



## University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics

---

Volume 1  
Issue 1 *Working Papers*

Article 4

---

1-1-1994

# The Syntax of Verb Movement in Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact

Anthony Kroch

Ann Taylor

---

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol1/iss1/4>  
For more information, please contact [libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

# The Syntax of Verb Movement in Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact

# The Syntax of Verb Movement in Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact\*

Anthony Kroch and Ann Taylor

## 1 Introduction

Our goal in this paper is to show that the northern and southern dialects<sup>1</sup> of Middle English differ significantly in their verb-movement syntax. In particular, we will give evidence that these dialects exemplify a recently discovered typological distinction within the Germanic language family. Several studies have shown that the verb-second constraint generally found in this family may involve movement to either of two different positions, depending on the language investigated. In the better known languages (e.g., German, Dutch, and mainland Scandinavian), verb-second (V2) word order results from movement of the tensed verb to the C<sup>0</sup> position and concomitant movement of some maximal projection to the specifier of CP. In other Germanic languages (e.g., Yiddish and Icelandic), however, V2 word order reflects movement of the tensed verb to a lower position, labeled I<sup>0</sup> in studies using the phrase structure of (Chomsky, 1986).

The difference in the position to which the verb moves in different languages is, of course, subtle and hard to detect; but it leads to observable differences in the shape and distribution of verb-second clauses. Most strikingly, while the CP-V2 languages exhibit verb-second word order only in main clauses and in a highly restricted set of subordinate clauses<sup>2</sup>, IP-V2 languages show V2 word order in all clauses, whether main or subordinate (Diesing, 1990; Santorini, 1989; Santorini, 1992; Roegvaldsson & Thráinsson, 1990). In her recent dissertation, Pintzuk (Pintzuk, 1991) has shown that the verb in Old English V2

---

\*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Conference on Historical Linguistics at UCLA in August 1993. The work reported on here was supported by a research grant from the NSF (BNS 89-19701), with supplementary support from the University of Pennsylvania Research Foundation and the Institute for Research in Cognitive Science. Among other benefits, this support has permitted us to construct an extensive database of parsed Middle English text, currently approximately 250,000 words in size. With this database we are able to search out constructions and word order configurations automatically, making possible investigations hitherto impracticable. The results reported here represent our first extensive use of the database. We would like to thank Caroline Heycock, Jack Hoeksema, Sabine Iatridou, Susan Pintzuk, Donald Ringe, Bernhard Rohrbacher, Beatrice Santorini, and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments on various aspects of this paper. We have not in every case been able to do justice to their observations and suggestions, but they have materially improved the work.

<sup>1</sup>The dialect divisions of Middle English are complex and controversial. Divisions based on phonology recognize three to five major dialect areas. In this paper, however, we will be concerned only to show that there was at least one northern dialect and one southern dialect with the characteristics that we will describe. Roughly, the two syntactic dialects at issue were found in the North and in the Northeast Midlands, on the one hand, and the South and Southwest Midlands on the other. Within these areas further distinctions can be made that are beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>2</sup>The subordinate clauses exhibiting V2 word order in these languages are those with empty complementizers and those where CP-recursion is licensed (Haan, 1986; Iatridou & Kroch, 1992).

clauses surfaces in the  $I^0$  position; and as we will see, the southern dialects of Middle English preserve this characteristic, despite having become, unlike Old English, overwhelmingly INFL-medial and VO in basic word order. It is surprising, therefore, to discover that the northern dialect of Middle English, in addition to being INFL-medial and VO as in the South, appears to have developed the verb-movement syntax of a standard CP-V2 language and hence to be very similar to the mainland Scandinavian languages. In the following pages, after a brief discussion of the historical context, we will lay out the CP-V2 syntax of modern Scandinavian and the rather more complex Old English V2 syntax. With this background, we will proceed to describe the syntax of V2 in the southern and northern dialects of Middle English, respectively, and will show that V2 clauses in the two dialects differ in the landing site of the verb in just the way that Old English and Scandinavian do.

## 2 The Sociolinguistic Background

Although we are not here concerned primarily with the historical and sociolinguistic dynamic that established the Middle English dialects, the sociolinguistic history of population contact and diffusion which underlie them is a matter of considerable interest; and it sheds light on why the dialect difference we have uncovered should exist. Specifically, the northern dialect of English most likely became a CP-V2 language under the extensive contact with Scandinavian that resulted from the Danish and Norwegian population influx into the north of England during the late Old English period. Indeed, the Scandinavian language has had greater linguistic influence on English than any other in its history. The only comparable influence was the effect of French and Latin on the literary and learned vocabulary, but these languages influenced English grammar hardly at all. The strength of the Scandinavian influence resulted from the large numbers of Norwegians and Danes who settled in England in the three centuries before the Norman Conquest (Stenton, 1967). The Viking seafarers that harassed the British Isles from the 9th to the 11th centuries came at first to plunder but eventually stayed permanently. For long periods in the 9th and 10th centuries, the Danes or Norwegians ruled extensive kingdoms in England, and place name evidence indicates that the population of several shires was predominantly Scandinavian (Darby, 1936; Ekwall, 1936). Since the first settlers were soldiers of the Danish armies that plundered the English coastline, there must have been a great deal of intermarriage and intimate language mixture; but there were also substantial numbers of immigrants who came after areas of foreign control were established and among these were substantial numbers of women as well as men (Stenton, 1967:513). In the northwest of England, the major focus of Norwegian settlement, the settler-invaders came from already established Norse settlements in Ireland and might often have come as families. Moreover, in that region the density of Anglo-Saxon settlement was low and the newcomers necessarily formed a majority of the population in many places (Ekwall, 1936). The linguistic effect of this combination of population movement and population mixture was radical, comparable in some ways to the pidginization/creolization phenomena of more recent centuries.

