

# Some Observations on Wackernagel Objects and Inflected Demonstrative Pronouns in the History of English

Norihiko Kondo  
University of Tokyo

ll67075@mail.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, I make an observation of the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the history of English, and point out a correlation holding between them. After that, I cite the work by Watanabe (2006), and show the direction in which my future research will take. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 observes the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstratives in the history of English, and then indicates a correlation holding between them. Section 3 reviews the work by Watanabe (2006) and takes up four grammatical options in OE which involve an agreement relation with D. Section 4 focuses on the question when these grammatical options had disappeared and what had caused these changes. Section 5 summarizes the discussion in this paper.

## 2. A Correlation between Wackernagel Objects and Inflected Demonstrative Pronouns in the History of English

### 2.1. The Data in Early Middle English

In this section, I focus on the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in Early Middle English (EME).

First, I cite the following data from Miyashita (2004), which show the distribution of Wackernagel objects in the eight mid-13<sup>th</sup> century south midlands texts:<sup>1</sup>

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF OBJ<sub>PPRN</sub> IN THE EIGHT MID-13<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTH MIDLANDS/KENTISH TEXTS

	SOAV	SAOV	SAVO	SOVA	SVAO	TOTAL
<i>Southeast Midlands Dialects</i>						
cmvices1.m1	45	24	6	8	0	83
cmtrinit.mx1	15	14	9	5	0	43
<i>Southwest Midlands Dialects</i>						
cmlambx1.mx1	16	14	4	2	0	36
cmsawles.m1	1	2	5	0	0	8
cmhali.m1	3	2	8	0	0	13
cmkathe.m1	4	4	8	0	0	16
cmancriw.m1	20	14	36	1	0	71
<i>Kentish Dialects</i>						
cmayenbi.m2	42	38	2	1	0	83
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>148(41%)</b>	114 (32%)	78 (22%)	17 (5%)	0 (0%)	357

(Miyashita (2004: 114-116))

<sup>1</sup> The eight texts surveyed are as follows: *Trinity Homilies*, *Lambeth Homilies*, *Sawles Warde*, *Hali Meidhad*, *St. Katherine*, *Vices and Virtues*, *Ancrene Riwle* and *Ayenbite Inwit*.

Table 1 shows that personal pronominal objects (= Obj<sub>PPRN</sub>) have a tendency to appear in the Wackernagel position in the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century South Midlands texts.<sup>2</sup> This means that the Wackernagel object was also carried over from OE to EME. In total, 148 out of the 357 instances of the subordinate Obj<sub>PPRN</sub> (41%) appear in this position, while 114 instances (32%) appear in the post-auxiliary/pre-verbal position in the Aux-V context and other 78 instances (22%) appear in the post-verbal position in the Aux-V context (cf. Miyashita (2004)).

Next, look at the following quantitative data in Kondo (2005), which show the number of the inflected demonstrative pronouns used as a definite article in the eight mid-13<sup>th</sup> century south midlands texts (I cite the following data from Kondo (2005)):<sup>3</sup>

**(A) SOUTHEAST MIDLANDS DIALECTS**

(i) *cmvices1.m1* (CMVICES1, 3.2 – CMVICES1, 13.151)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 41)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmvices1.m1</i>	<i>ðane</i> (2), <i>ðat</i> (2), <i>ðan</i> (4), <i>ða</i> , <i>þa</i> (3), <i>ðare</i> (3), <i>þas</i> (1)	<i>ðe</i> , <i>þe</i> , <i>te</i> (24) (Nominative(5/24))

(ii) *cmtrinit.mx1* (CMTRINIT, 51.686 – CMTRINITY, 61.843)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 70)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmtrinit.mx1</i>	<i>þen</i> (1), <i>þo</i> (3), <i>þat</i> (11), <i>þene</i> (1)	<i>þe</i> (54) (Nominative(20/54))

