THE ADVENT OF THE ENGLISH PREPOSITIONAL PASSIVE: A MULTI-FACETED MORPHOSYNTACTIC CHANGE

GWANG-YOON GOH

1.   Introduction[1]

In general, Old English (OE) had two kinds of ways to represent passive.[2] First, there was one verb which had a synthetic passive, that is, *hatte* 'is/was called'. Second, OE also had a syntactic passive like Modern English (MnE). The norm for this OE passive is for the accusative object of the active verb to become the subject of the passive, which is called 'personal passive'. Otherwise, the impersonal passive was the rule, in which there is no (nominative) subject. That is, when an active verb takes a dative or genitive NP, the NP remains in the oblique case without becoming a subject of the passive, as follows:

(1) *Him*   weortheðblæd gifen!
    him [dat] became   glory given
    'he was given glory'   (Christ 877)[3]

(2) Forðæm se ðc *his*   ær   tide ne tiolað,
    because   his [gen] before time not provide (for)
    thonne bið   *his*   on tid   untilad,
    then   (it) is his [gen] on time unprovided
    'because they will not provide for him before time
    then it will be unprovided in respect of him when the time comes'
                              (Bo 67.11 [Mitchell 1985: §849])[4]

---

[1] OE (ME, MnE) = Old (Middle, Modern) English. DO = direct object, P = preposition, V = verb, P-V CV = preposition-verb compound verb, PP = prepositional phrase, PreP = prepositional passive, PO = prepositional object, OPO = occurrence of an overt PO in a non-canonical position.

[2] Impersonal *man* for indefinite agency was often used in the nominative singular with an active verb form as an equivalent of the passive voice.

[3] For identification of the OE texts and examples, I follow the system of Venezky and Healey (1980).

[4] Example (2) may be problematic because the word *untilad* can be regarded as an adjective rather than a past participle. Unlike the impersonal passive for the dative object, examples of the impersonal passive for

On the other hand, OE did not have the passive type *He was laughed at*. This type of passive, called the prepositional passive (PreP) or pseudo-passive, in which the subject of the passive corresponds to the object of a preposition (P) in the active, began to appear in the early 13th century, but remained rare until the end of the 14th century (Mustanoja 1960: 440-1, Denison 1985, 1993: ch.7).[5]

(3) Bot nu than am i *after send*
   'but now when I am after sent (= sent for)'
             (a1400 (a1325) Cursor 14216 [Denison 1993: 126])

(4) Litel is he louid or *lete by* that suche a lessoun techith   'he is little loved or thought of who teaches such a
lesson'
             (c1400(a1376) PPl. A(1) 11.29 [Denison 1993: 126])

The PreP is not found in what Denison calls 'Standard Average European', though there is something similar in mainland Scandinavian languages. Prepositional stranding (P-Stranding), of which the PreP is one special kind, is extremely rare among languages of the world (Croft 1990: 10) and also freer in modern English than in most other European languages (Denison 1993: 125). Thus, the advent of the English PreP constitutes an interesting question in English historical syntax.

2.   Major Earlier Studies and Their Contributions [6]

The advent of the PreP has been the main focus of many studies in English historical linguistics and various proposals have been made, considering almost every identifiable important factor involved for a more satisfactory account of the change. In this section, I will re-examine major proposals from the earlier works in order to see what indispensable insights we can derive from them and what (logical) gaps still to be filled.

Some studies attribute the advent of the PreP to a change in the nature of the English passive rules or in the scope of their application. Lightfoot (1979) claims that OE and Middle English (ME) had only a lexical passive rule but English came to have a transformational passive in the early MnE period (15th to 16th century).[7] Lightfoot (1981) says that OE had no PreP (or indirect passive (IP)) because the movement for such a passive would cause a conflict in the case of the moved NP (i.e. base-assigned oblique case vs. structurally assigned nominative case) and that the loss of base-generated oblique case in ME made the PreP possible. Even if the problems with his dates and 'catastrophic' explanation can be ignored and his rules and case distinction are taken for granted,[8] Lightfoot still has to explain why OE (and even ME, according to his claim) only had a

---

the genitive object are rare (Mclaughlin 1983: 62). This rareness is compatible with the distinction between dative and genitive, which is reflected in the obliqueness hierarchy proposed in this paper.

[5] Another type of passive that OE didn't have is the indirect passive (IP), which takes as its subject an NP (BENEFACTIVE) corresponding to the indirect object in the active (e.g. *I was given the book*). It became a feature of English usage in the 15th century (Mustanoja 1960).

[6] Denison (1985, 1993: chs. 6 & 7) has a good discussion of various approaches and other relevant factors.

[7] A lexical passive is derived by a local rule which permits only the verbal argument NP (= DO) to be moved into the subject position, whereas a transformational passive is derived by a more general syntactic process that moves an NP from the VP into the subject position.

[8] The dates of Lightfoot (1979) do not correspond to the rise and development of the PreP (and IP) (Lieber 1979, Denison 1993: 156). Moreover, his 'catastrophic' explanation, which predicts near-simultaneity in the developments of the new passives, is not compatible with their gradual development.

lexical passive (as in Lightfoot (1979)) and why even the impersonal PreP didn't occur in OE (cf. Mitchell 1985: §855), since this passive form would not create the case conflict assumed in Lightfoot (1981).

On the other hand, Bennett (1980) claims that English has always had both rules for lexical and transformational passives but that the scope of the relation 'direct object' (DO) was extended to some prepositional objects (PO).[9] Above all, though, he has to answer why and how POs came to be regarded as DOs. That is, what brought about the changes in the rules or their application posited as the cause of the appearance of the PreP? Without a suitable answer, any argument along these lines would be circular.

P-Stranding[10] has also been proposed as the cause or a main factor of the advent of the PreP. Thus, van der Gaaf (1930: 8) and Mustanoja (1960: 113, 441) claim that P-Stranding in V-P word order is significant for the origin of the PreP and its subsequent development. However, as Denison (1985: 197) notes, the PreP in early examples occurred also with P-V order.

On the other hand, Allen (1980a,b) connects the change in P-Stranding with the advent of the PreP as follows. First, OE had a constraint on movement out of PP, which made P-Stranding caused by processes other than deletion impossible.[11] Then, the 'superficial similarity' among relative clauses in the ME period prompted speakers to extend P-Stranding from *the-* relative clauses to other *wh*-relative clauses, and finally, the P-Stranding with *wh*-relatives spread to other prepositional constructions like the PreP.

Although the fact that *which* is virtually indeclinable may be in accord with the claim that *which*-relative clauses (and later *who*-relative clauses as well) acquired P-Stranding by analogy with *that*-relative clauses, the distinction between the two types of relatives has been very clear since OE, because "pied-piping"[12] has never been allowed for relative *that* (or its OE counterpart *the*) and also because *which* has never been used as a complementizer. Therefore, the basis for the proposed analogy is not solid. Furthermore, Allen's spreading scenario is not compatible with earlier examples: the PreP and new P-Stranding patterns began to appear almost at the same time and remained rare until the end of the 14th century (Denison 1993: 125, 132, Fischer 1992: 390, Mustanoja 1960: 440-1). At best, this means that P-Stranding began to spread to the PreP as soon as it began to be allowed in *wh*-relative clauses and long before it was fully established in any new P-Stranding constructions. In short, although changes in P-Stranding are clearly related to the advent of the PreP, how they are related is yet to be explained.

Many studies (e.g. Hornstein & Weinberg 1981, Fischer & van der Leek 1981, and Kemenade 1987) posit the mechanism of reanalysis, adopted from Chomsky (1965, 1974) by van Riemsdijk (1978: 218-26), to explain (the advent of) the PreP.[13] This

---

[9] Note that OE also had certain [V+P] collocations in which the [V+P] combination expresses a single predicate and governs a DO-like PO (Visser 1963-73: 391).

[10] Prepositional stranding refers to the phenomenon in which a preposition is not followed by its NP object. In general, the PO takes a non-canonical position (usually, the initial position of the clause), leaving the preposition deferred at the end of the clause.

[11] Allen assumes that OE had relative clauses via deletion (e.g. with *the*) or movement (e.g. with *se (the)*).

[12] Pied-piping is the phenomenon in which P is moved along with its complement (*wh*-)NP to the front of clauses. More generally, in pied-piping, the movement of α in the structure β . . . α . . .] causes the movement of β (Culicover 1997: 392).

[13] The proposal of reanalysis was envisioned much earlier by Jespersen (1909-49: part III, vol. II. 15.74) who said "... nothing hinders us from saying that *take notice of* is a verbal phrase governing an object (*me*), which can be made into the subject if the whole phrase is turned into the passive".

process of reanalysis makes a unit of the contiguous V and P, which are "listed in the lexicon as semantic units", by optionally introducing "an extra pair of V-brackets" (van Riemsdijk 1978: 222). Applying the insight concerning the reanalysis of V and P to an account of the rise of the PreP seems to be promising, and even necessary for later stages at least, since sufficient evidence for the unification of V and P is found in MnE PreP construction.

For this process to be fully justified as a major factor in the advent of the PreP, however, some significant aspects need to be better explained. Above all, we must answer what made such a reanalysis possible and why it happened in ME. Furthermore, we have to explain why OE didn't have a similar reanalysis since combining V and P was much easier in OE, in the sense that OE had so many morphosyntactically and semantically transparent P-V compound verbs (Kim 1997, Goh 1998b, in press).

The lexicalization of V and P collocations is also proposed as the cause of the PreP. For example, Fischer (1992: 386-7) says that after most OE prefixes disappeared, many OE P-V compounds with an inseparable prefix (e.g. *be-sprecan* 'to speak about') were simply replaced in ME by a new V-P combination, thereby making the semantic function of the new PO identical with that of a verbal DO and facilitating the lexicalization of the new V-P combinations.

Although the lexicalization of some V-P collocations may have been helpful for the reanalysis of V and P and the emergence of the PreP, invoking it also leaves some important questions untouched. First, OE also had V-P collocations whose prepositional objects are parallel to verbal DOs in semantic function (Visser 1963-73: 391, Denison 1985: 193). Why then is it that English didn't have the PreP at all, including the impersonal PreP, until ME? Moreover, not only is it the case that many unlexicalized combinations of V and P can be used in the PreP (e.g. *The bed was slept in*) but it is also true that some combinations of that kind (e.g. *run at, waded over, spat upon,* etc.), which are difficult to regard as lexicalized, were used even in early examples (cf. Denison 1985: 193). Finally, although it seems reasonable to argue that the semantic affinity of some V-P collocations helped the reanalysis of V and P and NP movement out of PP, why is the evidence of reanalysis found only in passive?[14] All this means that lexicalization may be necessary but not sufficient for the advent of the PreP.

The loss of case inflection and the subsequent reanalysis of dative object as passive subject have been proposed as a cause of the rise of the PreP as well as of the IP (van der Gaaf 1930, Lightfoot 1981, van Kemenade 1987, etc.). On the one hand, this position does not seem to be easy to maintain because, unlike the IP, the PreP had no impersonal counterpart like **Her was talked to* in OE (Denison 1985: 195-6). However, the loss of case inflection seems to have played an important role in the advent of the PreP by eliminating the formal distinction among NP objects of different cases, thereby motivating the change in the way of representing and maintaining relative obliqueness among NP arguments, as will be discussed later.

