items. Parametric values for grammar of an individual language are determined in the course of children's language acquisition. Thus, the synchronic cross-linguistic variations are considered to be consequences of different parametric values chosen in language acquisition. The diachronic change in a language is also considered to be the consequence of the parametric values determined differently from the ones for previous generation's grammars. The cue-based model of language acquisition and language change views language change as a result of the case that when a cue for acquiring a certain linguistic phenomenon is lost due to another historical change, children choose parametric values that are different from the ones for previous generation's grammars. The Inertial Theory advocated by Keenan (1994) and subsequently developed by Longobardi (2001) maintains that language change in a strict sense (i.e. syntactic change) results from the changes at the interfaces between the faculty of language and other cognitive systems, and that the syntactic component, by itself, is diachronically completely inert. Within this theory, parametric change is induced by extra-linguistic factors such as language contact or extra-syntactic factors such as phonological/semantic changes, or other syntactic factors caused by the loss of cues. When extra-linguistically or extra-syntactically induced parameter changes create a new system which tends to undergo further parametric change, recursive syntactic change occurs. This is called cascades of parametric change, which instantiate intra-syntactically driven language change.

Since the aim of this dissertation is to provide a detailed description and a principled explanation of the changes in the occurrence positions of PPrn objects in the history of English, particular attention is paid to the following two linguistic phenomena related to (1) and (2) above, which are shown to be instances of intra-syntactically driven language change:

- (3) a. loss of cliticization in the history of English
- b. rise and loss of pronominal object shift (henceforth, OS) in the history of English

Concerning (3a), previous qualitative research was restricted to specific periods of the history of English and little quantitative research is found. To my knowledge, moreover, research on (3b) has scarcely been conducted so far. Thus, this dissertation has conducted independent empirical surveys with the aid of the following syntactically

annotated electronic corpora and collected diachronic linguistic data on OE to LModE systematically, obtaining a bird's-eye view of them:

- (4) SYNTACTICALLY ANNOTATED ELECTRONIC CORPORA
- a. OE: *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (Taylor et al. (2003))
  - b. EME & LME: *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, 2nd edition (Kroch & Taylor (2000))
  - c. EModE: *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* (Kroch et al. (2004))
  - d. LModE: *Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English* (Kroch et al. (2010))

Chapters 2 and 3 investigate the linguistic phenomenon in (3a), searching the electronic corpus in (4b), and present analyses of the findings. It is revealed based on the collected data that cliticization phenomena attested in OE such as PPrn objects in the Wackernagel position and displaced PPrn complements to prepositions (i.e. CPPrns) are lost in the mid-14th century in all the dialects of LME (i.e. Midland/Southern and Northern dialects). These chapters attempt to provide the language change in question with an account by developing the trichotomy of PPrns mentioned above into the classification in (5) in terms of syntactic-structural and formal-lexical differences and adopting the clause structure in (6) assumed in the MP:

- (5) CLASSIFICATION OF PPRNS
- a. SPPrn:  $DP = D^{\text{Min}} \langle i\phi/u\text{Case} \rangle + \text{phonologically null } N^{\text{Min}} \langle \text{Foc} \rangle$
  - b. WPPrn:  $D^{\text{Min/Max}} \langle i\phi/u\text{Case} \rangle$
  - c. CPPrn:  $D^{\text{Min/Max}} \langle i\phi \rangle$
- (6) CLAUSE STRUCTURE:  $[_{CP} C [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} T [_{v^*P} v^* [_{VP} \dots V \dots ] ] ] ] ] ] ]$

When an FN (i.e. DP) enters into an Agree relation with a functional head  $T/v^*$  and  $u\text{Case}$  of the FN and  $u\phi$  of  $T/v^*$  are valued, the FN in question is formally licensed by  $T/v^*$ . Since the SPPrn in (5a) is no different from the FN in the syntactic structure and formal features, the FLC on the FN applies to the SPPrn. The WPPrn in (5b) is similar to the SPPrn in that both bear  $u\text{Case}$ , but it syntactically behaves as a head (i.e.  $D^{\text{Min}}$ ) as well as a phrase (i.e.  $D^{\text{Max}}$ ); the FLC on the WPPrn differs from the one on the SPPrn. The CPPrn in (5c) is different from the WPPrn in that it lacks  $u\text{Case}$ , and it is also different from the SPPrn in that like the WPPrn it syntactically behaves as a head as well as a phrase; the FLC on the CPPrn differs from the one on the SPPrn and the one on the WPPrn. The CPPrn is formally licensed by cliticizing to a functional head with which it enters into an Agree relation. It is proposed based on the classification in (5) and the clause structure in (6) that when children acquire CPPrns lacking  $u\text{Case}$ , they use subject position asymmetry (henceforth, SPA) in the main topic-initial context (i.e. coexistence of V2 order with an FN subject and verb-third (henceforth, V3) order with a PPrn subject) as a cue. In the absence of the SPA, children acquire WPPrns bearing  $u\text{Case}$ . When the SPA is lost, consequently, CPPrns disappear while WPPrns appear. It is pointed out that the modes and causes of this change differ among dialects. They are described and explained as follows. The loss of SPA in the Midland/Southern dialects is attributable to the rise of uniform V3 order via loss of V-to-Fin movement (i.e. loss of part of the cue  $[_{CP} \text{Topic} [_{FinP} V [_{TP} \text{Subj}_{FN} \dots ] ] ]$ ) while the loss of SPA in the Northern dialect is attributable to rise of the uniform V2 order via borrowing of third person plural forms of non-clitic PPrns (e.g. nominative *þei/pai*, accusative/dative *þem* and genitive *þeir/pair*) from Old Norse. It is also revealed that a series of such changes induced a grammatical system with new pronominal paradigms involving WPPrns and SPPrns (but lacking CPPrns) to emerge in the mid-14th century. It is argued based on these findings that in addition to SPPrns, two classes of deficient PPrns exist in earlier English: the deficient PPrns in OE to EME are CPPrns that require cliticization to its host (i.e. a functional head  $C/T/v^*/K$ ) and they are lost in the transitional period from EME to LME; the ones that emerged and replaced CPPrns in LME are WPPrns that do not require cliticization.

