Some Observations on Object-Verb Order in 15th Century English[*]

Harumasa Miyashita

University of Tokyo

harumasa@attglobal.net

1. Introduction

Recent studies on object-verb (henceforth, OV) order show that it was on the decline in quality as well as in quantity since the 15th century. That is, while it was declining in number, the object types and the syntactic environments exhibiting the OV order were also restricted since the 15th century. On the basis of previous studies, Miyashita (2000) summarizes the qualitative decline of OV order in Late Middle English and Early Modern English (henceforth, LME and EModE, respectively), which is illustrated by the following table:[1]

TABLE 1 --- SUMMARY OF THE QUALITATIVE DECLINE OF OV ORDER

	OBJECT TYPES	SYNTACTIC ENVIRONMENTS
14TH CENTURY	any object	anywhere
15TH CENTURY	negated/quantified object topicalized object (any object) pronominal object	Aux Obj V relative/coordinate clause w/ $\emptyset_{Subj}$ anywhere
16TH CENTURY	negated object topicalized object (any object) pronominal object	Aux Obj V relative/coordinate clause w/ $\emptyset_{Subj}$ anywhere
17TH CENTURY	pronominal object	anywhere

(Miyashita (2000: 181) with slight modification)

[1] In Table 1 and in what follows, the notation 'Aux' is understood to be referring to auxiliary or modal verbs, and 'V' to non-finite verbs or past participles. In the absence of an auxiliary or modal verb, 'V' refers to finite verbs. The notation '$\emptyset_{Subj}$' is understood to be referring to an empty subject.

The issue addressed by Miyashita (2000) is that no previous study makes a thorough observation.[2] For instance, Ingham (2000), Moerenhout & Wurff (2000) and Koma (2001), investigating the *Paston Letters* written in the 15th century, observe that the OV order was mainly found with a negated object (henceforth, Neg-Obj), and that this was possible only in the Aux-Obj-V sequence. Conducting a survey on various texts in LME, Wurff (1999) and Fischer et al. (2000) also maintain that the OV order in the 15th century was restricted to the Neg-Obj and quantified object (henceforth, Q-Obj) in the Aux-Obj-V sequence and the topicalized object (henceforth, Top-Obj) in the Obj-$\emptyset_{Subj}$-(Aux)-V sequence. Foster & Wurff (1995) indicate, however, that in the Aux-Obj-V sequence, the OV order in LME favors pronominal objects including personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns (henceforth, Pprn-Obj and Dprn-Obj, respectively).[3] Obviously, these observations must be clarified, and further investigations into the OV order are required.

Thus, this paper is a sequel to Miyashita (2000), and as preliminary research, its aim is to re-investigate the OV order in 15th century English and present its facts. Specifically, this paper conducts a survey on the OV order in the texts from M4 (1420-1500) and MX4 (composition date unknown; manuscript date 1420-1500) by using the second edition of *the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (Kroch & Taylor (2000); henceforth, PPCME2). Thereby it is shown that the OV order in the 15th century is attested with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj as well as with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj/Top-Obj. It is also shown that some instances of the 15th century OV order with a full nominal object (henceforth, FN-Obj) are, in fact, either synthetic compounds or instances of other OV patterns.

This paper is organized as follows: §2 presents the result of my survey on the 15th century OV order; §3 investigate the OV patterns frequently attested with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj/Neg-Obj/Q-Obj; §4 briefly discusses the OV order with an FN-Obj; §5 concludes this paper.[4]

---

[2] Miyashita (2000) concludes that the OV order with a negated/quantified/topicalized object was already non-existent in the 16th century, based on Wurff (1999). Here, however, I follow Fischer et al. (2000) in assuming that the OV order with a negated/topicalized object was still found in the 16th century. According to Wurff & Foster (1997), moreover, the OV order with a pronominal object was, in fact, restricted to the Aux-Obj-V sequence in EModE. As will be shown below, the syntactic environment of the OV order with a pronominal object was also restricted.