**(B) SOUTHWEST MIDLANDS DIALECTS**

(iii) *cmlambx1.mx1* (CMLAMBX1, 3.1 – CMLAMBX1, 15.183)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 102)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmlambx1.mx1</i>	<i>þere</i> (4), <i>þat</i> , <i>þet</i> (10), <i>þane</i> (2), <i>þam</i> (3), <i>þene</i> (4), <i>þes</i> (1), <i>þan</i> (5), <i>þon</i> (2), <i>þa, ða</i> (35)	<i>þe</i> (31) (Nominative(9/31))

(iv) *cmsawles.m1* (CMSAWLES, 165.1 – CMSAWLES, 180.220)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 81)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmsawles.m1</i>	<i>þen</i> (2), <i>þes</i> (1)	<i>þe</i> , <i>te</i> (78) (Nominative(19/78))

(v) *cmhali.m1* (CMHALI, 135.104 – CMHALI, 147.274)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 79)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmhali.m1</i>	<i>þet</i> (1), <i>þer</i> (1), <i>þes</i> (4)	<i>þe</i> , <i>te</i> (73) (Nominative(19/73))

(vi) *cmkathe.m1* (EETS OS 80, 48.1032 – EETS OS 80, 66.1436)<sup>4</sup>

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 50)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
<i>cmkathe.m1</i>	<i>þen</i> (1), <i>þene</i> (2)	<i>þe</i> , <i>te</i> (47) (Nominative(6/47))

<sup>2</sup> Wackernagel objects are those pronominal objects which appear between a subject and an auxiliary verb in a subordinate clause.

<sup>3</sup> In counting the number of the demonstratives in the texts, I have referred to the series of EETS and have counted only those demonstrative pronouns which are used as a definite article:

<sup>4</sup> For the text *cmkathe.m1*, I have referred to the EETS version of it (i.e. *The Life of Saint Katherine* (Einenkel (1978))), because some pages are lacking in the PPCME 2 version.

(vii) *cmancriw.m1* (CMANCRIW, I.42.2 – CMANCRIW, I.54.136)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 93)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
cmancriw.m1	<i>þet</i> (4), <i>þa</i> (1), <i>þene</i> (1)	<i>þe</i> , <i>ðe</i> (87) (Nominative(15/87))

(C) **KENTISH DIALECTS**

(viii) *cmayenbi.m2* (CMAYENBI, 5.4 – CMAYENBI, 11.131)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 82)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
cmayenbi.m2	<i>þane</i> (6), <i>þet</i> (5)	<i>þe</i> (70), <i>the</i> (1) (Nominative(16/71))

As you can see from these quantitative data, inflected demonstratives are still found in the eight mid-13<sup>th</sup> century south midlands texts (i.e. 126 out of the 591 instances of the demonstrative pronouns are inflected (21%).

On the basis of these data, then, we obtain the following result with respect to Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the eight mid-13<sup>th</sup> century south midlands texts:

TABLE 2: *PERCENTAGES OF WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS AND INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES IN THE MID-13<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTH MIDLANDS/KENTISH DIALECTS*

	<b>WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS</b>	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
EME (South Midlands/Kentish)	<b>148/357 (41%)</b>	<b>126/591 (21%)</b>

2.2. *The Data in Late Middle English*

In this section, we observe the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in Late Middle English (LME).

First, look at the following table which shows the distribution of Wackernagel objects in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century southern/midlands texts:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The same texts are treated by Haeberli (2002) to survey the V2/V3 order in these texts.

TABLE 3: DISTRIBUTION OF OBJ<sub>PPRN</sub> IN THE LATE 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTHERN/MIDLANDS TEXTS

	SOAV	SAOV	SAVO	SOVA	SVAO	TOTAL
<i>Southern Dialects</i>						
cmpolych.m3	0	1	110	0	1	112
cmntest.m3	0	0	16	0	0	16
cmpurvey.m3	0	0	17	0	0	17
<i>West Midlands Dialects</i>						
cmedvern.m3	0	6	21	0	0	27
cmbrut.m3	2	48	32	0	0	82
<i>East Midlands Dialects</i>						
cmearlps.m2	0	0	19	0	0	19
cmctpars.m3	0	2	38	0	0	40
cmctmeli.m3	0	1	55	0	0	56
cmboeth.m3	0	0	12	0	0	12
cmastro.m3	0	0	1	0	0	1
cmwycser.m3	0	0	50	0	0	50
cmotest.m3	0	0	9	0	0	9
cmcloud.m3	0	0	27	0	0	27
cmmandev.m3	0	0	62	0	0	62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2 (0.4%)</b>	58	469	0	1	530