---

[14] V and P of prepositional verbs in the PreP form a single cohesive unit which cannot be broken up by other material, whereas they can be intervened by other material in the active form, as follows:

(i) a. The committee agreed unanimously on the resolution.
     b. *The resolution was agreed unanimously on by the committee.   (Radford 1988: 428)

(ii) a. Napoleon slept fitfully in that bed.
     b. *That bed was slept fitfully in by Napoleon. (Riemsdijk 1978: 222)

Besides those we have considered so far, many other factors, e.g. semantic roles or types (Bolinger 1977, Vestergaard 1977, Couper-Kuhlen 1979, Thornburg 1985, etc.), social variations and borrowing (Wurff 1992) and fixing of SVO word order among others, have been proposed.[15] One common feature of most earlier studies is their emphasis on isolated aspects or factors of the given change. Despite the potentially significant role of each, however, none of the generally accepted main factors are sufficient on their own to explain the advent of the PreP. Thus, the problem is that few previous studies have shown how those main factors can be logically and coherently put together to bring about the new passive. Furthermore, even after we succeed in refining and integrating those main factors, we may need other complementary factors to fill some significant logical gaps in the resultant integrated account, which are difficult to identify until a well-woven overall picture of the change is drawn.

3.   Prepositional Stranding in Old English and Its Syntactic Necessity

OE shows a very rigid contrast between two groups of prepositional constructions with regard to P-Stranding possibilities. Above all, P-Stranding was allowed and was obligatory in the following six prepositional constructions in OE: *the*-relative clauses, zero relative clauses, free relative clauses introduced by *swa hw- swa* 'whatever, whoever', infinitival relatives, comparative construction, and complement object deletion construction, as in (5)-(10), respectively:

(5) ... nyhst þæm tune   ðæ   se   deada man *on* lið
    ... next that homestead that the dead man in lies
    '... next to the homestead that the dead man lies in'   (Or 20.30)

(6) ðonne is other stow elreordge men beoð *on*
    then is   other place   barbarous men are   in
    'then, there is (an)other place barbarous men live in'   (Maarv 18.1)

(7) And heogefret softnysse oððe sarnysse, *swa hwæðer   swa* heo*on* bið
    andit feels softness   or   pain   so which [acc] as   it   in   is
    'and it feels softness or pain, whichever it is in'   (ÆHom 11.218)

(8) ðeah   he nu   nanwuht elles næbbe   *ymbe* to sorgienne
    though he now nothing   else not-have aboutto worry
    'though he now has nothing else to worry about'   (Bo 24.15)

(9) he us ne   mæge gescildan to   beterantidun thonne we nu   *on* sint
    he us not can shield   for better   timesthan   we now in are
    'he can protect us for better times than we are now in'   (Or 86.4-5)

(10) heowæs swithe fæger   *an* to locianne
     it   was very beautiful atto look
     'it was very beautiful to look at'   (Or 74.12-3)

In each of the above OE constructions, P-Stranding was necessary in the sense that the alternative co-occurrence of P and its PO within the same PP (i.e. ... [PP P NP] ...) was not possible in the given sentence, whereas P-Stranding itself was not prohibited in OE. That is, the *the*-relative, which is often considered to correspond to the relative *that* in

---

[15] Denison (1985, 1993: ch.7) has a good summary along with some relevant criticism.

later English, has never been allowed to occur after P as a PO.[16] Thus, a construction such as *... *myd the we* ... was ungrammatical in OE.[17] In all the other constructions, neither pied piping nor having P and its object NP within the same PP, which can obviate P-Stranding in a given sentence, is allowed since there is no overt PO in the relative clause which can occur with P.[18] Note that none of these P-Stranding types involve (the displacement of a PO from PP and) the 'occurrence of an overt PO in a non-canonical position' (OPO, i.e., ... NP_i ... [$_{PP}$ P t_i] ...).[19] That is, the overt NP which should be the PO of the deferred P is missing in every case of OE P-Stranding.

Except for the above five cases, no other type of P-Stranding is attested in OE. In particular, none of Modern English P-Stranding types involving OPO (i.e. *wh*-questions, *who-* or *which*-relatives, the prepositional passive, topicalization, and exclamations) were possible. Therefore the alternative co-occurrence of P and its PO within the same PP through pied piping or impersonal constructions, which could avoid OPO, had to occur if it was not prohibited otherwise in OE. Thus, pied piping, as the only possible alternative in *se the-* or *se*-relative clauses, as in (11) and (12), in *wh*-questions, as in (13), and in topicalization, as in (14), was obligatory, whereas the prepositional passive and exclamations involving pied piping were not allowed, as in MnE.[20]

---

[16] There is no evidence that OE 'relativizer' *the*, which roughly corresponds to the 'relativizer' *that* in later English, is the PO of the deferred P. Above all, except for the dative and accusative forms of the second person, personal pronoun *thu* 'you', which has anything to do with relative pronouns, it is not identical in form with any pronoun. Furthermore, it was indeclinable, whereas virtually every pronoun (and noun) in OE was declinable. Note also that it was mainly used as a subordinating conjunction (in other places). Thus, the status of OE 'relativizer' *the* was clear, unlike its later English counterpart *that*, which is identical in form with the demonstrative pronoun *that* but is still analyzed as a complementizer rather than a relative pronoun in many theoretical frameworks including Government-Binding theory. Furthermore, there are some periods in which the 'relativizer' *that* could be used together with a relative pronoun. Thus, the co-occurrence of the 'relativizer' *that* and a relative pronoun was very common in late ME and is observed even in MnE, as follows:

(i) ... the Minotaur, *which that* he slough in Crete.
    '... the Minotaur, which he had slain in Crete'   (Chaucer, Knight Tale 122)

[17] At least in MnE, a resumptive pronoun as a PO can sometimes occur after P in *that*-relative clauses, as Jespersen (1939 III. 5.63) observes, as follows:

(i) a. By force of argument, *that* you being licentiate should stand *vpon't*.   (Marl F 206)
    b. They cure a lot of folks *that* you regular docs can't seem to find out
       what's the matter *with 'em*.   (Tarkington MA 163)

Note, however, that the addition of a resumptive pronoun is not natural unless the clause is long. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence that this construction involving a resumptive pronoun after P in *the*-relative clauses was grammatical in OE. Thus, although it might be a conceivable alternative to the Stranding in *the*-relative clauses to consider, it is hypothetical at best.

[18] The free relative in (7) at least syntactically belongs to the main clause, not to the relative clause. This is clear from the fact that the *wh*-pronoun or demonstrative head of the free relative takes the case assigned by the verb (or preposition) of the main clause (i.e. accusative but not dative, which is normally expected to be assigned by the P *on* in the given relative clause) and that the PO is absent at surface structure. Thus, even if the free relative may be considered the PO (semantically), its co-occurrence with the deferred P within the same PP will be ungrammatical.

On the other hand, OE didn't allow a relative pronoun to be used with infinitival relatives. Thus, no examples such as *a book about which to talk* are found until Chaucer's period (Allen 1980b: 275). Except for this difference, English, since OE, has been the same in the necessity of Stranding in all the above prepositional constructions.

[19] Note that for the purpose of this study, it doesn't matter whether the non-canonical positioning of the PO is a result of movement or base-generation. What is relevant here is that it is there, not how it got there.

[20] Thus, the following types of sentences have always been ungrammatical in English.

(11) Eala ðu   wundorlicerod,   *on ðære ðe*   crist   wolde ðrowian.
hailthou wonderful   cross on which thatChrist would suffer
'hail, you wonderful cross, on which (that) Christ deigned to suffer'
(ÆlS 27.115)

(12) Gehyr ðu   arfæsta God mine stefne, *mid ðære*   ic earmto ðe cleopie.
hear   thou merciful God my   voice   with which   I poor to thee cry
'hear you, merciful God, my voice, with which I, poor one, cry to you'
(BlHom 89.13)

(13) a.*To hwæm* locige icbutan to ðæm eaðmodum?
to whom look   I but   to the   humble
'to whom shall I look but to the humble?'   (CP 299.19)

b. Ic nat   ful geare *ymb   hwæt*thu giet tweost
I not-know fullentirely aboutwhat you still doubt
'I do not fully understand what you still doubt about'   (Bo 12.26)

(14) a.*On thisne enne god*we sceolon geleafan
in   this   one Godwe must   believe
'in this one god, we must believe'   (ÆlS i. 1.40)

b. *For ðæs lichaman life,* the   langsum beon ne   mæg,
for the body's life,   thatlong   be   not may,
swincað mennswide,
toil   men   greatly
'for the life of the body, that cannot last eternally, men toil greatly'
(ÆHom 6.145-6)

Note that none of the unattested types of P-Stranding were necessary in that the alternative co-occurrence of P and its PO within the same PP was available in the given sentences. Moreover, all the unattested (potential) types of P-Stranding must have OPO in OE, and no attested P-Stranding in OE involved OPO while P-Stranding was not prohibited otherwise in OE. All this strongly suggests that OPO was strictly prohibited in OE, allowing for the formation of an OE constraint against OPO: $*... NP_i ... [_{PP} P t_i] .... I$ refer to this constraint as *OPO.[21]

One corollary of the above observation is that if some English construction requires P-Stranding involving OPO, it will not be allowed in OE, even if it is otherwise possible. One piece of positive evidence which demonstrates this corollary is the so-called *tough*-construction (e.g. *Bill is hard to convince; Mary is easy to talk with*). Although OE shows many examples of the *tough*-construction, as in (15), no such examples involve P-

(i) (a) **Into* the city's accounts were thoroughly looked (by a financial controller).
(b) **About* the affair was talked (by all the people in the country).
(ii) (a) **In* what wonderful house you live!
(b) *I can't believe *in* what a mess you've got!

[21] The impossibility of movement out of PP and the obligatoriness of pied piping in the above OE constructions have often been observed and PPs in OE have been suggested as an island (out of which no movement is allowed) in many previous studies within derivational frameworks (van Riemsdijk 1978, Allen 1980a,b, Hornstein & Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1981a,b, Lightfoot 1981, Bennis & Hoekstra 1984, among others). Most previous studies, however, put their emphasis on the analysis of the constraint against movement out of PP in OE mainly from a theoretical standpoint and ignore why OE had such a constraint and what made it change in ME, aspects which are indispensable for a complete account of the changes in P-Stranding.

Stranding and thus no examples of the *tough*-construction with P-Stranding are attested in OE (Allen 1980a,b and van der Wurff 1990, 1992).[22]

(15) a. se deada byð*uneaðe* ælcon men   on neaweste   to hæbbenne
       the dead is difficult for each manin neighborhood to have
       'the dead man is difficult for everyone to have nearby'   (BlHom 59.14)

    b. thæt him wære*eaðelic* se wifhired to healdanne &   to rihtanne
       thathim was   easy   the nunnery to hold   and to rule
       'that the nunnery was easy for him to lead and rule'   (GD I. 27.4)

Since the *tough*-construction without P-Stranding was possible (as in (15)) *and* P-Stranding was allowed unless it violated *OPO, the absence of the *tough*-construction involving P-Stranding can be best explained under the assumption that P-Stranding in the *tough*-construction would have had to involve the prohibited OPO.[23] This is supported by the fact that alternative, impersonal constructions with or without a dummy subject, which do not have to violate *OPO, are well-attested in OE, as follows:

(16) Hit bið swiðe *unieðe* ægðer to donne,ge   *wið* ðone to cidanne
     it is very   difficult both to take andagainst him to contend
     'it is very difficult both to take and to contend against him'   (CP 355.41)

(17) *Eaðere* ys olfende   to faren *thurh næðle   thyrel*,
     easier   is for a camel to go   through needle's eye
     '(it) is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye'   (Mk. Bos 10.25)

Finally, the non-existence of the PreP in OE can be explained in the same way. The personal PreP has to involve OPO because it requires the underlying PO to be in the

---

[22] Even though the *tough*-construction involving OPO has been said not to occur in OE in some studies including Allen (1980b: 283, fn.25) and van der Wurff (1990, 1992), its relevance in regard to the change of P-Stranding has not been sufficiently discussed in any previous studies.

On the other hand, although Kemenade (1987: 152) claims that P-Stranding in the *tough*-construction was obligatory in OE, this is simply not true. See (16) and (17) for some counterexamples. Furthermore, her single example, given in (i) below, is dubious: the adjectives *myrige* 'pleasant' and *smylte* 'serene' can hardly be considered *tough*-adjectives, since they often assign a theta-role to the subject of the sentence; rather, (i) would seem to be a case of the Complement Object Deletion construction.