It is well-known that many originally Scandinavian vocabulary items were borrowed into northern English; for example, Scandinavian *egg* for Old English (and general West Germanic) *ey*, Scandinavian *sister* for Old English *swuster*, and so forth. Most significantly for our purposes, several of the borrowings from Scandinavian were of closed class items which functioned mainly as morpho-syntactic signals of grammatical relations. For example, the third person plural pronoun 'they' was borrowed into northern English from Scandinavian and was adopted over time into other dialects (Morse-Gagné, 1992; Morse-Gagné, 1993; and the references cited there). Similarly, the anaphoric noun 'same' is Scandinavian in origin. Other grammatical forms remained restricted to the North and never became general. The Middle Scots demonstrative system, for instance, contains an important Scandinavian element (Morse-Gagné, 1993). Also, northern texts often show *till* for 'to' as a preposition and *at* as a complementizer introducing both tensed clauses and

infinitives (McIntosh, Samuels, & Benskin, 1986). These features are clearly borrowed from Scandinavian, as is the use of an empty complementizer to introduce relative clauses and object complement clauses (Jespersen, 1938). Another important morpho-syntactic influence of Scandinavian on northern English was on the system of verbal inflections. In the North, the pattern of person endings in the present tense is very much reduced compared Old English and seems to be a mixture of the Old Norse and Old English paradigms (Donald Ringe, personal communication). Unfortunately, the crucial information regarding the character of V2 in the Scandinavian languages of the contact period is unavailable. However, the extensive grammatical influence of Scandinavian on northern English indicates that the V2 grammar of the dialect could also have been affected by the contact. There is certainly no other apparent reason for the grammar of V2 in the North to differ from that in the South.<sup>3</sup> While no proof of this influence is currently available, we have uncovered evidence which supports it to a certain extent and which we will present at the appropriate point in our grammatical discussion (see section 6 below).

### 3 The V2 Syntax of Mainland Scandinavian

The modern mainland Scandinavian languages are clearly CP-V2 languages; that is, the tensed verb in a main clause (and also in other clause-types with empty complementizer positions) must move to C<sup>0</sup> and some other constituent must also move to fill the specifier of CP position. In subordinate clauses introduced by overt complementizers, verbs cannot move to C<sup>0</sup> (except in the limited case of CP recursion under bridge verbs (see note 2)); so they appear instead lower in the clause. In this regard the mainland Scandinavian languages behave like German and Dutch. However, because the basic word order of mainland Scandinavian is SVO, the differences in superficial word order induced by the V2 constraint are less prominent. In particular, the word order in a subject initial clause in Scandinavian is likely to be the same whether the clause is main or subordinate. Compare, for instance, the word order contrast in German, as illustrated in (1), with the lack of contrast found in Swedish, as illustrated in (2):

- (1) a. Erich kaufte das Buch in Stockholm.  
       E    bought the book in S  
       b. Ich fragte ob        Erich das Buch in Stockholm kaufte.  
       I    asked whether E    the book in S            bought
- (2) a. Erik köpte boken i Stockholm.  
       E    bought book-the in S  
       b. Jag frågade om       Erik köpte boken i Stockholm.  
       I    asked whether E    bought book-the in S

Since, except for cases of CP recursion, topicalization does not occur in subordinate clauses with overt complementizers, it seems at first that there might be no positive evidence to a language learner for a main/subordinate asymmetry in word order in these languages. In the absence of such evidence, we might expect SVO languages necessarily to be IP-V2 languages. INFL-final V2 languages can only be V2 if the verb moves to C<sup>0</sup> and hence

<sup>3</sup>The situation here is quite complex. It is likely that Old Norse was actually an IP-V2 language, since modern Icelandic is of that type and is very close in its syntax to Old Norse. If so, the influence of Scandinavian in producing the CP-V2 system of the North would have to have been indirect. One possibility is that the simplification of the inflectional system in the North, clearly due to contact and perhaps a creole-like effect, led to the change in the V2 grammar. However, the details of such an account and its ultimate plausibility remain to be determined.