[3] In Foster & Wurff (1997), they attribute the facts observed in Foster & Wurff (1995) to discourse-related factors such as givenness, specificity and definiteness.

[4] Although I present below the results of our survey on the OV order with a Top-Obj, we will abstract away from a detailed discussion. This is because the Top-Obj, in fact, can be any nominal type. That is, any type of nominal object such as a Pprn-Obj, an FN-Obj or a Neg-Obj can undergo Topicalization. Since we maintain the view that the OV order in 15th century English was on the decline in quality as well as in quantity, the discussion on the OV order with a Top-Obj may complicate the rest of the argument of this paper. Thus, along the line of previous studies (Fischer et al. (2000) and Wurff (1999)), we simply speculate here that the OV order with a Top-Obj can be analyzed as Topicalization in the presence of an empty subject.

2. OV Facts in M4 and MX4

By using the second edition of PPCME2, I have conducted a survey on the OV order in the texts from M4 and MX4.[5] I have found 206 OV tokens out of 20099 sentences searched.[6] The following tables show the number of OV tokens sorted by texts:

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%)

As can be seen in Table 2, the total OV tokens found (i.e. 206) constitute only 1.02% of the total sentences searched (i.e. 20099). This means that the OV order in 15th century English was really on the decline in number (cf. Fries (1940)). But this is not the whole story. The OV order in 15th century English was declining in quality as well as quantity. This is illustrated by the following table:

---

[5] The following are the texts I have investigated: from M4, *Aelred of Rivaulx's De Institutione Inclusarum in Bodley ms.* (cmaelr4), *Capgrave's Chronicle* (cmcapchr), *Capgrave's Sermon* (cmcapser), *Life of St. Edmund* (cmedmund), *Fitzjames' Sermo die Lune* (cmfitzja), *Gregory's Chronicle* (cmgregor), *In Die Innocencium* (cminnoce), *The Book of Margery Kempe* (cmkempe), *Malory's Morte Darthur* (cmmalory), *Caxton's History of Reynard the Fox* (cmreynar), *The Commonplace Book of Robert Reynes* (cmreynes), and *The Siege of Jerusalem* (cmsiege); from MX4, *The 'Liber de Diversis Medicinis' in Thornton ms.* (cmthorn). For reference, I indicate which dialect these texts belong to: *The 'Liber de Diversis Medicinis' in Thornton ms.* (cmthorn) is written in the northern dialect; *Malory's Morte Darthur* (cmmalory) and *The Siege of Jerusalem* (cmsiege) are written in the West Midland dialect; *Gregory's Chronicle* (cmgregor) is written in the southern dialect; the rest of the texts are written in the East Midland dialect. Note that there is no major dialectal difference with respect to OV order (contra the dialectical difference in V2 pointed out by Kroch & Taylor (1997) and subsequently by Haeberli (2000)). See Table 2.

[6] Although some instances of the so-called impersonal constructions are hit as OV tokens, I have excluded them from my calculation. This is because the impersonal constructions exhibit syntactic behavior different from the real OV patterns. For example, the nominal preceding the verb is almost always in the dative form in impersonal constructions, whereas this is not the case in real OV patterns.

TABLE 3 --- OBJECT TYPES INVOLVED IN THE ATTESTED OV ORDER

	FN-OBJ	PPRN-OBJ	DPRN-OBJ	NEG-OBJ	Q-OBJ	TOP-OBJ	TOTAL
cmaelr4	0	1	0	3	1	1	6
cmcapchr	1	1	0	3	1	4	10
cmcapser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
cmedmund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
cmfitzja	1	1	2	1	2	2	9
cmgregor	1	1	1	0	1	2	6
cminnoce	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
cmkempe	12	5	0	20	3	16	56
cmmalory	2	9	0	3	1	7	22
cmreynar	3	2	2	2	0	3	12
cmreynes	6	9	1	4	0	7	27
cmsiege	2	45	3	0	0	5	55
cmthorn	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
TOTAL	29	74	9	36	9	49	206