(i) forðonthe heo ishwiltidum *smylte* and *myrige*   on torowenne,
    because that she is sometimes serene and pleasant on to live
    'because it is sometimes serene and pleasant to live in'   (Ahth. I. 182.31)

[23] This non-existence of the *tough*-construction involving P-Stranding in OE is expected if we accept the assumption that the subject of the main clause in the *tough*-construction is generated as a PO and moved to the subject position. Thus, the *tough*-construction with P-Stranding, for it to be possible, must involve the prohibited OPO, which makes the P-Stranding in the *tough*-construction ungrammatical in OE. See Rosenbaum (1967), Postal (1971), and Berman (1973) for this line of analyses based on object-raising.

There is considerable controversy about the *tough*-construction. One analysis within Government-Binding theory (e.g. Chomsky (1977b), one of the earliest proposals along this line) is to propose (the movement of) an empty operator that binds the trace in the object position and is coindexed with the subject, as in (i):

(i) Bill$_i$ is easy [$_{CP}$ O$_i$ [$_S$ PRO to convince t_i]].

In Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, on the other hand, the *tough*-movement rule is analyzed as a lexical fact about some predicates such as *easy, take,* and *cost* which subcategorize for infinitive complements containing an accusative NP gap coindexed with the subject (Pollard & Sag: 1994: 167).

passive subject position.[24] Moreover, the personal PreP was not necessary because OE could have resorted to an alternative, impersonal PreP, which does not violate *OPO since the impersonal construction allows P to co-occur with its PO within the same PP. In fact, an impersonal PreP in OE was not only theoretically possible but also very plausible in several respects. Above all, OE didn't always require a nominative subject and therefore had the impersonal passive as well as many other impersonal constructions. Furthermore, the impersonal PreP is actually found in some Germanic languages such as Old Norse, Icelandic and German, as follows:

(18) a. Meine Mutter sorgt für die Kinder.
        'my mother is taking case of the children'
     b. Für die Kinder wird gesorgt.
         'the children are being taken care of'
     c. Es wird für die Kinder gesort.
        'the children are being taken care of'

(19) a. Ich arbeite unter dieser Brücke.
        'I work under this bridge'
     b. Unter dieser Brücke wird gearbeitet.
         'this bridge is worked under'
     c. Es wird unter dieser Brücke gearbeitet.
        'this bridge is worked under'

However, if even this potential alternative was prohibited for some independent reason, it must be that OE could not have any form of the PreP. This line of reasoning will be developed later in this paper.

In short, the following generalization about OE P-Stranding can be made: first, OPO was strictly prohibited in OE; second, P-Stranding was allowed only when it was syntactically 'necessary' in that the alternative co-occurrence of P and its overt PO within the same PP in a given sentence was even potentially not available, on the one hand, and P-Stranding itself (without violating *OPO) was not prohibited, on the other; finally, the co-occurrence of P and its overt PO within the same PP through pied piping or an impersonal construction, an alternative to the prohibited but potential P-Stranding involving OPO, was obligatory unless it was unavailable or prohibited otherwise.[25]

4.   What Was Behind the Constraint on the Separation of P and Its Object

The investigation of OE prepositional constructions has shown that OPO was strictly prohibited, and no matter how such a prohibition is theoretically analyzed, it seems clear that OE had some sort of constraint on OPO. Thus, I will now address the issue of what motivates the constraint by explaining what made OPO so difficult in OE. I will propose, in particular, that what was behind the constraint is a high degree of 'obliqueness' of OE prepositional arguments, which was rigidly marked and represented by P as an 'obliqueness marker', and the representation and maintenance of relative obliqueness among OE NP arguments.

---

[24] Even in the theoretical frameworks which do not assume movement or transformation (e.g. such lexicalist approaches as Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar by Pollard & Sag (1987, 1994)), the PO or verbal object in the active is considered to correspond to the subject in the passive.

[25] Note that the logic of my argument is more along lines of 'soft' or violable constraints, which can be well accommodated in Optimality theory.

4.1. Relative Obliqueness Among NP Arguments in Old English [26]

Although grammatical roles or functions were so variably encoded in OE cases that the traditional notion of case government cannot be properly employed to systematically identify and generalize the grammatical contributions of OE cases,[27] there was a very rigid distinction among OE verbal arguments with regard to their morphological cases, especially between accusative NPs and NPs of other cases. This distinction is clearly seen in the behavior of verbal arguments in passivization: personal passive for accusative NPs versus impersonal passive for NPs of other object cases.

Now, let us assume that the rigid distinction between accusative NPs and other oblique NPs reflects the different degrees of obliqueness encoded in OE morphological cases.[28] Thus, an obliqueness hierarchy (OH) can be proposed as follows:

(20) Obliqueness Hierarchy for OE Verbal Arguments [29]

   Accusative < Dative ≤ Genitive

Many OE preposition-verb compound verbs (P-V CVs) show that although the head V determines most of the morphosyntactic features of the whole CV, the valence of the CV is jointly determined by the head V and the nonhead P (Kim 1997).

(21) in leohte<u>him</u>   <u>tha</u>   <u>word</u>   cwethað
     in light   him [dat]those words [acc] speak
     'they will speak those words to him in glory'   (Christ 401)

(22) gif inc   hwa   <u>ðæs</u>   withcwethe
     if you-two [dat] anyonethat [gen]   contradicts
     'if anyone contradicts you about that'   (BlHom 71.1)

(23) *with* [acc/dat/gen] 'against'   (Mitchell 1985: §1178)

With-cweðan in (22), as a ditransitive, takes dative and genitive, which come from the head V cweðan and the nonhead P with, respectively. This means that the nonhead (P) as well as the head (V) participates in the determination of the argument structures of OE P-V CVs.

On the other hand, the investigation of OE P-V CVs and their case government shows that relative obliqueness exists between verbal arguments and prepositional arguments and that it is systematically maintained in the subcategorization inheritance through OE P-V compounding (Goh 1998a,b, in press). That is, when a prepositional argument is

---

[26] Section 4.1 is mainly based on Goh (1998b, in press).

[27] See Plank (1983) and Goh (to appear) for such alternative object case markings and their discussions.

[28] The representation of grammatical relations by means of relative obliqueness can be found in many studies including Keenan & Comrie (1977, 1979), Comrie (1981: 148-55), and Pollard & Sag (1987: 67-72, 117-121, 1994). Note, however, that their hierarchies, being based mainly on grammatical functions, are difficult to properly apply to NP arguments which have the same grammatical function (i.e. the direct object) but alternative case markings. Thus, unlike most other scholars, I here define relative obliqueness with regard to the morphological cases of NP arguments rather than to their grammatical roles or functions.

[29] $Case_1 < Case_2$ means that $Case_1$ is less oblique than $Case_2$. Unlike the impersonal passive for the dative object, on the other hand, clear examples of the impersonal passive for the genitive object seem to be rare (Mclaughlin 1983: 62). Anyway, this rareness is compatible with the distinction between the dative case and the genitive case, which is reflected in the obliqueness hierarchy proposed in (24).

composed as a verbal argument, it always takes a case which is more oblique than the case of the original verbal argument.[30] This means that OE prepositional arguments are always more oblique than verbal arguments, regardless of the morphological cases involved. Thus, the following extended OH including prepositional arguments can be given:

(24) Obliqueness Hierarchy among Old English NP arguments

   a. Nom < Acc < Dat ≤ Gen
   b. Verbal arguments < Prepositional arguments

In fact, the relative obliqueness between verbal and prepositional arguments is expected because the OH among verbal arguments is originally based on their potential for passivization and also because passivization in any form (i.e. personal or impersonal) was not allowed for OE prepositional arguments.[31]

The high degree of obliqueness of OE prepositional arguments is well supported by the productivity of OE P-V compounding. Unlike later English, OE had very productive compounding of P and V and thus most of the intransitive verbs commonly used in OE could combine with almost every frequently used P to form a P-V CV, as follows:

(25) *cuman* 'to come'[32]

   a-, an-, be-, for-, fore-, forth-, ge-, in-, of-, ofer-, ofer-be-, on-be-, ongean-, thurh-, to-, to-be-, under-, up-cuman

(26) *faran* 'to travel'

   a-, be-, for-, forth-, ge-, geond-, in-, of-, ofer-, on-, oth-, thurh-, to-, ut-, with-, ymb-faran

(27) *gangan* 'to go'

   a-, æt-, be-, bi-, for-, fore-, forth-, ful-, ge-, in-, of-, ofer-, on-, ongean-, thurh-, to-, under-, up-, ut-, with-, ymb-, ymbe-gangan

This unusual productivity of OE P-V compounding, together with the highly transparent argument structures of many OE P-V CVs, suggests that most selected prepositional arguments in later English are very likely to have occurred as a verbal argument of P-V CVs in OE. This claim is also supported by the fact that in the ME period English lost most OE P-V CVs: many of P-V CVs (and some simplex verbs) were replaced by (new) V-P phrases or prepositional verbs of new or same components (Fischer 1992: 386). Through this process, many (former) verbal arguments, which could be passivized (personally or impersonally), changed to prepositional arguments,

---

[30] This means that if a simplex verb subcategorizes for only an NP of dative or genitive, then it does not inherit accusative through compounding. Therefore, a P-V CV formed by that verb and a preposition must not take accusative either, because accusative is less oblique than either of dative and genitive. Goh (1998b) verifies this conclusion by examining the OE genitive- or dative-governing simplex verbs (cf. Mitchell 1985: § 1092) and by showing that none of them form a P-V CV which takes a less oblique case than the case specified for the simplex verb.

[31] Note that the argument so far is not circular, because the relative status of verbal and prepositional arguments in the OH was derived on the basis of empirical evidence. Furthermore, the relative obliqueness posited here between verbal arguments and prepositional arguments is not at all unusual, and this is suggested by the fact that although passive constructions have been reported in all the main language families, the PreP is found in only a very small number of languages of the world (Siewierska 1984: 23).

[32] The list of complex verbs is from BT(s).

maintaining the original (passivizable) degree of obliqueness.[33] Thus, many early examples of the PreP in ME have prepositional verbs or V-P phrases whose OE counterparts in the respect of form or meaning are P-V CVs, as follows:[34]

(28) OE *be-licgan* 'to lie or sleep by/with/around' > ME *liggen bi*

this maiden ... feled also bi her thi | thatsche was   *yleyen bi*
this maiden ... felt also by her thigh thatshe had-been lain   by
'this maiden felt by her thigh that she had been lain with'
(c1330 (?a1300) *Arth. & M.*(Auch) 849)

(29) OE *ymb-sprecan* or *be-sprecan* 'speak of/about' > ME *speken of*

And the comaundment ys brokun, | And thehalyday, byfore   *of spokun.*
and the commandment is broken   and the holy day previously of spoken
'and the commandment was broken, and the holy day previously spoken of'
(a1400 (c1303) Mannyng, *HS* 1033)

(30) OE *on-spætan* or *be-spætan* 'spit upon' > ME *spitten (up)on*

and aftyr   he was turmentyd, and aftyr   he was *spyt vpon*
and afterwards he was tormented and afterwards he was spat upon
(a1425 *Wycl.Serm.* I 39.26)

In conclusion, unlike the prepositional arguments of later English, OE prepositional arguments were absolutely as well as relatively more oblique than OE verbal arguments. Thus, 'true' prepositional arguments in OE were always too oblique to be subcategorized for by a verb and therefore to be passivized. Note that this high degree of obliqueness of prepositional arguments was systematically represented by prepositions. It is in this very sense that OE prepositions can be called 'obliqueness markers'.[35]