they will always show a main/subordinate asymmetry. SVO or INFL-medial V2 languages, on the other hand, can be V2 within the IP domain. Hence, if such a language is V2 and lacks evidence of a main/subordinate asymmetry, learners should never postulate it to be a CP-V2 language. The modern mainland Scandinavian languages, however, have a characteristic which provides the needed positive evidence. Unlike most of the SVO languages of Europe (e.g., French or Icelandic), they lack verb movement to INFL (V-to-I movement; see Holmberg & Platzack, 1988; Vikner, 1993; and the references cited there). In V-to-I movement languages, the tensed verb moves to  $I^0$  in both main and subordinate clauses, never remaining *in situ* as the head of VP. Therefore, in sentences where an adverb or other element intervenes between  $I^0$  and VP, the tensed verb moves across that element, creating a word order contrast between those cases where tense is borne by an auxiliary verb and those where there is a single, tensed main verb. The contrast is illustrated with the French examples in (3):

- (3) a. Marie n'a pas aimé le chocolat.  
       M    *neg* has not loved the chocolate  
       b. Marie ne préfère pas le chocolat.  
       M    *neg* prefers not the chocolate

In the mainland Scandinavian languages, no word order difference of the French sort is found.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in matrix V2 clauses, like the Swedish examples in (4) below, the adverb or negation appears to the right of the verb, because the verb has moved to  $C^0$ ; but in subordinate clauses with overt complementizers, as in (5), the adverb/negation appears to the left of the tensed verb. If, as is widely assumed, the relevant adverbs and negation are adjoined to VP in underlying structure, then their appearance to the left of the tensed verb demonstrates that it has not moved to  $I^0$ .

- (4) a. Jag talar inte svenska.  
       I    speak not Swedish  
       b. Vi talade verkligen om filmen.  
       We spoke really about film-the  
       (5) a. Hon frågade om jag inte talar svenska.  
       She asked whether I not speak Swedish  
       b. Hon frågade om vi verkligen talade om filmen.  
       She asked whether we really spoke about film-the

Recent work (Holmberg & Platzack, 1988; Platzack & Holmberg, 1990; Roberts, 1993; Rohrbacher, 1993; Vikner, 1993) has argued that the difference between mainland Scandinavian and other SVO languages in the position of the verb is due to the fact that the mainland Scandinavian languages lack subject-verb agreement morphology. Since there is no subject-verb agreement morphology in these languages, if it is such agreement that licenses (and requires) movement of the tensed verb to INFL, the mainland Scandinavian languages will necessarily lack it. As the cited authors note, the agreement parameter that governs the appearance of V-to-I movement is not as simple as it might be. In particular, there are languages (e.g., English and Faroese) which have subject-verb agreement but nonetheless do not allow V-to-I movement. Interestingly, however, agreement in these languages is morphologically weak. For example, both English and Faroese have only

<sup>4</sup>In this respect, they are similar to English, where V-to-I movement occurs with auxiliaries but not with main verbs. Unlike English INFL, however, INFL in Mainland Scandinavian seems to be completely inert syntactically and neither blocks V-to-C movement nor interacts with negation. These languages, therefore, lack anything like English 'do'-support.

one person/number distinction in their paradigms in the present tense and none in the past (Vikner, 1993). This circumstance has led researchers to propose that subject-verb agreement must be somehow “strong” if it is to license V-to-I movement. Just exactly what the theoretical status of strength of agreement could be is not clear; but descriptively, it apparently corresponds to the number and type of distinctions in the verbal paradigm. Under the interpretation of Roberts (1993), agreement is strong when both the singular and the plural number have a visible non-zero mark. According to Rohrbacher (1993), the essential requirement is that the first and second person be distinctively marked. Although small number of inflectional distinctions marked on the verb in northern Middle English poses a problem for both Roberts’ and Rohrbacher’s analyses (as they themselves discuss), the dialect gives clear evidence of V-to-I movement and is in this way different from modern mainland Scandinavian. Therefore, the above-mentioned learnability problem for CP-V2 grammars posed by INFL-medial languages reappears for northern Middle English. Once again, however, that language has syntactic characteristics which give learners positive evidence for a CP-V2 grammar. The character of this evidence will be presented at the appropriate point in our discussion.

## 4 The V2 Syntax of Old English

Old English was a West Germanic language with a syntax similar to that of modern German. In several ways, however, its word order exhibits more complex variation than do the modern West Germanic languages. For instance, it freely allows postposition of complements and adjuncts, both nominal and prepositional, to the right of the uninflected, VP-final verb. This postposition leads to superficially free word order in texts, which has misled some scholars (though not all) into thinking that Old English is a non-configurational language. Recent studies have demonstrated, however, that the apparent freedom of order of the verb with respect to its complements or adjuncts in Old English results almost entirely from the greater freedom of rightward extraposition in that language relative to its modern West Germanic cousins. (Pintzuk & Kroch, 1989; Kemenade, 1987). In addition, and of more immediate relevance to the present discussion, there is work by Kemenade, Pintzuk, and others on the V2 pattern in Old English, which has shown that it too is highly patterned and rule governed (Kemenade, 1987; Pintzuk, 1991). Here too, the superficial behavior of sentences is highly variable; and earlier scholars believed that V2 was only a tendency, not a rule, in Old English. The current studies, however, have substantially sharply reduced, though not to zero, the amount of variability that must be postulated.