Aside from the FN-Obj and Top-Obj, the OV order is mainly attested with a Neg-Obj (17.48% of the total OV tokens) on the one hand and with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj (40.29% of the total OV tokens) on the other.[7] If we exclude the number of the OV tokens involving the Top-Obj from the total OV tokens found, the ratio of the OV tokens with a Neg-Obj and with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj will amount to 22.93% (i.e. 36 ÷ (206 – 49) × 100) and 52.87% (i.e. (74 + 9) ÷ (206 – 49) × 100), respectively. Thus, we can conclude from Table 3 that aside from the FN-Obj and abstracting away the Top-Obj, the OV order in 15th century English was dominant with the Neg-Obj and Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj. As mentioned in footnote 7, we will shortly get back to the OV order with an FN-Obj. But before that, we will turn to the characteristics of the OV order with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj/Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj in the next section.

3. Frequent OV Patterns with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj/Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj

According to Wurff (1999), Fischer et al. (2000), Ingham (2000), Moerenhout & Wurff (2000) and Koma (2001), the Neg-Obj and Q-Obj are restricted to the Aux-Obj-V sequence when they are found in the OV order. This pattern is indeed attested in PPCME2, and it is the most dominant pattern among the OV tokens with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj found in M4 and MX4. 28 instances out of the 36 OV tokens involving the Neg-Obj and the 7 instances out of the 9 OV tokens involving the Q-Obj are in the Aux-Obj-V sequence. The following are the example sentences in question:[8]

---

[7] We will get back to the OV order with an FN-Obj in §4. For the OV order with a Top-Obj, see footnote 4.
[8] Throughout this paper, the example sentences are represented with the (grammatical) objects boldfaced, lexical verbs italicized, and auxiliary/modal verbs underlined when they are present.

(1) AUX-OBJ-V ORDER WITH A NEG-OBJ

    a. Reynart the theef had grete enuye by cause they were so sure that he <u>cowde</u> **none** *gete*
       of them   (CMREYNAR, 11.154)

    b. & þei seyden þei woldyn han a-wey hyr mayden fro hir þat sche <u>xuld</u> **no strumpet** *be* in
       hyr cumpany.   (CMKEMPE, 62.1382)

(2) AUX-OBJ-V ORDER WITH A Q-OBJ

    a. He cleped þe men þat <u>myte</u> **moost** *doo* in þe eleccion,   (CMCAPCHR, 91.1806)

    b. I <u>may</u> **any-thyng** *suffyr* for hys lofe,   (CMKEMPE, 123.2856)

It should be emphasized here that the OV order with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj in the Aux-Obj-V sequence is merely a 'dominant' pattern, and it is not the case that all of the OV tokens with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj are in this sequence. For instance, an Obj-V sequence is attested with a Q-Obj, as shown in (3), although this is a 'minority' pattern. Only 1 instance out of the 9 OV tokens involving the Q-Obj is attested in this pattern.

(3) OBJ-V ORDER WITH A Q-OBJ

    Cirus & Darius **many grete thynges** *restoryd* to the seconde reedifycacyon as it is declaryd
    the fyrste boke of Esdre the fyrste & syxte chapytours   (CMFITZJA, A6R.84)

With respect to the Neg-Obj, Obj-Aux-V and Obj-V sequences are also attested, as exemplified in (4) and (5), respectively. Again they are minority patterns. Only 1 instance out of the 36 OV tokens involving the Neg-Obj is attested in the Obj-Aux-V sequence, and also only 1 is attested in the Obj-V sequence.