4.2. Flexibility of Surface Word Order in Old English

Although many studies, including generative ones such as Koopman (1985, 1990a, 1990b, 1992) and Pintzuk & Kroch (1985, 1989), have tried to show that there is a general tendency, especially at a deep level, towards SXV or SOV in OE word order, the surface word order is very flexible and, in many cases, can hardly be conclusive for determining the grammatical relationships among NPs in an OE sentence.[36]

---

[33] The passive subject *thæt scyp* in (1) below is the former PO which has been inherited as a verbal object from the nonhead P *ofer*. Note that the P-V CV *ofer-geotan* has the corresponding V+P phrase, as in (ii):

(i) swa thætthætscyp   wearð *ofer-goten* mid ythum
so   that the   ship became over-poured with water
'so that the ship was being covered (< poured over) with water'   (Mt 8.24)

(ii) tha   wæswopes   hring hat heafodwylm *ofer*hleor   *goten*
then was of weepingsound hot tears   overcheek poured
'then there was the sound of weeping and hot tears poured over the cheek' (El 1131-3)

[34] ME examples are from Denison (1993). By providing these examples, I don't mean to imply that prepositional verbs are functional replacements of OE P-V CVs, as in de la Cruz (1973).
[35] Both morphological case endings and prepositions can be called 'obliqueness markers' in the sense that the relative obliqueness among OE NP arguments is consistently represented and maintained by means of those two types of markers. In particular, OE prepositions can be called 'absolute obliqueness markers' since any NP arguments marked (i.e. governed) by them are always too oblique to be passivized.
[36] Most of the efforts to establish basic word orders in OE are mainly concerned with the relative order of subject and verb or with the position of the verb, often ignoring a large body of exceptions, many attested order possibilities, and some evidence of non-homogeneity within OE (Denison 1993: 27-9; Mitchell 1985:

In particular, an NP argument often doesn't seem to have any special restriction in its position with respect to other NP arguments in a sentence. Thus, an object NP could occur almost in any place in a sentence: it could follow the subject and V, precede the subject and V, or occur between the subject and V, as follows:

(31) a. We willath secgan *eow   sum byspel*
        we wish to say   you   a parable
        'we want to tell you a parable'   (ÆCHom I. 212. 6)

     b. Geseah ic *wuldres treow*   wædum   geweorðod
        saw   I   of glory tree   with garments adorned
        'I saw the tree of glory adorned with garments'   (Dream 14)

     c. for than the he tæhte   *him   tha gastlican lare*
        for   he taught them the spiritual   learning
        'for he taught the spiritual learning'   (ÆCHom I. 186.22)

(32) a. *hine* geswencte seo wædlung
        him   afflicted   the poverty
        'poverty afflicted him'   (ÆCHom I. 332.9)

     b. and *treowa*   he deth   færlice   blowan
        and trees [acc] he causes suddenly bloom [inf]
        'and he causes trees to burst into bloom'
                          (HomU 34 (Nap 42) 196.1 [Denison 1993: 174])

     c. theah *hit   him*   man secge
        though it   him   one says
        'though people say it to him'   (WHom 4.77)

(33) a. Ic *the* gethyldelice geyrde
        I   you patiently   hear
        'I will hear you patiently'   (ÆCHom I. 590.2)

     b. thæt he mehte *his feorh*   generian
        that he could his life   save
        'so that he could save his life'   (Or 48.18)

     c. and thæt he *him and his geferan*   *bigleofan* thenian wolde
        and that he him and his companions food   serve would
        'and that he would serve him and his companions food' (ÆCHom II. 78.198)

Furthermore, no matter whether it is in poetry or prose, some adverbial phrase or clause could occur between V and its complement, especially an object, without causing any serious problems, as follows:

(34) a. Geseah he *in recede*   rinca   manige,
         saw   he in the building warriors many
         'he saw many warriors in the building'   (Beo 728)

    b. Ond hiene tha Cynewulf *on Andred* adræfde,
        and him   then Cynewulf in Andred   drove out
        'and then Cynewulf drove him out from Andred'   (Chron 755.4)

This flexibility in word order in OE can be considered possible because, like many other highly inflected languages, OE maintained the grammatical relationships among sentential elements mainly by encoding the various kinds of grammatical information in case endings and prepositions governing oblique prepositional arguments.

On the other hand, there was one conspicuous exception to such general flexibility in word order, that is, the relative word order of P and its object NP. P in OE could occur in one of the two positions with respect to its object NP: it could precede (as a pre-position) its (non-)pronominal object NP or follow (as a post-position) its pronominal object NP, as in (35) and (36), respectively (Mitchell 1985: §§1061-2):

(35) a. se fæder *thurh*   hine gesceop us
        the father through him created us
        'the father created us through him'   (ÆCHom II. 3.11)

    b. Symon me *mid*his englum gethiwde
        Simon me with his angels   threatened
        'Simon threatened me with his angels'   (ÆCHom I. 378.1)

    c. Hu Moyses lædde Israhela folc   *from* Egyptum *ofer* thone Readan Sæ,
       how Moses led Israelite people from Egypt   over the Red   Sea
       'how Moses led Israelite people from Egypt over the Red Sea'(Or 1. 16)

(36) a. gehyrde myccle menigo   him *beforan* feran
        heard   great multitude[dat.sg.fem] him before go
        'he heard a great multitude go before him'   (BlHom 15.14)

    b. Him *to* genealæhton his discipuli
        him to approached   his disciples
        'his disciples approached him'   (ÆCHom I. 548.25)

In spite of the high degree of flexibility in OE word order, it was much more difficult in OE to separate P and its object NP from each other than in MnE, which has a fixed word order, to the extent that it constitutes a rare constraint on the otherwise flexible word order in OE. Note that such rigidity in the relative position of P and its governing NP is very commonly observed in most languages with a highly flexible word order such as Japanese and Korean, in which the representation of grammatical relationship among NP arguments heavily depends on the relevant case markers.[37, 38]

---

[37] 'Case markers' may be postpositions but nothing crucial hinges on this. Thus, 'case markers' here are used in a broad sense since in many languages such as Korean and Japanese they can encode almost any oblique relation and be attached even to a clausal argument, as in the following Japanese sentence:

4.3.   Maintenance of Relative Obliqueness and Prepositional Stranding

In spite of the high degree of flexibility of surface word order in OE, one constraint on syntactic operations which seems to be generally but often implicitly assumed can be applied also to OE syntax: no matter what syntactic operation sentential elements undergo, it should not create any (serious) confusion in the grammatical relationships.

In particular, such a constraint seems to be most relevant in the case of OPO since OPO is very likely to cause a confusion in grammatical relationships, especially relative obliqueness, which was very rigidly maintained in relevant morphosyntactic operations such as passivization and subcategorization inheritance. Note that case endings cannot play a decisive role for the distinction in the relative obliqueness between verbal and prepositional arguments. This is because both verbal and prepositional arguments mostly take accusative or dative in OE and therefore P is the only distinctive obliqueness marker. In this situation, OPO in a language with a high degree of flexibility of surface word order will make it very difficult to distinguish between verbal and prepositional arguments.

Thus, if a PO is separated from its governor P and occurs in a non-canonical position, even general grammatical relationships as well as relative obliqueness will be very difficult to maintain, and therefore there wouldn't be any reasonable way to get the intended meaning of the relevant sentence. For example, in examples (35) and (36) above, it would be very difficult to decide whom the father created through whom in (35a), whom Simon threatened with whom (35b), who led whom and how (35c), and who went before whom in (36a). In spite of the general flexibility of word order in OE, therefore, the PO, with its governor P, should remain in its canonical position (i.e. within PP). There is therefore some functional motivation for why OPO was so difficult in OE.

Still, there may have been more to *OPO than just functional concerns. For speakers of such languages as German, Japanese and Korean, which have prepositions or post-positions as periphrastic case markers, separating an obliqueness marker such as a case marker and a preposition or post-position from its host or argument is hardly tolerable and judged totally unacceptable, regardless of the comprehensibility of the given sentence. Thus, there seems to be a purely syntactic side to *OPO. Moreover, OPO would entail the effacing of an inherent property (i.e. a certain degree of obliqueness) from the argument. Thus, *OPO seems to reflect a tendency for speakers to reject the separation of an obliqueness marker from an oblique argument itself.

In short, the (relative and absolute) obliqueness of OE NP arguments was most systematically encoded through case endings and P as their obliqueness markers and could be best represented and maintained only when each obliqueness marker remained in its original form (for case endings) and canonical position (for P). In particular, OPO could bring about a serious problem in maintaining the grammatical and semantic relationships by altering or confusing relative obliqueness among NP arguments or at least by eliminating the absolute obliqueness of the prepositional argument. This is what

---

(i)   Hanako-wa [s Taroo-ga zibun-o zibun-nohihan-kara   mamorikir-e-nakatta] koto-o sitteita.
      Hanako-TOP[Taroo-NOM self-ACC self-GEN   criticism-FROM defend-could-not   COMP-ACC knew
      'Hanako knew that Taroo couldn't defend her/himself against her/his own criticism'

[38] Note that MnE allows parentheticals between P and PO, as in *John left his money to, for all intents and purposes, the whole family*. However, there is no evidence that such a parenthetical insertion is possible in OE as well as in Japanese or Korean.

motivated *OPO, and the changes related to this factor can be seen to have played a significant role in the advent of new P-Stranding patterns and the PreP.

5.   Why Old English Had No Prepositional Passive
5.1.   What Questions to Ask and Why

Earlier studies essential ask why OE had no PreP. It is fair to consider why we have to ask this question? First, most previous studies have put their main emphasis on an abstract analysis of the PreP and other (new) P-Stranding constructions mainly from a theoretical standpoint (e.g. generative studies such as Lightfoot 1979a,b, Allen 1980a,b, and Kemenade 1987) or on the account of some selected aspects involved (e.g. most earlier works such as van der Gaaf 1930, Jespersen 1909-49, Visser 1963-73, and de la Cruz 1973) from a traditional descriptive viewpoint. Second, unlike all the other P-Stranding constructions, the answer to the question "what was behind *OPO or the loss of *OPO?" doesn't directly explain the advent of the (P-Stranding in) PreP. This is because, unlike other P-Stranding constructions, the PreP requires some additional condition(s) besides "no *OPO". To see why this is so, consider the following examples:

(37) a. This is the long river which we slept beside last night.
    b. Which river did you sleep beside last night?
    c. This cold river is very difficult to sleep beside.
    d. The long river is very beautiful to sleep beside.
    e. *This long river was slept beside last night (by us)

In the above examples, the sentence (37e), which has the preposition *beside* stranded in the PreP, sounds very odd at best, while the preposition can freely be stranded in other prepositional constructions, as shown in (37a-d). This difference between the PreP and other P-Stranding constructions, under the assumption that *OPO prohibited the P-Stranding in the above constructions (37a-c) in OE, tells us that the simple loss of the constraint by itself is not sufficient for the advent of the PreP.

Few previous studies, except for Denison (1985), have tried to directly deal with the question of why OE had no PreP. Denison claims that OE differs from ME quantitatively rather than qualitatively in that OE also had the purely syntactic factor of P-Stranding but other factors (e.g. decay of OE case system, obsolescence of OE prefixal system, increased use of prepositions, lexicalization and semantic function, etc.) were "simply less strongly operative in OE" (p. 203).

However, it is not clear whether his account really addresses the issue of why OE had no PreP. Although OE might also have (the purely syntactic factor of) P-Stranding and while it might have been that the factors of the PreP were less strongly operative in OE, the kinds of P-Stranding allowed in OE are clearly distinguished from the new P-Stranding patterns in later English since P-Stranding involving OPO was never allowed in OE. Thus, the issues should be why OE had no P-Stranding with OPO, even in non-passive constructions which seldom require the additional factor(s) of the PreP, and how English came to have the (syntactic) factor(s) of the new P-Stranding patterns involving OPO, if the change in P-Stranding is significant for the advent of the PreP at all. Furthermore, although his claim that some factors promoting the PreP were "simply less strongly operative in OE than in ME" may be compatible with the general gradualness of language change, it does not sufficiently explain why OE had no PreP at all, including the potential impersonal PreP, which doesn't need OPO (see (18) and (19)).