Pintzuk (1991) demonstrates that Old English texts manifest competition between two underlying phrase structures for clauses, one INFL-final and the other INFL-medial.<sup>5,6</sup> Both main and subordinate clauses exhibit this variation, though main clauses are more often INFL-medial and subordinate clauses more often INFL-final. Examples of INFL-final and INFL-medial sentences from both main and subordinate clauses are given in (6) and (7) below. See Pintzuk’s discussion for detailed analysis of these cases:

- (6) a. ... deah hit ær upahæfen wære (CP 34.6)  
       ... although it before up-raised was  
       b. Se manfulla gast þa martine gehyrsumode. (AELS 31.1050)  
       the evil spirit then martin obeyed

<sup>5</sup>Haberli and Haegeman (1992) give additional evidence for the existence of INFL-medial phrase-structure in Old English based on facts regarding the scope of negation.

<sup>6</sup>For further discussion of the notion of competition between grammars see Kroch, 1989; Pintzuk, 1991; Santorini, 1992; Taylor, 1990.

- (7) a. ... þæt he ahof upp þa earcan (GC(C) 42.6)  
 ... that he lifted up the chest  
 b. þa sundor-halgan eodun þa ut soþlice. (WSCp, Matt. 12.14)  
 the Pharisees went then out certainly

The relative frequency of these two phrase structures changes over time, with the number of INFL-medial sentences increasing steadily in both main and subordinate clauses. By the end of the Old English period, the language has become entirely INFL-medial, though the character of the reanalysis which leads to this outcome is obscured by the collapse of Old English as a written language in the early 12th century and the paucity of Middle English documents in the earliest period (See Lightfoot, 1991; Pintzuk, 1990; Pintzuk, 1991 for further discussion). The existence of INFL-final main clauses in Old English indicates that, at some point before the period documented by texts, its grammar must have been consistently SOV and INFL-final, a configuration presumably inherited from proto-Germanic and ultimately from proto-Indo-European. V2 word order, as far as one can tell, arose and spread along with INFL-medial phrase structure; and by the time of the earliest texts, it was dominant in main clauses. In subordinate clauses, it became increasingly common during the course of the historic Old English period. In any case, all and only underlyingly INFL-medial clauses seem to be V2, showing that, unlike in German or Dutch, V2 sentences in Old English do not derive from an underlyingly INFL-final phrase structure. Instead, INFL-final phrase structure is a feature of the declining proto-Germanic phrase structure option, whether it appears in main or subordinate clauses, and is driven out of use by the competing INFL-medial V2 option. Pintzuk argues that the association in Old English between INFL-medial underlying structure and the V2 constraint, and the corresponding absence of the German/Dutch derivational relationship between INFL-final and V2 can be explained only if one supposes that Old English is an IP-V2 language like Yiddish or Icelandic and not a CP-V2 language like German or Dutch. It is only this perspective that allows us to explain adequately the possibility of INFL-final main clauses in a V2 language while also, as we will see, accounting in detail for the word order patterning in the non INFL-final sentences of the language; that is, those that should be governed by the V2 constraint.

The range of superficially distinct word orders in Old English V2 sentences is broad and has been difficult to account for in a principled way. Pintzuk's IP-V2 analysis, however, accounts quite simply for the different word orders, without the postulation of special rules or principles. We list here the types of V2 sentences found in Old English and explain how the analysis accounts for them. Along the way, we will propose a modification of the analysis to relate it more closely to standard treatments of Germanic syntax and to improve somewhat its descriptive adequacy.

#### 4.1 Subject-Initial Sentences

The single most common sentence type is the subject-initial sentence, in which the first constituent is the subject and the second is the tensed verb. The subject may be any nominative case noun phrase or pronoun. The subject has moved to the specifier of a functional projection in the C/I system and the tensed verb to the head of that projection. Subject-initial matrix clauses are not SVO sentences but just V2 sentences in which the topic happens to be the subject. In the case of embedded clauses, the correct analysis of subject-initial sentences is trickier and will be discussed further in the next section.



## 4.2 Sentences with Non-Subject Topics

The second sentence type consist of those cases in which the first constituent is a non-pronominal complement, a prepositional argument or adjunct, or one of many adverbs. In this type, word order depends on whether the subject is itself a pronoun or a non-pronominal NP. In the latter case, the tensed verb appears immediately after the first constituent – i.e., in second position; and hence, is inverted with respect to the subject. Some examples, taken from Pintzuk (1991) and Kemenade (1987), are listed in (8) below:

- (8) a. & of heom twam is eall manncynn cumen (WHom 6.52)  
and of them two is all mankind come  
b. þæt hus hæfdon Romane to ðæm anum tacne geworht (Or 59.3)  
that building had R with the one feature constructed  
c. þær wearþ se cyning Bagsecg ofslægen (Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Parker,  
there was the king B slain  
871)