(4) OBJ-AUX-V ORDER WITH A NEG-OBJ

    And, as þei wer in þe chirche, þe forseyd creatur, desiryng teerys of deuocyon, **non** <u>myth</u>
    purchasyn at þat tyme   (CMKEMPE, 226.3680)

(5) OBJ-V ORDER WITH A NEG-OBJ

    ne I bid þe **no-thyng** *do* but þat whech is worshep to God & profyte to thy sowle ȝyf þu
    wilt do þer-aftyr,   (CMKEMPE, 76.1714)

The OV order with a Neg-Obj is also attested in infinitives and present participle/gerunds, namely in Obj-*to*-V and Obj-V-*ing* sequences, as exemplified in (6) and (7), respectively. They are also minority patterns. 4 instances out of the 36 OV tokens involving the Neg-Obj are attested in the Obj-*to*-V sequence, and 2 instances are attested in the Obj-V-*ing* sequence.

(6) OBJ-*TO*-V ORDER WITH A NEG-OBJ

for it longyth to þe wyfe to be wyth hir husbond & **no very joy** to *han* tyl sche come to hys presens. (CMKEMPE, 31.700)

(7) OBJ-V-*ING* ORDER WITH A NEG-OBJ

& euyr sche thankyd God of alle, **no-thyng** *desyryng* but mercy and forȝefnes of synne.

(CMKEMPE, 13.255)

Thus, we can conclude that the OV order with a Neg-Obj/Q-Obj is fairly restricted to the Aux-Obj-V sequence, and that the Neg-Obj and Q-Obj in the 15th century, when found in the OV order, have a rather fixed position. The minority patterns exemplified by (3)-(7) need an explanation, though. Concerning (3) and (5), both of which are embedded clauses, the Obj-V sequence may be due to the absence of V2; it is well-known that V2 in earlier English is restricted to the root clause. The Obj-Aux-V sequence in (4) is also attributable to the absence of V2, which saw a sharp decline in the end of the 14th century and in the beginning of the 15th century (cf. Fischer et al. (2000)): hence, V2 can be absent from the 15th century root clause. We will get back to the Obj-V-*ing* sequence when we consider the OV order with an FN-Obj in the next section. The Obj-*to*-V sequence remains as a puzzle.

Along with the number of OV tokens involving the other object types, the following table shows the number of the attested OV tokens involving the Neg-Obj/Q-Obj sorted by syntactic environment:

TABLE 4 --- SYNTACTIC ENVIRONMENTS OF THE ATTESTED OV ORDER

	AUX OBJ V	OBJ AUX V	OBJ V	OBJ *TO* V	OBJ V-*ING*	TOTAL
FN-OBJ	10	3	3	2	11	29
PPRN-OBJ	20	0	40	9	5	74
DPRN-OBJ	1	1	5	2	0	9
NEG-OBJ	28	1	1	4	2	36
Q-OBJ	7	0	1	0	1	9
TOP-OBJ	0	8	41	0	0	49
TOTAL	66	13	91	17	19	206

Table 4 also includes the syntactic environments for the OV order with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj, which is also the dominant object type in the 15th century OV order. Unlike the Neg-Obj/Q-Obj facts, the Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj seems to favor the Obj-V sequence. 40 instances out of the 74 OV tokens involving the Pprn-Obj are attested in the Obj-V sequence, and 5 instances out of the 9 OV tokens involving the Dprn-Obj are attested in this sequence. The following are relevant example sentences:

(8) OBJ-V ORDER WITH A PPRN-OBJ

    a. and I mekely **hit** *kyssyd* and allsoo þe heme of þe clothe þat he werryd.

                                                  (CMSIEGE, 78.225)

    b. but wyth a knyfe þat he borrowyd of his kepper to pare wyth a peyr he **hymeselfweth**
       slowe.   (CMSIEGE, 90.647)

(9) OBJ-V ORDER WITH A DPRN-OBJ

    a. When Archeles **þis** *herd,* he slowe hymeselfe wyth his ovn sorde   (CMSIEGE, 87.540)

    b. The apostle **this** *declareth* to the Hebreos the ix chapytre.   (CMFITZJA, A5V.83)

Out of the 9 OV tokens involving the Dprn-Obj, 1 instance of the Aux-Obj-V sequence, 1 instance of the Obj-Aux-V sequence and 2 instances of the Obj-*to*-V sequence are attested, as exemplified in (10), (11) and (12), respectively. They are obviously minority patterns.