Thus, what we really need for a complete account of why OE had no PreP and how the PreP came into being in ME is not just the lack of stronger operation of the factors promoting a PreP in OE. Rather, we need to bring other crucial factors into consideration. Above all, we must explain what, despite some already existing factors which could have facilitated a PreP but were never sufficiently developed so as to allow it, actively prevented the PreP from actually being allowed. Moreover, we have to answer what, under the ripened linguistic circumstances, actively triggered OPO in the passive construction.

5.2.   Why Old English Had No Personal Prepositional Passive

Before the question of why OE had no PreP at all is answered, several assumptions about passivization need to be made clear. The first assumption is that an (NP) object should be 'not-too-oblique' in order to be passivized. Since the concept of 'obliqueness' doesn't seem to be clearly defined in any previous studies, let us say that an NP argument is too oblique if it is not subcategorized for by the given verb in the lexicon.[39] Thus, the difference in the acceptability between the following MnE examples of the PreP can be ascribed to whether the former PO (i.e. the passive subject) or the PP including the PO in each of the sentences is subcategorized for by the verb or not:

(38) a. The document has been closely looked at.
      b. Federal benefits have been desperately asked for by many poor people.
      c. This conclusion was finally arrived at after a long discussion.
      d. The boat was decided on.

(39) a. *Columbus was finally arrived at.
      b. *Columbus was died in by many people.
      c. *His mother was traveled with by John. (Riemsdijk 1978: 220)
      d. *Many hours were argued for. (Riemsdijk & Williams 1986: 147)

Second, I assume that the PO needs to be composed as a verbal argument in order to be passivized and that such argument composition is made possible by morphological incorporation (MI) or syntactic incorporation (SI), in which the verb incorporates the preposition to make a complex verb and the former prepositional argument becomes the composed argument of the complex verb [V-P].[40] The reason the PreP needs

---

[39] Among generally favored criteria for the passivization of a prepositional object (Radford 1988: 430) are: being a complement of a verb or being in a c-command relationship (Chomsky 1965: 105-6, Hornstein & Weinberg 1981: 58-59) with the verb, forming a 'semantic unit' (Chomsky 1977a: 87), and making a 'natural predicate' (Riemsdijk & Williams 1986: 188). Nonetheless, there are many grammatical examples of the PreP in MnE, in which the passive subject NP or the relevant PP including the NP is difficult to consider as subcategorized for by the verb, as follows:

(i) a. The bed was slept in.
     b. The bridge was walked under by many great people such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Napoleon Bonaparte, Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, and so on.

One crucial factor for the acceptability of the PreP is related to the 'affectedness' of the passive subject by the action expressed by the predicate (Hopper & Thompson 1980, Huddleston 1984: 441, Quirk et al 1985: 1164-5), which goes beyond the domain of syntax. However, this factor doesn't need to be considered in explaining the advent of the PreP since few early examples of the PreP concern such an aspect; still, it may reflect some significant on-going changes in the English passive and therefore should ultimately be considered in a complete diachronic and synchronic account of the passive construction.

[40] The reason I prefer to use the term 'incorporation' rather than 'reanalysis' is that OE also had a morphological mechanism, which is analogous to the syntactic 'reanalysis' of MnE in that the original prepositional argument can be composed as a verbal argument through the incorporation of the preposition

incorporation can be explained as follows: passivization must only be a change in the viewpoint for the semantic relationship expressed by the verb of the clause and, like most other syntactic operations, it must not involve a change in the complementhood of the involved arguments.[41] I propose that incorporation is responsible for a change in the grammatical function at a certain level.[42]

One logical conclusion from the discussion in section 3 is that if a type of P-Stranding violates *OPO and is not necessary because some alternative construction is theoretically possible in the language system, then the given type of P-Stranding must be prohibited and the alternative must be obligatory. However, if even the theoretically possible alternative was not allowed for some independent reason, then it must be that OE couldn't have any such construction.

Thus, the answer to the question of why OE had no PreP at all can be given in two steps. The first step requires us to explain why OE had no personal PreP. First, POs in OE were 'too oblique' to be 'fully' passivized for the personal passive. That is, the personal PreP was impossible in OE because a PO in OE was always more oblique than a verbal argument, regardless of the morphological cases involved and because the rigid norm of the OE syntactic passive for any oblique object was the impersonal passive. Thus, if any form of syntactic passive were possible for a PO in OE, it would have to be the impersonal passive at best.

Second, the personal PreP had to require the P-Stranding involving OPO, which is clear since the passive subject (in the PreP) corresponds to the PO in the active in that they are assigned the same theta-role by the same head. Since no P-Stranding through OPO was allowed in OE, the personal PreP could not be allowed either.[43]

Finally, the personal PreP was not 'necessary' in OE because it had a potential alternative construction, that is, the (theoretically possible) impersonal PreP. In fact, no evidence has been found that OE had an impersonal PreP.[44] However, whether the impersonal PreP in OE existed or not doesn't make much difference. Note that the potential impersonal PreP does not violate *OPO. Furthermore, OE had not only many examples of the impersonal passive (for oblique verbal objects) but also many prepositional constructions which have a dummy subject or no nominative subject, which made P-Stranding unnecessary. This means that in principle OE could have the impersonal PreP. Thus, if OE had no impersonal PreP at all, then there must have been some other factors which prohibited the construction. Thus, the more suitable question to ask should be why OE had no impersonal PreP or why, if it occurred, it was so rare.

---

into the verb coupled with subcategorization inheritance (Kim 1997, Goh in press); also the existence of this MI is closely related to the absence of PreP in OE and to the advent of the PreP and SI.

[41] A similar but often more general assumption can be found in many syntactic frameworks. For example, the Projection Principle of Government-Binding theory requires lexical properties to be projected to all levels of syntactic representation (Horrocks 1987: 99).

[42] Radford (1988: 432) posits that the reanalysis of V and P must apply in the *Base*, after lexicalization and before transformations. I believe that the level at which such an incorporation occurs is somewhere in the lexicon rather than the syntax, which can be well accommodated in a lexicalist approach such as Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Pollard & Sag 1987, 1994).

[43] The correspondence between the relevant passive subject and active object is generally accepted in many syntactic frameworks, including those which don't assume movement. For example, Pollard & Sag (1994: 121) explains the passive by means of a lexical rule, in which SUBCAT lists of an active transitive verb form are permuted so that the passive subject and active object correspond to each other.

[44] This does not necessarily mean that OE had no impersonal PreP at all. Note that the impersonal PreP is not very common even in languages such as German in which the impersonal PreP is allowed. Thus, the unavailability of the evidence of the impersonal PreP in OE might be a gap in data.

5.3.   Why Old English Had No Impersonal Prepositional Passive

Why then did OE essentially have no impersonal PreP? First, most true prepositional objects in OE were too oblique to be passivized. Note that OE had extremely productive P-V compounding. Thus, it is very likely that most not-too-oblique POs occurred as a composed verbal argument of P-V CVs through the MI of P by V and subcategorization inheritance.[45] Thus, we can find OE passive examples in which the original PO, composed as a verbal argument, becomes the passive subject. Interestingly but not very surprisingly, the meaning of the P-V CV *under-etan* 'to eat under, undermine' in (42) is quite different from that of its corresponding MnE CV *undereat*.

(40) hie theah swa ondrædendlice gebidon þæt se ege   *ofer-gongen* wæs,
        they however fearfully   awaited thatthe terrorover-gone   was
        'however, they fearfully awaited for the terror to be passed over'   (Or 160.30-1)

(41) ... þæt min freondsiteð under stanhlithe storme   behrimed,
        ... that my lover   sits under cliff   by storm covered with hoar-frost
        wine werigmod,   wætre   *be-flowen*   on dreorsele.
        lord   disconsolate, by water around-flowed in the hall of sorrow.
        '... that my lover, my disconsolate lord, sits under a rocky cliff,
        covered with frost by the storm, surrounded by water'   (Wife 47-50)

(42) scearde scurbeorgescorene gedrorene ældo   *under-eotone*
        cut down buildings torn   collapsed by old age under-eaten
        'buildings (were) cut down, torn, collapsed, undermined by old age'(Ruin 5-6)

Supportive also is the fact that many early examples of the PreP in ME have prepositional verbs or V-P phrases whose OE counterparts in the respect of form or meaning are P-V CVs, as in the following examples (= (28)-(30)):

(43) OE *be-licgan* 'to lie or sleep by/with/around' > ME *liggen bi*

        this maiden ... feledalso bi her thi | thatsche was   *yleyen bi*
        this maiden ... felt also by her thigh thatshe had-beenlain   by
        'this maiden felt by her thigh that she had been lain with'
                                                        (c1330 (?a1300) *Arth. & M.*(Auch) 849)

(44) OE *ymb-sprecan* or *be-sprecan* 'speak of/about' > ME *speken of*

        And the comaundment ys brokun, | And thehalyday, byfore   *of spokun.*
        and the commandment is broken   and the holy day previously of spoken
        'and the commandment was broken, and the holy day previously spoken of'
                                                        (a1400 (c1303) Mannyng, *HS* 1033)

(45) OE *on-spætan* or *be-spætan* 'spit upon' > ME *spitten (up)on*

        and aftyr   he was turmentyd, and aftyr   he was *spyt vpon*
        and afterwardshe was tormented and afterwardshe was spat upon
                                                        (a1425 *Wycl.Serm.* I 39.26)

---

[45] Note that the incorporation of P by V and the composition of the prepositional argument as a verbal argument is very similar to the (syntactic) reanalysis proposed by Jespersen (1909-49: part III, vol. II. 15.74) and formulated by van Riemsdijk (1978), since through the reanalysis, P is incorporated with V to form a 'complex' or 'compound' verb and the former prepositional argument comes to have the status of a verbal argument.

Second, another reason, which is rather hypothetical since it is difficult to prove, is that OE only had MI but didn't have the mechanism of SI, which, under the assumptions made above, enables the prepositional argument to be composed as a verbal argument and then passivized, thus taking a detour around *OPO. Regardless of the plausibility of the claim that the mechanism of SI came into being in ME and the general acceptance of the evidence of SI, the existence of the extremely productive MI of P and V in OE is very likely to have alleviated considerably or even obviated altogether the need for SI; such a situation will make the claim of no SI in OE much more plausible.

6.   The Advent of the Prepositional Passive in Middle English

In section 3, we have observed that all cases of P-Stranding in OE had their own necessity and that such necessity was always compatible with the prohibition against OPO. What then would become of the grammar if, for some reason, the compatibility between the necessity and the prohibition collapses and they begin to conflict with each other? More specifically, if the previously unavailable P-Stranding in some prepositional construction becomes necessary due to some change(s) in the language system, with any alternative construction still remaining unavailable and *OPO still strong, then what kind of result will the conflict bring to the relevant construction? Will one simply win over the other? Can the P-Stranding in that construction become acceptable unless it is prohibited for other reasons? In this section, I will argue that this is what really happened in the history of English and that such a conflict was resolved through an 'optimal' choice available which made it possible to detour around the apparent dilemma without immediately destroying the balance between the necessity and the constraint.[46]

How then did English come to have the new PreP in ME? Above all, the advent of the PreP in ME was a morphosyntactic change which was gradually nurtured by significant changes in other parts of the language system. In particular, almost every component of the grammar contributed to the advent of the PreP by jointly or independently enabling the English grammar to be equipped with the factors promoting the PreP, which were previously unavailable or insufficient.