When the subject is a pronoun, however, it ordinarily appears before rather than after the tensed verb, yielding superficial verb-third word order. This special behavior of pronoun subjects is due to their clitic-like character (van Kemenade 1987, Pintzuk 1991) and is not evidence of variability or irregularity in the adherence of Old English to the verb-second constraint. Here are some examples of the use of pronoun subjects yielding verb-third word order, also taken from Pintzuk (1991):

- (9) a. Ælc yfel he mæg don (WHom, 4.62)  
each evil he can do  
b. scortlice ic hæbbe nu gesæd ymb þa prie dælas... (Or 9.18)  
briefly I have now spoken about the three parts  
c. æfter his gebede he ahof þæt cild up... (AEChom. 2.28)  
after his prayer he lifted the child up

Under Pintzuk's analysis of Old English as an IP-V2 language, the word order in (9) reflects movement of the verb to  $I^0$  and movement of a topic to Spec,IP. Clitic pronouns in Old English, like pronouns in the other verb-final West Germanic languages, move to the boundary between CP and IP and so should appear sentence initially. However, because sentence initial position is not available for clitics (perhaps for reasons of prosodic phonology), a special rule postposes them to the immediate right of the first constituent. Hence, when the verb moves to  $I^0$ , the pronominal subject appears immediately before it, between Spec,IP and  $I^0$ . Full NP subjects, as in (8), remain in their underlying position in Spec,VP and are assigned nominative case under government, as in the modern IP-V2 languages (see Santorini, 1992). With pronominal objects of verbs and of prepositions, as in the examples from Pintzuk in (10) below, the same sort of verb-third effect appears, and for the same reason since they often behave as clitics and move to the CP/IP boundary.

- (10) a. þin agen geleafa þe hæfþ gehæledne (BIHom 15)  
thine own faith thee has healed  
b. & seofon ærendračan he him hæfde to asend (ASC, Parker, 905)  
and seven messengers he him had to sent

Example (10b) shows that the verb will appear in fourth position when a sentence contains both a subject and an object clitic. In addition to pronouns, certain adverbs (e.g., 'so') may

also move to this position, suggesting that the clitic behavior of Old English pronouns is actually a grammaticized form of the leftward scrambling of constituents commonly found in Germanic. This scrambling, as we will see, remains prominent in Middle English.

An important problem with Pintzuk's analysis is that the special clitic movement rule needed has no counterpart in the other Germanic languages and does not have clear theoretical standing. One can, however, imagine another treatment of the Old English facts which preserves the essence of Pintzuk's account in a way more consonant with standard assumptions. Suppose that, while the tensed verb in an Old English V2 sentence moves to  $I^0$ , the topic moves, not to Spec,IP but to Spec,CP. In that case, the clitic pronoun can move straightforwardly to the CP/IP boundary and the correct word order will result without any special clitic movement. The result is that Old English becomes a hybrid between the CP-V2 and the IP-V2 types. The tensed verb moves and the NP subject is licensed as in an IP-V2 language while the topic moves as in a CP-V2 language.<sup>7</sup> Aside from the more standard treatment of clitics, this analysis has one other important advantage over Pintzuk's proposal: It helps to explain why Old English does not exhibit V2 word order with non-subject topics in subordinate clauses, as the modern IP-V2 languages do.<sup>8</sup> Since topicalization involves movement to Spec,CP and since the Germanic languages generally do not allow movement to this position by topics in subordinate clauses<sup>9</sup>, we do not expect to find subordinate clause topicalization under our proposal, while under Pintzuk's the absence of such cases is surprising.

The analysis we are proposing has, of course, difficulties of its own, which we cannot claim to have entirely overcome. Chief among these is the fact that the topic in Spec,CP in a Germanic language normally requires a tensed verb in  $C^0$  to license it, while under our analysis, the  $C^0$  must be empty. Furthermore, in matrix clauses, the Spec,IP position must also be empty to produce the correct word order in sentences with full NP subjects while in subject-initial INFL-medial subordinate clauses, Spec,IP must host the subject. These problems, however, are not as serious as they might seem to be, for both theoretical and empirical reasons. First, as we will see in the next section, Old English reserves the  $C^0$  position for verbs with special semantic features, suggesting that ordinary indicatives do not belong in that position, at least on the surface. In line with recent proposals regarding economy (Chomsky 1992), one might say that the ordinary indicative tensed verb in Old English carries only a weak feature driving its movement to  $C^0$  and so moves there only at LF. In questions and the other environments discussed below, on the other hand, the feature driving movement to  $C^0$  would be strong and so movement would be visible on the surface. In either case, movement to  $C^0$  would occur by LF, and, therefore, the topic would have to be in Spec,CP in order to be properly licensed. Furthermore, under the proposals in Chomsky 1992, movement to Spec,CP might occur in one step and the Spec,IP position, having no function would not be projected. As for the use of Spec,IP as the landing site for subjects in INFL-medial subordinate clauses, there is a solution in the approach to licensing outlined in Heycock and Santorini (1992) and Heycock and Kroch (1993). Under this approach, the Spec,IP position and the Spec,CP position in Old English

<sup>7</sup>It might seem, under this analysis, that subordinate clauses should be verb-first since the subject is licensed in a position below INFL; and, of course, this word order is not found. We assume, however, (following Heycock 1991 and Heycock and Kroch 1993) that in addition to case and agreement, verbs and their associated functional projections have an obligatory predication function to discharge onto an external argument. Hence, verb-first sentences of the type that would be generated here will not be permitted. See Heycock's work for further discussion. We thank Bernhard Rohrbacher for pointing out the potential difficulty with our formulation.