(10) AUX-OBJ-V ORDER WITH A DPRN-OBJ

    knelyng, he <u>schall</u> **this** *seyn:*   (CMREYNES, 145.62)

(11) OBJ-AUX-V ORDER WITH A DPRN-OBJ

    but what wronge there was noo man **that** <u>darste</u> *say,*   (CMGREGOR, 198.1567)

(12) OBJ-*TO*-V ORDER WITH A DPRN-OBJ

    The foxe sayde, what lyef neuew, Who that wyl goo thurgh the world **this** to *here,* and
    that to *see,* and **that other** to *telle,* truly it may not clerly be done. (CMREYNAR, 60.660)

With respect to the Pprn-Obj, there is another major pattern: an Aux-Obj-V sequence. 20 instances out of the 74 OV tokens involving the Pprn-Obj are attested in this sequence. As is obvious from Table 4 above, this is the second dominant pattern. The following examples exhibit this pattern:

(13) AUX-OBJ-V ORDER WITH A PPRN-OBJ

    a. and fro his enmyes I <u>schall</u> **hym** *defende.*   (CMREYNES, 266.509)

    b. I have herd typingis þat þe Emparovr <u>wyl</u> vs **al** *destrye.*   (CMSIEGE, 86.503)

Out of the 74 OV tokens involving the Pprn-Obj, 9 instances of the Obj-*to*-V sequence and 5 instances of the Obj-V-*ing* sequence are attested, which are exemplified in (14) and (15), respectively. They are again minority patterns.

(14) OBJ-*TO*-V ORDER WITH A PPRN-OBJ

    And as kynge Pharrov com **them** to <u>have</u> *slayn,* when he was in þe see wytt all his ost, þe
    wattur ouerhyllyd þem   (CMSIEGE, 70.9)

(15) Obj-V-*ING* Order with a Pprn-Obj

    For a lytil hastynes, **hym-self** *defendyng* as he myght not chesyn les þan he wold a be ded

    thorw pursute of hys enmys,   (CMKEMPE, 55.1246)

    We can conclude from (8)-(15) that the OV order with a Pprn-Obj is found primarily in either the Obj-V sequence or Aux-Obj-V sequence while the OV order with a Dprn-Obj is fairly found in the Obj-V sequence. The rest of the OV sequences are minority patterns.

    To sum up, we have presented in this section the syntactic environments where the OV tokens involving the Neg-Obj/Q-Obj and Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj are attested, and we have seen that the syntactic environments of the OV tokens involving these object types are fairly restricted. From Table 4, we can make the following generalization:

(16) The OV order in the 15th century is found primarily in the following sequences:

    i. Aux - Neg-Obj - V   /   Aux - Q-Obj - V

    ii. Aux - Pprn-Obj - V

    iii. Pprn-Obj - V   /   Dprn-Obj - V

The OV sequences in (16i-iii) are the norm in 15th century English, and the rest of the OV sequences are minority patterns. These minority patterns need to be explained, presumably in terms of (the absence of) V2 or some other instance of V-movement.

4.   Apparent OV Order with an FN-Obj

    In the course of discussion on the object types involved in the OV order, we have refrained from considering the FN-Obj. This is because some of the OV tokens involving the FN-Obj may not be real OV phenomena. Let us consider the dominant pattern, namely the Obj-V-*ing* sequence, which is exemplified as follows:

(17) Obj-V-*ING* Order with an FN-Obj

    a. Therfore, in the thre ages of oure lyfe lette us besye ourselfe to prayse God wyth pure childerne, amendynge our lyfe by dedes of penaunce and **vertuouse dedes** *usynge,* exhortynge you with the wordes of my tyme   (CMINNOCE, 9.139)

    b. In prayng, in thynkyng, in wepyng, in **pylgrimage** *goyng,* in fastyng, er in **any good word** *spekyng,* it is fully my wyl þat þow ȝeue Maystyr R. halfyndel to encres of hys meryte as yf he dede hem hys owyn self.   (CMKEMPE, 21.437)

Out of the 29 OV tokens involving the FN-Obj, 11 instances of this pattern are attested. Our

concern here is that *vertuouse dedes usynge* in (17a) and *pylgrimage goyng* in (17b) may be taken for instances of the synthetic compound. If so, the Obj-V-*ing* sequence in these sentences is not a syntactic phenomenon, but it is rather a morphological phenomenon. Hence, the Obj-V-*ing* sequence may have to be excluded from the real OV phenomena. The same is true of the Obj-V-*ing* sequence with other object types. Thus, *any good word spekyng* in (17b), which exemplifies the Obj-V-*ing* sequence with a Q-Obj, may be an instance of the synthetic compound, that is, an instance of the morphologically formed pattern.

Let us turn now to the second dominant pattern, namely the Aux-Obj-V sequence. Out of the 29 OV tokens involving the FN-Obj, 10 instances of this sequence are attested. All of the FN-Obj instances attested in this sequence are given below:

(18) AUX-OBJ-V ORDER WITH AN FN-OBJ

    a. We <u>may</u> no lengur **þe tovne** *kepe*.   (CMSIEGE, 87.531)

    b. Yf þou <u>can</u> **my son** *helpe*, I <u>wyl</u> þe *reywarde* ry3t wele,   (CMSIEGE, 88.580)

    c. and now thou <u>shalt</u> **hir love** *lose* for ever, and she thyne.   (CMMALORY, 183.2548)

    d. yet sayd he to me more that he <u>was</u> **a cloysterer or a closyd recluse** *becomen*

                                        (CMREYNAR, 11.164)

    e. 3e <u>scholn</u> **soth** *seyn* of alle maner articules þat schal be put to 3ow here of þe Kyngis

        behalfe and **trewe verdite** *make*.   (CMREYNES, 143.42)

    f. Of how many articules 3e <u>schulne</u> **soth** *seyn* þat here schall be put to 3ow bytwyxe

        partye and partye,   (CMREYNES, 144.47)

    g. & euyr it cam a-geyn so fast þat sche <u>myth</u> not **rest ne qwiet** *han* in hir mende

                                          (CMKEMPE, 226.3683)

    h. whan he <u>had</u> **ony proye** *brought* home or that he wiste that ony sought hym forhys

        mysdedes and trespaces   (CMREYNAR, 13.244)

    i. and sayde that He that <u>had</u> **Londyn** *for sake* Wolde no more to hem take,

                                          (CMGREGOR, 215.2014)

    j. and seide onto hem þat in þe ilde of Scicile he <u>had</u> **gret tresoure** *hid*,

                                          (CMCAPCHR, 94.1902)

Some of the example sentences in (18) may not be real OV tokens involving the FN-Obj. Consider (18g) first. In (18g), the object preceding the lexical verb is *rest ne qwiet*, which includes the negative coordinator *ne*. Hence, (18g) can be taken for an OV instance involving the Neg-Obj. Turn to (18h-j) next. The sentences in (18h-j) employ *have*, and hence they are ambiguous between causative and perfect interpretations. If these sentences are interpreted in the perfect aspect, they are real instances of the OV order. If they are

interpreted as causative, however, they are instances of the unmarked word order. The latter possibility cannot be denied. Finally, Osamu Koma (p.c.) pointed out to me that *soth* in (18e) and (18f) can be interpreted as an adverb, hence it may not be the object of the verb *seyn*. In that case, (18e) and (18f) cease to be the instances of OV order.