6.1.   Changes in Sound and Morphology
6.1.1.   Sound Change and Leveling of Inflectional Endings

As is well known, various sound changes around the ME period were simple but far-reaching. In particular, the weakening and reduction of (unstressed) final syllables reduced a number of previously distinct grammatical endings, including dative and accusative case endings, to a uniform -e [ə], which, along with the operation of analogy, brought about the leveling of inflectional endings. Thus, the OE case system was beginning to decay already in the OE period and by the early ME, English came to lose the accusative and dative distinction. Traces of this reduction of inflectional endings are found even in OE documents as early as the tenth century and by the end of the twelfth century, this change for the most part is completed (Baugh & Cable 1993: 155, Allen 1995).

In fact, the loss of inflectional endings in ME has often been linked to the advent of the PreP as well as the indirect passive (van der Gaaf 1930, de la Cruz 1973, Lightfoot 1981, etc.). We have already seen, in section 2, that the reanalysis of a prepositional

---

[46] By using the term 'optimal', I don't assume any particular theoretical framework, although this is in the spirit of Optimality theory, as noted in fn. 23.

dative object as passive subject is not tenable because of the nonexistence of the impersonal PreP in OE. Denison (1985: 193) argues that the loss of case distinctions increased the number of V and P collocations which, as a semantic unit, govern an NP as an affected DO, thereby making it eligible for passivization. However, note that, other things being equal, the loss of the formal distinctions in case itself cannot make the PO (semantically) less oblique and thereby increase the pool of eligible collocations. At best, it only means the increase of accusative POs, which already existed in OE (van der Gaaf 1930, Visser 1963-73: 391).

The loss of case distinctions, indeed, played a significant role in the advent of the PreP but its contribution lies in a different place. OE morphological cases, together with prepositions, were 'obliqueness markers', which systematically encoded and represented relative obliqueness among NP arguments. The loss of case distinctions brought about the loss of the morphological way of representing and maintaining relative obliqueness, making it necessary for English to have a different mechanism, since relative obliqueness of NP arguments has always been one of the most significant grammatical or semantic relationships, underlying both the rigid maintenance of the OH in the subcategorization inheritance of P-V CVs and the prohibition against OPO in OE.

Note that one main motivation for this prohibition was the maintenance of grammatical or semantic relationships, especially relative obliqueness. Now, due to the loss of the distinctions in case endings as obliqueness markers, English began to depend increasingly on fixed word order until it became the sole means of representing and maintaining relative obliqueness. This means that *OPO weakened considerably, making OPO relatively easier. Thus, around the 13th century, the new types of P-Stranding, which involve OPO, began to appear. However, we should say *OPO was still quite strong since the new P-Stranding types remained rare until the end of the 14th century.

6.1.2. Loss of Preposition-Verb Compound Verbs

Another important change in morphology which contributed to the advent of the PreP is the loss of OE P-V CVs. English lost most of P-V CVs along with the disappearance of many OE prefixes and appearance of a number of new prepositions (Fischer 1992: 386-7, Mustanoja 1960: 345-427). What is interesting here is that the loss of P-V CVs is not just due to the disappearance of many prefixes or prepositions or their replacement by new prepositions. This is clear since English lost even most of the P-V CVs whose components are both alive, as in (46)-(49), as well as the P-V CVs whose component P or V is lost or replaced, as in (50) and (51). Also note that almost every P-V CV which remains in MnE is semantically not very transparent, as in (52) and (53), which is generally expected from any result of compounding:[47]

(46) *ofer*-V

    ofer-beon 'be over', *ofer-climban* 'climb over', *ofer-faran* 'go over',
    ofer-gan 'go over', *ofer-gestondan* 'stand over', *ofer-glidan* 'glide over',
  ofer-hleapan 'jump over', *ofer-lihtan* 'light upon', *ofer-ridan* 'ride across',
    ofer-rowan 'row over', *ofer-sawan* 'sow (over)', *ofer-settan* 'set over',
    ofer-standan 'stand over', *ofer-swimman* 'swim over', *ofer-ðencan* 'think over',
    ofer-wadan 'wade over'.

---

[47] The OE words and definitions are based on Hall (1960). Note the difference between the CVs in (46) and (47) and those in (48) and (49): the preverbs *ofer-* and *under-* in (46) and (47) are still alive as both a prefix and a preposition, whereas *æt-* and *ðurh-* in (48) and (49) are alive only as prepositions.

(47) *under*-V

under-beran 'support', *under-crammian* 'fill underneath', *under-delfan* 'dig under', *under-don* 'put under', *under-etan* 'eat underneath, *under-flowan* 'flow under', *under-gestandan* 'stand under', *under-gan* 'undermine', *under-secan* 'examine', *under-stredan* 'strew under'.

(48) *æt*-V

æt-beran 'carry to', *æt-clifian* 'cleave to', *æt-gangan* 'go to', *æt-sittan* 'sit by', *æt-slapan* 'sleep beside', *æt-standan* 'stand at'.

(49) *ðurh*-V

ðurh-blawan 'inspire', *ðurh-borian* 'bore through', *ðurh-brecan* 'break through', *ðurh-brengan* 'bring through', *ðurh-creopan* 'creep through', *ðurh-delfan* 'dig through', *ðurh-drifan* 'drive through', *ðurh-etan* 'eat through', *ðurh-faran* 'pass through', ðurh-*fleon* 'fly through', *ðurh-gan* 'go through', *ðurh-secan* 'search through', *ðurh-sceotan* 'shoot through', *ðurh-seon* 'look through', *ðurh-stingan* 'pierce through', *ðurh-swimman* 'swim through'.

(50) *ofer*-V

ofer-geotan 'pour upon', *ofer-leoran* 'pass over', *ofer-mæstan* 'over-fatten', *ofer-magan* 'prevail', *ofer-ricsian* 'rule over', *ofer-stigan* 'climb over', *ofer-swiðan* 'overpower', *ofer-teldan* 'cover over', *ofer-teon* 'draw over', *ofer-weorpan* 'throw over, overthrow', *ofer-wreon* 'cover over'.

(51) *under*-V

under-bugan 'submit to', *under-hnigan* 'submit to', *under-iernan* 'run under', *under-lutan* 'bend under', *under-smugan* 'creep under', *under-ðenian* 'serve under'.

(52) *ofer*-V

ofer-cuman 'overcome', *ofer-don* 'overdo', *ofer-drincan* 'drink too much' *ofer-growan* 'overgrow', *ofer-libban* 'survive', *ofer-sprædan* 'overlay'.

(53) *under*-V

under-lecgan 'support', *under-licgan* 'be subject to, give way to', *under-standan* 'perceive', *under-writan* 'write at the foot of'.

Why then is it that English lost even most P-V CVs whose components are still alive? The answer to this question is closely related to the fact that those OE P-V CVs were not compounds in the MnE sense. In fact, the status of OE P-V CVs was very different from that of MnE P-V CVs: first, P-V compounding in OE was extremely productive; second, OE P-V CVs were semantically and morphosyntactically very transparent. Note that both of the features can be expected mainly for V and P phrases or prepositional verbs in MnE.

Furthermore, most of the transparent OE P-V CVs in (46)-(49), although they were lost, are still alive or have their counterparts in the form of V-P phrases or prepositional verbs in MnE. This strongly suggests that P-V compounding in OE was a morphosyntactic way of incorporating P by V as well as a part of ordinary compounding which is considered to be involved in such OE P-V CVs, as in (52) and (53), and also in most compounds in MnE. Thus, OE had at least two kinds of P-V CVs: one is the more

transparent P-V CVs which resulted from MI, and the other is the more opaque ones which were the result of ordinary compounding.[48]

Given this, the loss or change of OE P-V CVs can be explained as follows: first, most 'true' compounds (from ordinary compounding), if their components are alive, remain in later English, as in (52) and (53); second, English lost most of the P-V CVs whose components were lost, as in (49) and (50); and finally, English also lost most P-V CVs whose components are still alive and whose phrasal counterparts are found in MnE, as in (46)-(49). Note that the first and second cases are 'naturally' expected, whereas the third case is quite exceptional. Now if we assume that the third group was the result of the MI of P by V and that English lost the mechanism of that (transparent) MI, then the loss of the third group can also be well explained.

Although the loss of MI is related to the general trend of change in English, from synthetic to analytic, it also has much to do with the loss of formal distinctions in case as an 'obliqueness marker'. With a prohibition against OPO, flexible word order, and productive P-V compounding, one optimal choice in English for the composition of the prepositional argument as a verbal argument would be through MI by P-V compounding. In this case, the relative obliqueness between verbal and prepositional arguments can be maintained only by the morphological cases as obliqueness markers. Now, the loss of case inflections brought about the loss of the overt obliqueness markers, putting the representation and maintenance of (relative) obliqueness in danger. In this situation, an attempt to compose the prepositional argument as a verbal argument through MI will be fatal to the maintenance of relative obliqueness. Furthermore, along with the general trend of change in English grammar, relative obliqueness among NP arguments now came to be maintained mainly by fixed word order. Thus, MI came to be a very unfavorable option for the argument composition of the prepositional argument.

In short, the loss of OE P-V CVs means that English lost the productivity of P-V compounding, which was responsible for the MI of P and V as well as ordinary compounding. The loss of MI, in particular, is demonstrated by the loss of P-V CVs, which belong to the third group, exemplified in (46)-(49), and their survival as or replacement by prepositional verbs and V-P phrases in later English. This strongly suggests that the appearance of the so-called reanalysis of V and P or SI in ME is not new at all: English has had the same mechanism from the OE period, adjusting it to the change in the overall shape of the language system but maintaining its core properties.

6.2.   Changes in Semantics

The loss of OE P-V CVs or complex verbs consisting of a (non-prepositional) prefix and a simplex verb and their replacement by corresponding V-P phrases or collocations affected the semantics of prepositional objects in general. As we have already seen, many OE P-V CVs and other complex verbs were replaced by corresponding V-P phrases or prepositional verbs (cf. de la Cruz 1973, Fischer 1992: 386-7). However, the V-P phrase replacements of P-V CVs are often semantic replacements rather than just functional replacements since many replacing V-P phrases or prepositional verbs have different P or V components from their corresponding OE P-V CVs, if they existed.

---

[48] Productivity and (semantic) compositionality are among the most commonly cited criteria for distinguishing syntactic rules and lexical rules (Wasow 1977). Considering that unlike the P-V CVs in (52) and (53), the P-V CVs in (46)-(49) are very productive *and* morphosyntactically and semantically transparent, their formations are more (morpho)syntactic rather than purely lexical.

Now no matter what the general characteristics of the replacement were, it is clear that the transitivizing function of those compound verbs, along with the loss of the Germanic prefixes as a productive system, came to be fulfilled by other means, especially by V and P collocations (Denison 1985: 193). This, above all, means that many concepts previously expressed by those P-V CVs came to be represented by V-P phrases of new or same components, in which process former verbal arguments, which could be passivized, became prepositional arguments, maintaining the passivizable degree of obliqueness of the original verbal arguments. This can be considered one of the main sources which brought about not only Bennett's (1980) extension of the scope of the relation 'direct object' but also the lexicalization of some V and P sequences, as mentioned above (cf. Denison 1985: 193 and Fischer 1992: 386-7). Thus, we can find many OE P-V CVs which were replaced by V-P phrases with or without the change in their components and some are found even in early examples of the PreP.[49]

Most importantly, all this means that at least some English prepositional objects became less oblique or 'not-too-oblique' enough to be passivized and that the overall obliqueness of the English prepositional objects decreased. Thus, the relative obliqueness between verbal arguments and prepositional arguments now became valid only for the same verbal head in the same sentence. In OE, on the other hand, the relative obliqueness between the two was always maintained, as can be seen in the regularity of passive for verbal arguments versus no passive for prepositional arguments.

There was another semantic change which is significant for the advent of the PreP. In OE, prepositions were one of the two obliqueness markers and just like the other obliqueness marker (i.e. morphological case endings) they couldn't be overtly separated from their objects; as noted earlier, remaining in their canonical position was the best way to prevent any potential change or confusion in the absolute obliqueness of prepositional objects and the relative obliqueness between verbal and prepositional arguments.