(Miyashita (2004: 117))

As this table shows, instances of the Wackernagel objects cease to be attested in these texts. In fact, they are almost extinct in this period; only two instances are attested in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century texts.<sup>6</sup>

Next, look at the following quantitative data on demonstrative pronouns in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century southern/midlands texts (I cite the following data from Kondo (2005)):

(A) *SOUTHERN DIALECTS*

(i) *cmpolych.m3* (CMPOLYCH, VI, 3.3 – CMPOLYCH, VI, 29.196)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 134)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
cmpolych.m3	*	<i>þe</i> (127), <i>the</i> (7) (Nominative(27/134))

(ii) *cmntest.m3* (CMNTEST, I, 1.4 – CMNTEST, III, 20.224)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 100)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
cmntest.m3	*	<i>the</i> (100) (Nominative(19/100))

(iii) *cmpurvey.m3* (CMPURVEY, I, 1.3 – CMPURVEY, I, 2.91)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 105)

	INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES	UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES
cmpurvey.m3	*	<i>the</i> (105) (Nominative(31/105))

<sup>6</sup> In this paper, I follow Miyashita (2004) and Kondo (2005) in assuming that personal pronouns in this period lost their clitic status.

**(B) WEST MIDLANDS DIALECTS**

(iv) *cmedvern.m3* (CMEDVERN, 240.3 – CMEDVERN, 243.191)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 74)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmedvern.m3</i>	*	<i>þe</i> (74) (Nominative(12/74))

(v) *cmbrut.m3* (CMBRUT3, 1.3 – CMBRUT3, 8.193)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 95)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmbrut.m3</i>	*	<i>þe</i> (86), <i>the</i> (9) (Nominative(19/95))

**(C) EAST MIDLANDS DIALECTS**

(vi) *cmearlps.m2* (CMEARLPS, 1.5 – CMERRLPS, 8.314)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 79)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmearlps.m2</i>	*	<i>þe</i> (79) (Nominative(14/79))

(vii) *cmastro.m3* (CMASTRO, 662.C1.3 – CMASTRO, 664.C2.65)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 100)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmastro.m3</i>	*	<i>the</i> (100) (Nominative(16/100))

(viii) *cmboeth.m3* (CMBOETH, 429.C1.5 – CMBOETH, 436.C1.299)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 90)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmboeth.m3</i>	*	<i>the</i> (90) (Nominative(20/90))

(ix) *cmctmeli.m3* (CMCTMELI, 217.C1b.3 – CMCTMELI, 221.C2.161)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 67)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmctmeli.m3</i>	*	<i>the</i> (67) (Nominative(21/67))

(x) *cmctpars.m3* (CMCTPARS, 288.C1b.3 – CMCTPARS, 291.C2.129)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 100)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmctpars.m3</i>	*	<i>the</i> (100) (Nominative(16/100))

(xi) *cmwycser.m3* (CMWYCSE, 223.3 – CMWYCSE, 234.182)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 82)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmwycser.m3</i>	<i>þere</i> (2), <i>þer</i> (2)	<i>þe</i> (63), <i>the</i> (15) (Nominative(78/24))

(xii) *cmotest.m3* (CMOTEST, I, 1G.5 – CMOTEST, III, 1G.134)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 103)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>cmotest.m3</i>	*	<i>the</i> (103) (Nominative(30/103))

(xiii) *cmcloud.m3* (CMCLOUD, 13.4 – CMCLOUD, 24.171)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 117)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
cmcloud.m3	*	<i>þe</i> (117) (Nominative(14/117))

(xiv) *cmmandev.m3* (CMMANDEV, 1.1 – CMMANDEV, 5.71)

(The total number of demonstratives as a definite article = 100)

	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>	<b>UNINFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
cmmandev.m3	*	<i>the</i> (100) (Nominative(6/100))

As you can see from these quantitative data, inflected demonstratives are hardly used in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century southern/midlands texts (except for one text, *CMWYCSE*R). Instead, the uninflected form ‘*the*’ or ‘*þe*’ is used as a definite article throughout these texts.