If we exclude the 11 instances of Obj-V-*ing* sequence and the 6 instances of the Aux-Obj-V sequence (i.e. (18e-j)) from the total OV tokens involving the FN-Obj, the resultant total OV tokens will be 12, and the OV order with an FN-Obj will be classified as exceptional. Consequently, we can still maintain the view that the OV order in 15th century English was on the decline in quality as well as in quantity.

Of course, the OV order with an FN-Obj, which is now considered as an exceptional case, also has minority syntactic patterns: Obj-Aux-V, Obj-V and Obj-to-V sequences. These sequences are really exceptional in that they are exceptions of an exceptional case. All of the attested instances of these sequences are given below:

(19) OBJ-AUX-V ORDER WITH AN FN-OBJ

    a. And the same Cecilie and her atturnyes **the forseyd tenement with alle londes, closes, groves, aldercarris, stardolys, ffendolys and russhedolys, and ffysshyng**, to the forseyd Robert Reynys, to his eyris and assynes, aȝens alle maner men <u>schall</u> *warantyn and defendyn*. (CMREYNES, 290.544)

    b. And the same Iohn Hardyngham, his eyris and assynes **the forseyd iii acris londe** to the forseyd Roberd Reynys, to his eyris and his assynes, aðens alle maner men <u>schall</u> *warantyn and defendyn*. (CMREYNES, 292.556)

    c. For as moche as Criste god & man, Many wyses **thys seconde temple** with his holy presence <u>dyde</u> *dedicate & inourne* (CMFITZJA, A6R.84)

(20) OBJ-V ORDER WITH AN FN-OBJ

    a. Besyde this woman dwelled an holy man to whom sche **this reuelacion** *schewed*, (CMREYNES, 266.511)

    b. and sche **þe same** *tolde* to her susteres, that were therof wol gladde. (CMREYNES, 267.527)

    c. and so Ulphuns and Brastias **othir two** *smote* downe (CMMALORY, 15.470)

(21) OBJ-*TO*-V ORDER WITH AN FN-OBJ

    a. The foxe sayde, what lyef neuew, Who that wyl goo thurgh the world **this** to *here*, and **that** to *see*, and **that other** to *telle*, truly it may not clerly be done. (CMREYNAR, 60.660)

    b. For **schrewyd wordys** to *suffyr* for þi lofe it hirte me ryth nowt, Lord, (CMKEMPE, 138.3230)

To sum up, we have seen in this section that some of the OV tokens involving the FN-Obj may not be real OV phenomena or may be reanalyzed as other OV patterns. Thus if we exclude them, the OV order with an FN-Obj cannot be the dominant pattern in 15th century English.

5. Conclusion

This paper has investigated the OV order in 15th century English, verifying the view that it was declining in quality as well as in quantity. We have seen that the OV tokens searched by the PPCME2 exhibit a clear tendency toward the OV order with a Neg-Obj/Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj. The Neg-Obj was fairly limited to the Aux-Obj-V sequence while the Dprn-Obj was limited to the Obj-V sequence. The Pprn-Obj was restricted to either the Aux-Obj-V sequence or the Obj-V sequence. We have also shown that some of the OV tokens involving the FN-Obj may not be real OV phenomena, and hence the OV order with an FN-Obj may not be the standard in the 15th century. Thus, the OV order in the 15th century was on the decline in quality as well, whereas the pre-15th-century OV order was found with various object types in various syntactic environments.

As is obvious from the data presented in this paper, Table 1 above, which is dependent on secondary sources, is partially inadequate (see also footnote 2). The 15th century OV order with a Pprn-Obj/Dprn-Obj is, in fact, limited to the Aux-Obj-V and Obj-V sequences. On the basis of Table 1, nevertheless, I gave an account on the qualitative decline of OV order in Miyashita (2001). Thus, I would like to recast my account given there with reference to the facts presented here.

References

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.

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

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) "Object Movement in the History of English," Talk given at the Monthly Meeting of Tokyo English Linguistic Circle held at Sophia University on December 15, 2001.

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

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.