On the other hand, along with the change in the means of maintaining relative obliqueness among NP arguments (i.e. from "obliqueness markers and the prohibition against their separation from their host NPs" to "rigid syntactic word order"),[50] the status of prepositions has been changed and their function as (absolute) obliqueness markers became trivial at best. Thus, prepositions in later English are now mainly used to express the relationship between the prepositional argument and other NPs (e.g. *put* NP$_1$ *on* NP$_2$) or extra shades of meaning of the verb (e.g. *look at* vs. *look for*).

Although prepositions in later English often indicate a high degree of obliqueness (especially, with an adjunct PP), such is not always the case because at least some prepositional arguments are not very different from verbal arguments (e.g. *look into* NP vs. *investigate* NP, *look for* NP vs. *seek* NP). Furthermore, even the relative obliqueness between a prepositional argument and a verbal argument in the same clause can now be represented by the word order alone. Thus, now OPO no longer causes any serious problem in maintaining relative obliqueness or general grammatical relations, as long as the PO is located in a legitimate position after the separation.

---

[49] See the examples in (28)-(30).

[50] In general, relative obliqueness among NP (object) arguments in MnE can be expressed in terms of word order as follows: the nearer an (NP) argument is to the verb, the less oblique it is. This relationship between relative obliqueness and word order is generally accepted in many syntactic frameworks. For example, in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, the relative obliqueness of complements is modeled by position on the list for the SUBCATEGORIZATION value of the head (Pollard & Sag 1987: 70-1, 1994: 2-3), which generally represents the surface word order.

In short, the position of PP became much more restricted, whereas OPO came to be more permissible, opposite from the OE situation. This change in the semantics of prepositions, with the change in the obliqueness of prepositional arguments, is one of the main factors which contributed to the weakening of *OPO.

6.3.   Changes in Syntax
6.3.1.   The Establishment of Fixed Word Order

The most important syntactic change which contributed to the advent of the PreP is the establishment of fixed word order.[51] It is generally agreed that the loss of oblique case inflection and the fixing of SVO word order went together and that there is a correlation between these two, although the cause and effect relationship is not very clear. In addition, as we have considered above, the loss of case inflections as obliqueness markers and the replacement of their function of maintaining relative obliqueness by rigid word order are mutually supportive.

Most importantly, through the fixing of word order, English came to have a syntactic way of representing and maintaining relative obliqueness among NP arguments, which was morphosyntactically achieved by obliqueness markers (i.e. cases and Ps) and *OPO in OE. Note that both OE morphosyntactic and later English syntactic ways of maintaining relative obliqueness are complemented by the incorporation of P by V: OE had MI by P-V compounding and later English came to have SI.

The core insight in this account of the change in the means by which relative obliqueness was maintained is that the establishment of fixed word order, along with the loss of case inflections, contributed to the weakening of the motivation behind *OPO. That is, without the prohibition against OPO, it was almost impossible to maintain relative obliqueness between NP arguments in OE with a high degree of flexibility in word order. Furthermore, once the prepositional argument is composed into the argument structure of a verb, morphological cases were the only means to distinguish relative obliqueness. The SI of V and P or OPO with fixed word order, however, hardly causes any confusion in relative obliqueness as long as the PO is located in a legitimate position after the separation, since relative obliqueness is sufficiently represented and maintained by the relative word order and the well constrained reordering of relevant arguments.

6.3.2.   Syntactically Triggered Incorporation

Another important change for the advent of the English PreP is the rise of the reanalysis of V and P, the evidence for which seems to be quite generally accepted, no matter whether the mechanism itself is accepted or not.[52] As we have discussed in section 2, many studies posit this mechanism of reanalysis, which I call 'syntactic incorporation' (SI), to explain (the advent of) the PreP. Although several questions are still to be answered before we can accept the existence of SI, correlating SI with (the advent of) the PreP doesn't seem to encounter any serious logical problems. First, there is no clear evidence that OE had a similar type of SI. The presence of SI in OE is at best suspicious since OE clearly had functionally similar MI and this must have obviated the necessity of SI.[53] Second, there isn't any evidence that languages show similar evidence of SI without

---

[51] The fixing of English word order began around the beginning of the ME period and at least the prose of the ME period has much the same word order as MnE prose (Pyles & Algeo 1993: 162). On the other hand, Mitchell (1985: §3951) says that the SV(O) order was inevitable even before Norman influence began.

[52] For positions against the reanalysis proposal, see Postal (1986) and Koster (1987).

[53] Note that the impersonal PreP in German freely allows P to be separated from V, as in (18) and (19).

the PreP. Finally, the evidence for SI is found only in the PreP construction. Thus, it seems fair to assume that the PreP always involves SI and that whenever we have SI we also have the PreP; the priority relation between these two, however, is not easy to determine.

However, although applying the insight from SI to the account of the rise of the PreP seems to be essential, some serious questions need to be answered in order for this process to be fully justified as a major factor for the advent of the PreP. Why and how, above all, did English come to have SI in ME, if we assume that SI made the PreP possible or else always occurs with the PreP? Why didn't OE have a similar mechanism? It is crucial to answer such questions because otherwise a satisfactory diachronic explanation of the PreP will be lacking, even if synchronic accounts may be possible for the relevant construction at the beginning and endpoint of the change.

Furthermore, the evidence of SI seems to be found only with the personal PreP; there is no similar evidence from any impersonal PreP. Thus, even though German can have the impersonal PreP, as in (54), P-Stranding is not allowed at all and therefore the verb cannot occur with the preposition:

(54) a.Meine Mutter sorgt für die Kinder.
          'my mother is taking case of the children'
      b. Für die Kinder wird gesorgt.
          'the children are being taken care of'
      c.Es wird für die Kinder gesort.
          'the children are being taken care of'
      d. *Die Kinder werden gesorgt für / für gesorgt.

Thus, the question of why English came to have SI is closely related to the question of why the evidence for reanalysis/SI is found only in the (personal) passive and why English came to have the personal PreP only. Why then did English come to have SI and the personal PreP without having the impersonal PreP?

6.4.   Subject Requirement as a Trigger for the Change in the English Passive

The changes in sound, morphology, syntax and semantics considered so far influenced the English prepositional constructions and the potential for OPO in those constructions. The following table in (55) shows four main reasons why OE had no PreP at all, newly-developed, promoting factors in the advent of the PreP, and what still has to be explained:

(55) New Promoting Factors and What Yet To Be Explained

Reasons for no PreP	New promoting factors	What to be explained
Lack of necessity		**Necessity**
*OPO	Weakened ***OPO**	**Still strong *OPO**
Too oblique PO	New passivizable PO	
MI but no SI	(Loss of MI)	**Development of SI**

Above all, the various changes contributed considerably to the weakening of ***OPO**. The main motivation for ***OPO** was the high degree of obliqueness of the prepositional argument and the maintenance of relative obliqueness among NP arguments. Given this, the loss of P-V CVs and their replacement by V-P phrases, the development of less

oblique DO-like prepositional arguments, the loss of the case inflections, the fixing of word order, and the consequent change in the means of maintaining relative obliqueness must have decreased the possibility of confusion in relative obliqueness which can be caused by OPO.

Note that despite the significant contribution of those factors to the weakening of *OPO, the constraint was still strong, since the new P-Stranding patterns involving OPO remained rare for a long period after the advent of the PreP. Moreover, although English lost MI along with the loss of OE P-V CVs, the passivization possibilities of previously verbal but now DO-like prepositional arguments must have been maintained without any significant change. In such a situation, one good option would be the impersonal PreP, which is quite plausible since it can satisfy the still strong *OPO as well as the increased passivization possibility of the prepositional argument. However, there is no evidence to be found that English has had the impersonal PreP in any period.

What then made the advent of the personal PreP possible, leaving the impersonal PreP impossible? This, along with the question of why English came to have SI of V and P, suggests that despite all the major factors considered so far, there is still a logical gap which must be filled for a complete account of the advent of the PreP. More than anything else, we have to explain what, despite the still active *OPO, actively triggered the advent of the previously unnecessary, personal PreP over the impersonal PreP, bringing about SI.

Along with other conspicuous changes in the language system, especially the establishment of the fixed SVO word order, English came to require an overt subject in virtually every sentence and construction, a constraint which can be called the 'subject requirement' (SubjR). I claim that this SubjR, which began to be dominant in English around the early ME period, triggered the long-prepared advent of the PreP, making the personal PreP virtually the only practical option. That is, the SubjR was what made OPO obligatory in the passive, changing P-Stranding in the PreP construction from unnecessary to necessary.[54]

Note that *OPO was still very strong in the early ME period. Thus, the emerging SubjR must have brought about a serious conflict between the newly developed necessity of OPO and the still strong *OPO. Because the developing SubjR required the (nominative) subject even in passive sentences and also because an indefinite dummy subject has not been allowed in English except for a limited number of impersonal verbs and in the expression of indefinite agency, passivization of the PO would have had to become obligatory, making the previously impossible OPO necessary and the potential impersonal PreP even theoretically implausible and thus unavailable.

In such a dilemma between the necessity of OPO and the still active *OPO, SI must have been the 'optimal' choice. Above all, SI can break the apparently deadlocked situation with OPO, because it can nicely satisfy not only the obligatoriness of OPO but also the still strong *OPO, by enabling the prepositional argument to detour around the

---

[54] Although the SubjR (cf. Perlmutter 1971: 100) is widely assumed or implied in most diachronic and synchronic studies of English, what brought about the SubjR into the grammar of English has hardly been made clear. See Kim (1996: 182-7, 234-55) for a useful discussion of the SubjR in English. Although Kim makes reference to such a constraint (i.e. "Prototypical Subject Requirement") and uses it in her account of the shift from pro-drop to non-pro-drop of the referential NP and of the changes with impersonal verbs, she does not explain what caused the SubjR to come into being in English, either. I suspect that the loss of case distinctions and (analogical) reanalysis of (dative) objects or complements as nominative subjects, which was influenced by the predominant personal constructions, played a significant role.

barrier PP. Under the assumptions we made in section 5.2, passivization requires the composition of the prepositional argument as a verbal argument, as a way of maintaining the complementhood of the prepositional argument in passivization. In fact, SI provides a good means for argument composition, enabling V to compose the original prepositional argument as its own argument so that the passivized argument in the PreP can not only maintain its complementhood in passivization but also avoid *OPO (cf. Baker 1988, Sternefeld 1990).

Furthermore, SI of V and P is not completely new, because English already had the functionally similar MI in OE. OE had a morphological way of incorporating P into V and making the original prepositional argument inherited or composed by V through P-V compounding. English lost MI and many transparent P-V CVs came to be replaced by V-P phrases in ME, whereas a syntactic motivation for the incorporation of P by V was newly developed by the SubjR and supported by other relevant changes. In this situation, the rise of some compensatory means of SI in an analytic language would not be implausible, since loss in one component of the grammar is likely to be compensated for in another component (Hock & Joseph 1996: 211).

The SubjR as a trigger for the advent of the PreP can explain why the evidence for SI of P by V, in spite of no significant semantic difference between the two V-P phrases of the active and passive, is found only in the passive. This is because it is only in the passive that the SubjR requires the PO to become the nominative passive subject and motivates SI to make the consequent obligatory OPO possible. This also explains why English came to have only the personal PreP and also why similar evidence for SI is not found with the impersonal PreP that doesn't need a nominative subject.

In short, the advent of the English PreP was a morphosyntactic change, long in preparation and nurtured by the relevant changes in other parts of the language system. In particular, the change was triggered by the SubjR, which made OPO and the consequent P-Stranding in the PreP necessary and the impersonal PreP unavailable, and thus led to the deadlock between the necessary OPO and the still active *OPO. This apparently contradictory situation could be saved by the help of SI of P by V, whose rise is not totally new but rather is very reminiscent, in almost every respect, of the MI of P by V through P-V compounding in OE.