Based on the data in this section, then, we reach the following result in regard to Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century southern/midlands texts:<sup>7</sup>

TABLE 4: *PERCENTAGES OF WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS AND INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES IN THE LATE 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTHERN/MIDLANDS DIALECTS*

	<b>WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS</b>	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
LME (late 14 <sup>th</sup> century Southern Midlands)	<b>2/530 (0.4%)</b>	<b>5/1256 (0.4%)</b>

### 2.3. Generalizations Deduced from the Data in Section 2.1 and 2.2.

In this section, I summarize the discussions in section 2.1 and 2.2, and draw generalizations on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in Middle English.

To begin with, look at the following table which indicates percentages of Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in Middle English (cf. Table 3 and 4):

TABLE 5: *PERCENTAGES OF WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS AND INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES IN MIDDLE ENGLISH*

	<b>WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS</b>	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
EME (South Midlands/Kentish)	<b>148/357 (41%)</b>	<b>126/591 (21%)</b>
LME (late 14 <sup>th</sup> century Southern Midlands)	<b>2/530 (0.4%)</b>	<b>5/1256 (0.4%)</b>
LME (late 15 <sup>th</sup> century Southern Midlands)	<b>0/691 (0%)</b>	<b>0/1500 (0%)</b>

This table shows the total percentages of Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns observed in South Midlands/Kentish dialects in EME and Southern Midlands dialects in LME. According to this table, both Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns are productive in EME, while they are not in LME. Thus, from Table 5 we reach the following generalization on the relation between Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the English language:

- (1) In EME (South Midlands/Kentish dialects) and LME (Midlands/Southern dialects), a correlation is observed between the percentage of Wackernagel objects and that of inflected demonstrative pronouns.

<sup>7</sup> In this paper, I omit the data in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century Southern Midlands, because there is no instance of Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in this period.

As (1) says, the productivity of Wackernagel objects and the percentage of inflected demonstratives are correlated with each other in the ME period.

Next look at the following table that shows the ratio of Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in each of the texts in South Midlands/Kentish dialects in EME (cf. the data in section 2.1):

TABLE 6: *PERCENTAGES OF WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS AND INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES IN EACH OF THE MID-13<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTH MIDLANDS TEXTS*

	<b>WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS</b>	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>Southeast Midlands Dialects</i>		
cmvices1.m1	<b>45/83 (54%)</b>	<b>15/39 (38%)</b>
cmtrinit.mx1	<b>15/43 (35%)</b>	<b>16/70 (23%)</b>
<i>Southwest Midlands Dialects</i>		
cmlambx1.mx1	<b>16/36 (44%)</b>	<b>66/97 (68%)</b>
cmsawles.m1	<b>1/8 (12.5%)</b>	<b>3/81 (4%)</b>
cmhali.m1	<b>3/13 (23%)</b>	<b>6/79 (8%)</b>
cmkathe.m1	<b>4/16 (25%)</b>	<b>3/50 (6%)</b>
cmancriw.m1	<b>20/71 (28%)</b>	<b>6/93 (6%)</b>
<i>Kentish Dialects</i>		
cmayenbi.m2	<b>42/83 (51%)</b>	<b>11/82 (13%)</b>

From this table, we can see that the percentage of Wackernagel objects is high in those texts where that of inflected demonstrative pronouns is also high (at least, it is possible to say that if the ratio of Wackernagel objects is above 30%, that of inflected demonstrative pronouns is above 10%, or vice versa).