Chapter 4 investigates the linguistic phenomenon in (3b) searching the electronic corpora in (4a)-(4d), pointing out that in the course of the history of English, pronominal OS appeared in the mid-14th century (i.e.

LME) and disappeared in the end of the 19th century (i.e. LModE). Then, this chapter provides the findings with an explanation that the emergent grammatical system with new pronominal paradigms mentioned above, incorporating the emergence of a definite article in OE/EME and rise of V-to-T movement in EME, enabled pronominal OS. It is empirically demonstrated that the pronominal OS in LME is made possible by a new grammatical system where three universal principles of UG and three parametric factors (i.e. presence of WPPrns, a definite article and V-to-T movement) interact. The three descriptive factors are reconsidered in terms of formal features that constitute lexical items, and then formulated as three de facto parameters. It is also shown that loss of pronominal OS is induced by loss of V-to-T movement which is one of the three factors that enable pronominal OS.

Chapter 5 discusses two theoretical issues surrounding the analyses provided to the historical change in the FLC on PPrns in English inquired in Chapters 2 to 4. One issue is concerned with the micro-cue model of language acquisition and language change proposed by Westergaard (2009). It is concluded that the micro-cue model can be incorporated into the accounts advanced in this dissertation. The other issue is concerned with the way the default/unmarked value of parameters is formulated. It is shown based on the notion of markedness reversal proposed by Roberts (2007) that the characterization of the default/unmarked value of parameters advanced in this dissertation is valid.

Chapter 6 summarizes the findings obtained from the empirical investigation and theoretical consideration made in this dissertation. It is concluded that the FLC on PPrns in English changed in the following way. CPPrns in OE to EME were formally licensed by cliticizing to its host (i.e. a functional head C/T/v\*/K). Due to the interaction between three universal principles of UG and three parameters, WPPrns in LME to LModE were formally licensed in the shifted position (i.e. Spec v\*P) in the presence of V-to-T movement. Because of the decline of V-to-T movement in EModE to LModE, WPPrns in PDE are formally licensed in the externally-merged position (in the base order).

Biberauer & Roberts (2008) exemplify the intra-syntactically driven language change with various linguistic phenomena. This dissertation has paid particular attention to the otherwise unnoticed linguistic phenomena such as (3a) and (3b), and has demonstrated that change in the FLC on PPrns in English is also an instance of intra-syntactically driven language change.

## References

- Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts (2008) "Cascading Parameter Changes: Internally-Driven Change in Middle and Early Modern English," *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal Papers*, ed. by Thórhallur Eythórsson, 79-113, John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke (1999) "Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns," *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk, 145-233, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.
- Keenan, Edward (1994) "Creating Anaphors: An Historical Study of the English Reflexive Pronouns," Ms., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1987) *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*, Foris, Dordrecht & Cinnaminson, N.J.
- Lightfoot, David (1999) *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change and Evolution*, Blackwell, Oxford & Malden, Mass.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (2001) "Formal Syntax, Diachronic Minimalism, and Etymology: The History of French *Chez*," *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 275-302.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1999) *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Clause Structure*, Garland, New York & London.
- Roberts, Ian (2007) *Diachronic Syntax*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Westergaard, Marit (2009) "Word Order in Old and Middle English: The Role of Information Structure and First

Language Acquisition,” *Diachronica* 26, 65-102.

### **Syntactically Annotated Electronic Corpora**

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

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

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini & Lauren Delfs (2004) *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English*, Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania.

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

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini & Ariel Diertani (2010) *Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English*, Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania.

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

Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk & Frank Beths (2003) *York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*, Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York.

[<http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/YcoeHome.htm>]