<sup>8</sup>We are speaking, of course, of non-CP recursion environments. See Kemenade (1993) for discussion of this absence, which Pintzuk's own data confirm (personal communication)

<sup>9</sup>But see below for discussion of dialects, including northern Middle English, in which just such topicalization to Spec,CP is attested.

would both be licensed by a predication relation between the tensed verb and the Spec position. If one of these positions is filled, then the other cannot be because the verb can license only one predication.<sup>10</sup> If the verb moves to C<sup>0</sup>, as it must in matrix clauses by LF, it will license Spec,CP and Spec,IP will be unusable. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, Spec,IP will be available, but, apparently for thematic reasons, almost only for subjects.<sup>11</sup> Although the above sketch leaves us with several unresolved problems, we can conclude that Pintzuk's analysis of Old English V2 as movement to I<sup>0</sup> rather than to C<sup>0</sup> is defensible, even if her analysis needs some modifications. Moreover, the modifications, while not trivial, are formulable within current transformational theory.<sup>12</sup>

### 4.3 Sentences with Verb Movement to C<sup>0</sup>

The third V2 sentence type of Old English consists of four exceptional environments in which subject pronouns regularly invert with the tensed verb. These environments are: wh-questions, sentences introduced by *þa* and *þonne*<sup>13</sup> (when they are equivalent to modern English 'then'), sentences with preposed negated and subjunctive verbs, and certain verb-initial sentence types. Examples of these four environments are given in (11):

- (11) a. hwi sceole we oþres mannes niman? (AELS 24.188)  
       why should we another man's take  
       b. þa ge-mette he sceadan (AELS 31.151)  
       then met he robbers  
       c. ne mihton hi nænigne fultum æt him begitan (Bede 48.9-10)  
       not could they not-any help from him get  
       d. hæfdon hi hiora onfangen ær Hæsten to Beamfleote come  
       had they them received before H to B came  
       (ASC, Parker, 894)

Under Pintzuk's analysis, the exceptionality of the four environments arises because in these cases the verb moves further leftward than it does in ordinary declaratives, thereby

<sup>10</sup>The two positions cannot simultaneously be filled by overt elements; but traces are a different matter. In the treatment in Heycock and Kroch 1993, which we assume, it is chains that are licensed, not individual positions. See that work for further discussion.

<sup>11</sup>Kemenade (1993) gives Old English examples of non-subject NPs in the Spec,IP position in subordinate clauses; but these are always cases where the topicalized NP outranks the subject NP on the thematic hierarchy. As with similar examples in German, the verb agrees with the subject NP, which is in the nominative case, not with the topic. For us, however, the topic functions as the subject of the IP predication.

<sup>12</sup>Beatrice Santorini points out to us that one interesting feature of our analysis we here is that it relates topicalization in modern English more closely to the Old English construction than is usual. In modern English, where V2 does not obtain, the order topic – subject – verb is the only one allowed and one might ask what licenses the topic position. Our analysis gives an obvious answer: verb-movement to C<sup>0</sup> at LF, just as in Old English. Following a suggestion by Caroline Heycock, we can go a bit further: Suppose that in Modern English the Spec,IP position is available for subjects in topicalized sentences because nominative case and/or agreement are checked or assigned there under Spec-Head agreement while in Old English these relations are checked lower down, perhaps under government. This difference will then explain why Spec,IP available as a landing site for subjects in Modern English matrix clauses though it is not in Old English. The difference between the two languages proposed here would have arisen if Modern English inherited its nominative case assignment pattern from Northern Middle English (see section 7.1 below).

<sup>13</sup>Other narrative sequencing adverbs (e.g., *nu* 'now') are sometimes exceptional, behaving like *þa*, and sometimes behave like ordinary adverbs.

passing the position of the clitic pronoun subject. Specifically, the verb moves to  $C^0$  in these sentences, perhaps because the verbs must pick up certain syntactico-semantic features in  $C^0$ . In any case, the structural position of the verb in *wh*-questions, for example, is not the same as in topicalized sentences, in contrast to the situation in CP-V2 languages, where the verb is always found in the higher functional projection. The split between questions and topicalizations helps to explain why, when English lost the V2 constraint, word order in questions was unaffected. Like Old English, the other IP-V2 languages also exhibit movement to  $C^0$  in questions and certain other sentence types<sup>14</sup>; but they do not show the verb-third effect with pronominal clitics, the reason being that these languages do not have clitic pronouns that move to the IP/CP boundary.