7.   Conclusion: How Syntactic Is the 'Syntactic' Change?

In this paper, we have discussed one good example of linguistic change which has generally been called 'syntactic'. Yet, it is fair to ask just how syntactic the change involved was in the advent and development of the PreP. While the change in the English passive can be considered syntactic in that it was triggered by the syntactic factor SubjR and in that SI played a significant role, even these aspects are not totally syntactic. Clearly, the triggering SubjR was developed under the influence of the changes in other parts of the grammar. As for SI, its development and status is closely related to OE MI through P-V compounding and thus there no good reason why 'syntactic' incorporation cannot be treated morphologically or morphosyntactically rather than purely syntactically. Therefore, the change was purely syntactic only at the beginning and endpoint of the change: "no PreP in OE" and "the advent of the new syntactic passive form in ME".

Our discussion so far, if it turns out to be successful, seems to argue for something interesting about language change. Linguistic change, especially syntactic change, is more likely to come about through change in the outputs which resulted from change in

the inputs (especially, in sounds and morphology) to a certain rule or principle rather than through the modification or addition of rules; at most such rule change could be a result of the change but not a cause.[55] This view of language change, especially regarding the passive, is also suggested by Hock (1991: 346-8) and Joseph (1992): a change in the passive, as Hock states, which is "notorious for its instability", does "not involve the syntax of the passive, but its morphological encoding".

REFERENCES

ADAMSON, S, LAW, V. A., VINCENT, N., and WRIGHT, S. (eds.) (1990). Papers from the 5th international conference on English historical linguistics: Cambridge, 6-9 April 1987. (Current issues in linguistic theory 65). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ALLEN, C. L. (1980a). Topics in diachronic English syntax. New York/London: Garland Publishing. [Revision of Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1977].

_____. (1980b). Movement and deletion in Old English. Linguistic Inquiry 11. 261-323.

_____. (1995). Case marking and reanalysis: grammatical relations from Old to early Modern English. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BAKER, C. L. and McCARTHY, J. J. (1981). The logical problem of language acquisition. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

BAKER, M. C. (1988). Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BAUGH, A. C. and CABLE, T. (1993). A history of the English language. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

BENNIS, H. and HOEKSTRA, T. (1984). Gaps and parasitic gaps. The Linguistic Review 4: 29-89.

BENNETT, P. A. (1980). English passives: a study in syntactic change and relational grammar. Lingua 51: 101-14.

BERMAN, A. (1973). A constraint on tough-movement. Papers from the ninth regional meeting of Chicago linguistic society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. pp. 34-43.

BLAKE, N. (ed.) (1992). The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. II, 1066-1476. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOLINGER, D. (1977). Transitivity and spatiality: the passive of the prepositional verbs. In A. MAKKAI et al. (1977). pp. 57-78. [Revision of on the passive in English (1975)].

BT = BOSWORTH, J. AND TOLLER, T. (1882-98). An Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BTs = TOLLER, T. N. (1908-21). Supplement to an Anglo-Saxon dictionary, by J. BOSWORTH and T. N. TOLLER (1882-98). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

CHOMSKY, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

_____. (1974). The Amherst lectures. Unpublished lecture notes distributed by Documents Linguistiques. University of Paris VII.

_____. (1977a). Essays on form and interpretation. Amsterdam: North Holland.

_____. (1977b). On wh-movement. In P. W. CULICOVER et al. (1977). pp. 71-132.

COLMAN, F. (ed.) (1992). Evidence for Old English: material and theoretical bases for reconstruction. (Edinburgh studies in the English language 2). Edinburgh: John Donald.

COMRIE, B. (1981). Language universals and linguistic typology: syntax and morphology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CROFT, W. (1990). Typology and universals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COUPER-KUHLEN, E. (1979). The prepositional passive in English: a semantic-syntactic analysis, with a lexicon of prepositional verbs. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

---

[55] See Joseph (1998) for this line of argument about linguistic change.

CULICOVER, P. W. (1997). Principles and parameters: an introduction to syntactic theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____, WASOW, T., and AKMAJIAN, A. (eds.) (1977). Formal syntax. New York: Academic Press.
DAVENPORT, M., HANSEN, E., and NIELSEN, H. F. (eds.) (1983). Current topics in English historical linguistics. Odense: Odense university Press.
DE LA CRUZ, J. M. (1973). A late 13th century change in English structure. Orbis 22: 161-76.
DENISON, D. (1985). Why Old English has no prepositional passive. English Studies 66. 189-204.
_____. (1993). English historical syntax: verbal constructions. London: Longman.
EATON, R., FISCHER, O., KOOPMAN, W., and VAN DER LEEK, F. (eds.) (1985). Papers from the 4th international conference on English historical linguistics: Amsterdam, 10-13 April 1985. (Current issues in linguistic theory 41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
FAARLUND, J. T. (ed.) (1985). Germanic linguistics: papers from a symposium at the university of Chicago, April 24, 1985. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Club.
FISCHER, O. C. M. (1992). Syntax. In N. BLAKE (1992). pp. 207-408.
_____, and LEEK, F. C. VAN DER (1981). Optional vs. radical reanalysis: mechanisms of syntactic change, Review of Lightfoot (1979). Lingua 55: 301-49.
GAAF, W. VAN DER (1930). The passive of a verb accompanied by a preposition. English Studies 12: 1-24.
GOH, G-Y. (1998a). How to explain the contribution of nonheads. Papers from 1997 Mid-America linguistics conference. pp. 165-174. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri-Columbia.
_____. (1998b). Relative obliqueness and subcategorization inheritance in Old English preposition-verb compound verbs, OSU working papers in linguistics 51: 59-94.
_____. (in press). Case government of Old English verbs. Journal of English Linguistics.
_____. (to appear). Alternative case markings in Old English texts. English Studies.
GREWENDORF, G. and STERNEFELD, W. (ed.) (1990). Scrambling and barriers. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
HALL, J. R. CLARK (1960). A concise Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
HOCK, H. H. (1991). Principles of historical linguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
HOCK, H. H. and JOSEPH, B. D. (1996). Language history, language change, and language relationship: an introduction to historical and comparative linguistics. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
HOPPER, P. J. and THOMPSON, S. A. (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. Language 56.2: 251-299.
HORNSTEIN, N. and WEINBERG, A. (1981). Case theory and preposition stranding. Linguistic Inquiry 12. 55-91.
HORROCKS, G. (1987). Generative grammar. London & New York: Longman.
HUDDLESTON, R. (1984). Introduction to the grammar of English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
JESPERSEN, O. (1909-49). A modern English grammar on historical principles. Parts III & VII. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
JOSEPH, B. D. (1992). Diachronic perspectives on control. In R. K. LARSON et al. (1992). pp. 195-234.
_____. (1998). Diachronic morphology. In A. SPENCER & A. ZWICKY (1998). pp. 351-373.
KAYNE, R. (1981a). ECP extensions. Linguistic Inquiry 12: 93-135.

_____. (1981b). On certain differences between English and French. Linguistic Inquiry 12: 349-373.

KEMENADE, A. VAN (1987). Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English. Ph. D. dissertation. Utrecht. Dordrecht: Foris.

KEENAN, E. L. and COMRIE, B. (1977). Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 8: 63-99.

_____. (1979). Data on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy. Language 55: 331-351.

KIM, H-R. (1996). The synchrony and diachrony of English impersonal verbs: a study in syntactic and lexical change. Ph. D. dissertation, The Ohio State University.

KIM, H-R. (1997). Subcategorization inheritance in Old English P-V compound. Journal of Linguistics 31: 39-66.

KOOPMAN, W. F. (1985). Verb and particle combinations in Old and Middle English. In R. EATON et al. (1985). pp. 109-21.

_____. (1990a). Word order in Old English: with special reference to the verb phrase. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam (Amsterdam studies in generative grammar 1).

_____. (1990b). The double object construction in Old English. In S. ADAMSON et al. (1990). pp. 225-43.

_____. (1992). Old English clitic pronouns: some remarks. In F. COLMAN (1992). pp. 44-87.

KOSTER, J. (1987). Domain and dynasties: the radical autonomy of syntax. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

LARSON, R. K., IATRIDOU, S., LAHIRI, U., and HIGGINBOTHAM, J. (eds.) (1992). Control and grammar. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

LIEBER, R. (1979). The English passive: an argument for historical rule stability. Linguistic Inquiry 10: 667-88.

LIGHTFOOT, D. W. (1979). Principles of diachronic syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1981). The history of noun phrase movement. In C. L. BAKER and J. J. MCCARTHY (1981). pp. 86-119.

MAKKAI, A., BEKKER-MAKKAI, V., and HEILMANN, L. (eds.) (1977). Linguistics at the crossroads. Lake Bluff, IL: Padova/Jupiter Press.

MCLAUGHLIN, J. (1983). Old English syntax: a handbook. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

MITCHELL, B. (1985). Old English syntax. (vol. 1). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MUSTANOJA, T. F. (1960). A Middle English syntax. Part I. parts of speech. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

PERLMUTTER, D. M. (1971). Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax. New York: Holts, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

PINTZUK, S. and KROCH, A. S. (1985). Reconciling an exceptional feature of Old English clause structure. In J. T. FAARLUND (1985). pp. 87-111.

_____, _____. (1989). The rightward movement of complements and adjuncts in the Old English of Beowulf. (Revision of PINTZUK & KROCH (1985)). Language Variation and Change 1: 115-43.

PLANK, F. (1983). Coming into being among the Anglo-Saxons. In M. DAVENPORT et al. (1983). pp. 239-78.

POLLARD, C. and SAG, I. (1987). Information-based syntax and semantics. (vol. 1). fundamentals. CSLI Lecture Notes no. 13. Standford: CSLI publications. Distributed by University of Chicago Press.

_____, _____. (1994). Head-driven phrase structure grammar. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

POSTAL, P. M. (1971). Cross-over phenomena. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

_____. (1986). Studies of passive clauses. Albany: State University of New York Press.

PYLES, T. and ALGEO, J. (1993). The origins and development of the English language. 4th ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

QUIRK, R., GREENBAUM, S., LEECH, G., and SVARTVIK, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London/New York: Longman

RADFORD, A. (1988). Transformational grammar: a first course. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:

RIEMSDIJK, H. C. VAN (1978). A case study in syntactic markedness: the binding nature of prepositional phrases. (Studies in generative grammar, 4). Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
_____, and WILLIAMS, E. (1986). Introduction to the theory of grammar. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

ROSENBAUM, P. S. (1967). The grammar of English predicate complement constructions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

SIEWIERSKA, A. (1984). The passive: a comparative linguistic analysis. London: Croom Helm.

SPENCER, A. and ZWICKY, A. (ed.) (1998). The handbook of morphology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

STERNEFELD, W. (1990). Scrambling and minimality. In G. GREWENDORF and W. STERNEFELD (1990). pp. 239-257.

THORNBURG, L. (1985). The history of the prepositional passive in English. Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistics society 11: 327-36.

VENEZKY, R. L. and HEALEY, A. DIP. (1980). A microfiche concordance to Old English. Toronto: Center for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.

VESTERGAARD, T. (1977). Prepositional phrases and prepositional verbs: a study in grammatical function. The Hague: Mouton.

VISSER, F. T. (1963-73). An historical syntax of the English language. 3 parts; 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

WASOW, T. (1977). Transformations and the lexicon. In P. W. CULICOVER et al. (1977). pp. 327-360.

WURFF, W. VAN DER (1990). The easy-to-please construction in Old and Middle English. In S. ADAMSON et al. (1990). pp. 519-536.
_____. (1992). Syntactic variability, borrowing, and innovation. Diachronica 9: 61-85. (Revision of Variability and syntactic change. Dutch working papers in English language and linguistics 23).