Furthermore, based on the data in section 2.2, we obtain the following result which shows the ratio of Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in each of the texts of the late 14<sup>th</sup> century Southern/Midlands dialects:

TABLE 7: *PERCENTAGES OF WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS AND INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES IN EACH OF THE LATE 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOUTHERN/MIDLANDS TEXTS*

	<b>WACKERNAGEL OBJECTS</b>	<b>INFLECTED DEMONSTRATIVES</b>
<i>Southern Dialects</i>		
cmpolych.m3	<b>0/112 (0%)</b>	<b>0/134 (0%)</b>
cmntest.m3	<b>0/16 (0%)</b>	<b>0/100 (0%)</b>
cmpurvey.m3	<b>0/17 (0%)</b>	<b>0/105 (0%)</b>
<i>West Midlands Dialects</i>		
cmedvern.m3	<b>0/27 (0%)</b>	<b>0/74 (0%)</b>
cmbrut.m3	<b>2/82 (2%)</b>	<b>0/95 (0%)</b>
<i>East Midlands Dialects</i>		
cmearlps.m2	<b>0/19 (0%)</b>	<b>0/79 (0%)</b>
cmctpars.m3	<b>0/40 (0%)</b>	<b>0/100 (0%)</b>
cmctmeli.m3	<b>0/56 (0%)</b>	<b>0/90 (0%)</b>
cmboeth.m3	<b>0/12 (0%)</b>	<b>0/67 (0%)</b>
cmastro.m3	<b>0/1 (0%)</b>	<b>0/100 (0%)</b>
cmwycser.m3	<b>0/50 (0%)</b>	<b>4/82 (5%)</b>
cmotest.m3	<b>0/9 (0%)</b>	<b>0/103 (0%)</b>
cmcloud.m3	<b>0/27 (0%)</b>	<b>0/117 (0%)</b>
cmmandev.m3	<b>0/62 (0%)</b>	<b>0/100 (0%)</b>

Table 7 indicates that both Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns are extinct in each of the texts (except for two texts, *cmbrut.m3* and *cmwycser.m3*).

From Table 6 and Table 7, then, we get to the following generalization on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the history of English:

- (2) In each of the texts of EME (South Midlands/Kentish dialects) and LME (Midlands/Southern dialects), a correlation is also observed between the percentage of Wackernagel objects and that of inflected demonstrative pronouns.

According to (2), a correlation holds between Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns, even in each of the texts treated in Kondo (2005, 2006).

In this section, we have observed the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the ME period, and have reached the generalizations in (1) and (2). In the next section, then, to capture the correlations described in (1) and (2) I review the work by Watanabe (2006).

### 3. The Work by Watanabe (2006)

In this section, citing Watanabe (2006) I take up four grammatical options in OE which are considered to involve an agreement with D.

The first phenomenon to be considered is the indeterminate system in OE. As the following paradigm shows, there exists an indeterminate system of the Japanese type in this period:

(3)	<i>OE INDETERMINATE SYSTEM</i>					
	<b>WH</b>	<b>SOME/ANY</b>	<b>SOME</b>	<b>EVERY</b>	<b>EVERY/ANY</b>	
	<i>hwa</i>	<i>(a)hwa</i>	<i>nathwa</i>	<i>æghwa</i>	<i>gehwa</i>	
	<i>hwæt</i>	<i>(a)hwæt</i>	<i>nathwæt</i>	<i>æghwæt</i>	<i>gehwæt</i>	(Watanabe (2006))

A couple of examples are given in (4):

- (4) a. Hi eodon þa secende ealle endemes to þam wuda,  
 they went then seeking all together to the forest  
 secende **gehwær** geond þyfelas and bremelas  
 seeking everywhere through bushes and brambles  
 gif hi **a-hwær** mihton gemeton þæt heafod.  
 if they anywhere might find the head  
 (Ælfric, *Lives of Saints* XXXII.142-144; (Watanabe (2006))
- b. ác hi wát **gehwa**  
 but they knows everyone  
 (Ælfric, *Lives of Saints* XXXII.249; (Watanabe (2006))

Following Watanabe (2004a, b), if we assume that *ge-* and *a-* in (4a-b) occupy the D position, and further that they enter into agreement with the wh-part, then the following agreement relation holds:

- (5) [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>D</sub> ge] hwær] ]  
 \_\_\_\_\_ AGREE

It will be possible to assume that quantificational feature is involved in the agreement relation in (5), since indeterminates have the quantificational force such as universal or existential. Furthermore, if we take account of the fact that it is the individual particles that determine such quantificational force, then it follows that the feature of particles is interpretable, whereas that of the indeterminate is uninterpretable.