#### 4.4 Sentences with True Verb-Third Order

While most adverbs behave as described above, temporal adverbs functioning as ‘scene setters’ may fail to trigger subject-verb inversion of either pronoun or full NP subjects. These cases are true exceptions to the verb-second constraint as found in the modern Germanic languages; but they are found in all older West Germanic dialects, not just in Old English, and are of this one specific type. Here are some examples from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles:

- (12) a. Ða þy ylcan gere onforan winter þa Deniscan þe on Meresige sæton  
Then the same year before winter the Danes that on Merseyside sat  
tugon hira scipu up on Temese... (ASC, Parker, 895)  
pulled their ships up on Thames
- b. On þisum geare Willelm cyng geaf Raulfe eorle Willelmes dohtor  
In this year William king gave Ralph earl William’s daughter (to)  
Osbearnes sunu (ASC, Laud, 1075)  
Osborn’s son
- c. Her Oswald se eadiga arceb forlet þis lif. (ASC, Laud, 992)  
in-this-year Oswald the blessed archbishop forsook this life

Even in modern German, extremely strict in its expression of the V2 constraint, there are sentences with verb-third word order. These are of two types: ‘if-then’ sentences and left-dislocations. In such sentences, illustrated in (13), the first constituent in the clause is apparently left-adjoined to CP:

- (13) a. Wenn du kommst, dann amüsieren wir uns.  
if you come then amuse we ourselves
- b. Diesen Mann, den kenne ich nicht.  
this man him know I not

These German sentence types also occur in Old English; and, apparently, the range of constituents which could adjoin to CP was considerably greater in the latter language. Medieval German (Ebert, 1986; Behaghel, 1932: volume 4, p. 15) appears to have been intermediate between Old English and modern German in its tolerance for this kind of adjunction. In Old English, there are even rare cases where adverbs other than scene-setting temporals appear adjoined to CP to generate verb-third word orders. The examples given

<sup>14</sup>This statement is not entirely uncontroversial. See Diesing, 1990.

in (14) below are cases from the last Old English portion of the Peterborough Chronicle.<sup>15</sup>

- (14) a. Eac þis land wæs swide afylled mid munecan. (ASC, Laud, 1087)  
 Also this land was very filled-up with monks.
- b. þeahhweder his hiredmen ferdon ut mid feawe mannan of þam  
 Nevertheless his household men went out with few men from the  
 castele. (ASC, Laud, 1088)  
 castle
- c. & syddan litlan & litlan his leoht wanode swa þet... (ASC, Laud, 1107)  
 and afterwards little by little his light waned so that ...

## 5 The V2 Syntax of the Middle English Dialects

The V2 pattern we have described for Old English is largely maintained in the earliest Middle English of the west midland and southern dialects, except for the entire loss of the INFL-final phrase structure option. This loss occurs in all dialects but is irrelevant to the INFL-medial and verb-second pattern, which persists into the fourteenth century. From the beginning, however, there are a certain number of exceptions to the expected pattern, and these grow in number with time. Except in Kentish, a particularly archaic southern dialect, we find by the mid-fourteenth century that the number of exceptions has risen to the point where the V2 constraint is clearly being lost. The analysis of the exceptions and how they increase is a matter of considerable interest but lies beyond the scope of this paper. We will assume that the exceptions are the result of grammar competition both between V2 and non-V2 grammars and between northern and southern dialect grammars. This competition, however, can only be studied once we have a reasonable picture of the competing systems. The texts we are investigating in this paper are as close to pure representations of single grammatical systems as the surviving Middle English data affords.

In the North and in the Northeast Midlands, the areas of greatest Scandinavian settlement and linguistic influence, the history of the verb-second pattern is different. Unfortunately, there are no manuscripts of northern prose before 1400, which makes direct comparison with more southern dialects impossible; but evidence from poetry indicates a pattern unlike the Old English one. A recent investigation of the *Ormulum* (Morse-Gagné, 1992), a very early Middle English poem written in Lincolnshire, an area of dense Scandinavian population, reveals that pronoun and full NP subjects are more alike than different in their behavior. Both exhibit inversion of subject with tensed verb nearly categorically in sentences with noun phrase objects in topic position. In sentences with adverbs in topic position, inversion is categorical with full NP subjects and variable with pronoun subjects. While we do not understand this variability, it is sufficient for present

<sup>15</sup>We should note that the differences between modern German and the older Germanic languages may be exaggerated by differences in the conventions of the written language at different times. Jack Hoeksema has pointed out to us that in Modern German and Dutch sentences like (14b) are perfectly acceptable with a pause after the initial adverb:

- (i) a. Nichtsdestotrotz, wir müssen weiter.  
 b. Desalniettemin, we moeten verder.  
 nevertheless we must further (go).