The second phenomenon to be considered is wh-based free relatives, which are illustrated below:

- (6) a. Fæder and moder moton heora bearn to **swa hwylcum cræfte** gedon  
 father and mother must their child to so which<sub>dat</sub> occupation put  
 swa him leofost byð  
 as him liefest is  
 ‘Father and mother must put their child to whatever occupation is most pleasing to him.’  
 (*Homilies of Ælfric* (Pope), XIX. 54; (Allen 1980a, b), (Watanabe (2006)))
- b. Ond on **swa hwelcre stowe swa** min þrowung awriten ys ond man þa mærsge,  
 And in so which<sub>dat</sub> place as my passion written is and one it celebrates  
 afyrr þu, drihten, from þære stowe blindness  
 drive you Lord from that place blindness  
 ‘And whatever place my passion is written in and is celebrated, drive, O Lord, blindness from that place.’  
 (*OE Martyrology*, p.116.8; (Allen 1980a, b), (Watanabe (2006)))

Assuming that these constructions represent part of the indeterminate system in OE and that the first *swa* in (6a,b) has the same status as *ge-* or *a-* in (4), the following agreement relation holds:

- (7) [DP [D *swa*] WH ... ]  
 └──┬──┘ AGREE

Considered in this manner, it is possible to take that some kind of agreement with D is involved in the form of *swa WH swa TP*.

The third phenomenon is such demonstrative pronouns that are used as a relative pronoun, as shown below:

- (8) a. ond het getimbrian medomlic hus, on **þæt** nænig wer næfde ingang  
 and ordered to-build small house in which no man not-had admittance  
 ‘and ordered a small house built, in which no man had admittance’  
 (*OE Martyrology*, p.106.5; (Allen 1980b), (Watanabe (2006)))
- b. ac gif we asmeagaþ þa eadmodlican dæda **þa** þe he worhte, þonne ne  
 but if we consider those humble deeds which that he wrought then not  
 þincþ us þæt nan wundor  
 seems us that no wonder  
 ‘But if we consider the humble deeds which he wrought, that will seem no wonder to us.’  
 (*Blickling Homilies*, p.33; Allen (1980a), (Watanabe (2006)))

The demonstrative pronouns *þæt* in (8a) and *þa* in (8b) are used as a relative pronoun. If we speculate that these demonstratives have an uninterpretable definiteness feature, they need to enter into agreement relation with a goal to value it. Then, a suitable candidate for the goal is the D-head associated with the head NP:<sup>8</sup>

- (9) [DP D NP [CP dem C TP]]  
 └──┬──┘ AGREE

In (9) the definiteness feature in D is interpretable, while that of the demonstrative is uninterpretable. After they enter into agreement relation, then, the feature of the demonstrative is valued.

<sup>8</sup> In case a head NP is not definite as in (8a), a demonstrative pronoun is supposed to agree with specificity feature in the D-head.

The last phenomenon is the distinction between strong/weak adjectival inflection in OE. In OE, adjectives are inflected not only according to gender, number and case of a head noun, but according to the presence/absence of a demonstrative, possessive, or noun genitive: if an adjective is used after a demonstrative, possessive, or noun genitive, it takes the weak form, whereas it takes the strong form otherwise. The paradigm of the weak and strong forms for the adjective *til* ‘good’ is given below:

(10) STRONG/WEAK ADJECTIVAL DECLENSION: PARADIGM FOR *til* ‘good’

a. WEAK DECLENSION

	SG.			PL.
	MAS.	NEU.	FEM.	
NOM.	tila	tile	tile	tilan
ACC.	tilan	tile	tilan	tilan
GEN.	tilan	tilan	tilan	tilra, -ena
DAT.	tilan	tilan	tilan	tilum

b. STRONG DECLENSION

	SG.			PL.			
	MAS.	NEU.	FEM.	MAS.	NEU.	FEM.	
NOM.	til	til	tilu	tile	tilu	tile, -a	
ACC.	tilne	til	tile	tile	tilu	tile, -a	
GEN.	tiles	tiles	tilre	tilra	tilra	tilra	
DAT.	tilum	tilum	tilre	tilum	tilum	tilum	(Watanabe (2006))

And an example of the weak form is illustrated below:

- (11) þone halgan lichaman  
 that<sub>m.sg.acc</sub> holy body (Ælfric, *Lives of Saints* XXXII.174-175; (Watanabe (2006)))

In this way, the choice between weak and strong adjectival inflection in OE is sensitive to definiteness.

In this section, we have observed four grammatical options in OE which can be considered to involve an agreement relation with D. In the next section, then, I will investigate the question when these options had disappeared and what had brought about these changes in the English language. And after that, I slightly revise the proposal made in Kondo (2005).

#### 4. Changes in the Transition from OE to ME

Based on Watanabe (2006), I summarize the time of disappearance of the four grammatical options discussed in section 3:<sup>9</sup>

- (a) Loss of the indeterminate system (Kahlas-Tarkka (1987, 1994), Rissanen (1997))  
 ⇒ by the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century
- (b) Loss of the first *swa* in free relatives (Allen (1980a))  
 ⇒ by the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century
- (c) Loss of the demonstrative relative pronouns (Allen (1980a), Fischer (1992))  
 ⇒ by the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century
- (d) Loss of strong/weak adjectival inflection (Minkova (1991))  
 ⇒ by the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century

<sup>9</sup> Though not taken up in this paper, the creation of reflexive pronouns in English also took place at about the same time in EME (cf. Keenan (2003)).

From (a)-(d), we can say that all the four phenomena observed in section 3 had disappeared by EME. So, it will be reasonable to consider that some change had occurred in the transition from OE to ME. On the assumption that all these grammatical options involve some kind of agreement with D, we can hypothesize as follows with respect to the timing of a parametric shift in the D-system in the history of English:

(12) The value of the parameter ‘Agreeing-D’ had been shifted in the transition from OE to ME.

According to (12), the parameter resetting had occurred in the transition from OE to ME, and this had caused the disappearance of the four grammatical options observed in section 3.

Kondo (2005), on the other hand, proposes that it is in the transition from EME to LME that the parameter resetting had occurred:

(13) The value of the parameter ‘Agreeing-D’ had been switched in the transition from EME to LME.

(Kondo (2005))

In view of the discussions in section 2 and 3, however, the hypothesis in (12) is more adequate than that in (13). Therefore, in future research I will adopt (12) instead of (13), to analyze the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in EME presented in this paper.

## 5. Summary

In this paper, I have made an observation of the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns in the history of English, and have shown a correlation holding between them. After that, citing the work by Watanabe (2006), I have briefly pointed the direction in which my future research work will proceed. In section 1, we have observed the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstratives in the history of English, and have obtained the generalizations depicted in (1) and (2). According to these generalizations, the productivity of Wackernagel objects and the percentage of inflected demonstratives are correlated with each other. To account for these correlations in the Minimalist framework, then, I have taken up the work by Watanabe. He proposes that in OE there are some grammatical options which indicate the agreeing nature of D, in addition to an indeterminate system of the Japanese type, and hence that the parameter of the ‘Agreeing-D’ is set on in this period. For instance, the strong/weak adjectival inflection and the demonstrative relative pronouns are contained in them. Interestingly enough, these grammatical options in OE had been lost at about the same time in EME, as shown in section 4. Considering these points, then, we have reached the hypothesis in (12), according to which the value of the parameter ‘Agreeing-D’ had been shifted in the transition from OE to ME. This hypothesis is different from that in Kondo (2005), where it is proposed that the parametric change had occurred in the transition from EME to LME. The discussions in section 2 and 3, however, indicate that the hypothesis in (12) is more valid than that in Kondo (2005), so I have revised the proposal made in Kondo (2005) and have determined to adopt the former. Thus, in future research I will attempt to provide an explanation for the data on Wackernagel objects and inflected demonstrative pronouns from this new perspective.

## References

- Allen, Cynthia (1980a) *Topics in Diachronic English Syntax*, Garland, New York.  
Allen, Cynthia (1980b) “Movement and Deletion in Old English,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 261-323.  
Brugè, Laura (2002) “The Positions of Demonstratives in the Extended Nominal Projections,” *Functional Structure in DP and IP*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque, 15-53, Oxford University Press, Oxford.  
Campbell, Alistair (1959) *Old English Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.  
Einenkel, Eugen (1978) *The Life of Saint Katherine, edited from the Royal MS. 17 A. xxvii., &c, with its Latin*

- original from the Cotton MS. *Caligula, A. viii., &c., with the notes and glossary of Dr. Eugen Einenkel, M.A.*, (EETS OS 80), ed. by N. Trübner, Ludgate Hill.
- Fischer, Olga (1992) "Syntax," *The Cambridge History of the English Language vol. II 1066-1746*, ed. by Norman Blake, 207-408, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Haeberli, Eric (2002) "Observations on the Loss of Verb Second in the History of English," *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax: Proceedings from the 15<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. by C. Jan-Wouter Zwart & Werner Abraham, 245-272, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Kahlas-Tarkka, Leena (1987) *The Uses and Shades of Meaning of Words for every and each in Old English*, Société Néophilologique, Helsinki.
- Kahlas-Tarkka, Leena (1994) "What does the jungle of Middle English manuscripts tell us?: On ME words for 'every' and 'each' with special reference to their many variants," *English historical linguistics 1992*, ed. by Francisco Fernández, Miguel Fuster and Juan José Calvo, 305-315, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Keenan, Edward (2003) "Explaining the Creation of Reflexive Pronouns in English," *Studies in the history of the English language: a millennial perspective*, ed. by Donka Minkova & Robert Stockwell, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1987) *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Kondo, Norihiko (2005) "A Change in the D-system in the History of English," MA Thesis, University of Tokyo.
- Kondo, Norihiko (2006) "The Parameter 'Agreeing-D' and Unification of Three Changes in the D-system in the History of English," *Linguistic Research* 22, 1-28, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association.
- Kroch, Anthony S. & 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 S. & Ann Taylor (2000) *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, 2nd edition, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kroch, Anthony S., Ann Taylor & Donald Ringe (2000) "The Middle English Verb-Second Constraint: A Case Study in Language Contact and Language Change," *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, ed. by Susan C. Herring, Pieter van Reenen & Lene Schøsler, 353-391, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Lass, Roger (1992) "Phonology and morphology," *The Cambridge History of the English Language, vol. II*, ed. by Norman Blake, 23-155, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Minkova, Donka (1991) *The History of Final Vowels in English*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1985) *Old English Syntax*, Clarendon Press.
- Miyashita, Harumasa (2004) "Cliticization in the History of English: Loss of the Subject Position Asymmetry and the Wackernagel Pronominal Object," *Linguistic Research* 20, 103-154, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association.
- Philippi, Julia (1997) "The Rise of the Article in the Germanic Languages," *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent, 62-93, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 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.
- Rissanen, Matti (1997) "Whatever happened to the Middle English indefinite pronouns?," *Studies in Middle English linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 513-529, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Watanabe, Akira (2004a) "Indeterminates and Agreeing D," *Generative Grammar in a Broader Perspective*, ed. by Hang-Jin Yoon, 405-429, Hankook.
- Watanabe, Akira (2004b) "Indeterminates and Determiners," *Proceedings of the Workshop on Atlantic Formal Linguistics I (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 46)*, ed. by Aniko Csirmaz, Youngjoo Lee and Mary Ann Walter, 390-405, MITWPL.
- Watanabe, Akira (2006) "A Parametric Shift in the D-system in Early Middle English: Relativization, Articles, Adjectival Inflection, and Indeterminates," Ms., University of Tokyo.