Without the comma as a indicator of the pause, verb-second order is obligatory in the written language. In medieval texts punctuation was much less regular than now, so the absence of commas in (14) does not mean that there were not obligatory pauses after the sentence-initial adverbs.

purposes to note that it does not follow the pattern described above for Old English, but is rather more random. We believe that the variability of inversion with pronouns in the Ormulum and other northern texts reflects contact between a Scandinavian-derived V2 system and the Old English system and hope to show this in future work. For the present, however, we have fortunately found material, to be described below, in which this variability is minimized and allows us relatively direct access to a single, coherent northern grammar.

## 5.1 The Southern Dialects

As we have remarked, the early southern texts of Middle English exhibit the same basic patterning of the verb second constraint as is found in Old English. Table 1 shows this clearly. It combines data on positive declarative sentences from seven Midlands texts of the early to mid-thirteenth century: the Trinity Homilies, Lambeth Homilies, Sawles Warde, Hali Meidrad, Vices and Virtues, St. Katherine, and Ancrene Riwe. The sample consists of a total of 3064 matrix clauses, with the contributions of the individual texts ranging from 230 to 689 clauses. The texts have been grouped together to increase the sizes of the cells in the table, given that there is no evidence of any difference in their V2 syntax.

Proposed element	NP subjects			Pronoun subjects		
	Number inverted	Number uninv.	% inverted	Number inverted	Number uninv.	% inverted
NP complements	50	4	93	4	84	05
PP complements	12	4	75	0	11	00
Adjective complements	20	1	95	7	14	33
<i>þa/then</i>	37	2	95	26	10	72
<i>now</i>	12	1	92	8	22	27
PP adjuncts	56	19	75	2	99	02
adverbs	79	59	57	1	181	01

Table 1: V2 in seven early Midlands texts.

We see above, with exceptions as noted, the expected Old English pattern. Preposed complements generally trigger inversion of subject and verb with full NP subjects and almost never do so with pronoun subjects. The temporal adverbs *þa* and *then* trigger inversion with both NP and pronoun subjects, though not as regularly with pronoun subjects as in Old English, an indication that these adverbs are losing their special status. The adverb *now* is included in the table because in Old English it sometimes behaves like *þa* and sometimes like other adverbs; and as in Old English, it here behaves variably. If we look at a sample of approximately 200 clauses from another text of a different southern sub-dialect, the Kentish “Ayenbite of Inwit,” we see the pattern repeated:

Preposed element	NP subjects			Pronoun subjects		
	Number inverted	Number uniniv.	% inverted	Number inverted	Number uniniv.	% inverted
NP complements	14	3	82	1	11	08
PP complements	2	0	100	0	1	00
Adjective complements	5	0	100	0	1	00
<i>then</i> (no <i>þa</i> in text)	4	12	25	7	5	58
<i>now</i>	1	0	100	7	7	50
PP adjuncts	5	9	36	1	30	03
adverbs	19	15	56	5	52	10

Table 2: V2 in the Ayenbite of Inwit (Kentish).

This data is interesting because the Ayenbite text is from a holograph manuscript of the mid-fourteenth century, at least 100 years later than the southwest Midlands texts. By this time, the language of most of England was well on its way to losing the V2 constraint entirely; but Kentish, an isolated dialect that eventually died out, still preserved the Old English pattern of V2 nearly intact. The only detectable difference between the Kentish data and the earlier texts is a further erosion in the exceptional status of *then* and *now* and a generally freer attachment of adjuncts to CP, reflected in the lower rates of inversion of full NP subjects after PP adjuncts and adverbs.

## 5.2 The Northern Dialect

Because of the gap in the surviving record mentioned earlier, the syntax of the northern dialect is not easy to investigate. Nevertheless, there is sufficient evidence to support our claim that northern Middle English was, like modern mainland Scandinavian, a CP-V2 language. The primary difficulty in determining the character of northern Middle English is that there are no prose texts in the dialect before 1400, and by that date the decline of the verb-second constraint was far advanced in all areas of England. In the mid to late 14th century both northern texts like the writings of Richard Rolle and midlands texts like the works of John Wycliffe show less than half of appropriate sentences inverting subject and verb in order to obey the V2 constraint (Kemenade, 1987; Kroch, 1989). The mixture of V2 and non-V2 sentences in these texts indicates competition between V2 and non-V2 grammars (cf. *supra*); and, therefore, these texts cannot be readily analyzed grammatically.

In an unexpected discovery, however, we found, in a recent survey of the syntax of prose texts in our corpus, that one northern text, the so-called “Northern Prose Rule of St. Benet” (Kock, 1902), exhibits word order in V2 contexts that is not variable in the way that other late texts are. The Benet text is the first surviving prose document in the northern dialect and it comes from central west Yorkshire, hence either within or directly bordering the major area of Norwegian settlement in the North (McIntosh, et al., 1986; Wells, 1916). Until the rise of the cloth industry in the late 14th century, the area was thinly populated and isolated due in part to the famous devastation of the region wrought by William the Conqueror. Hence, like Kent in the South, it is a plausible relic area in which a dialect once spoken more widely might survive longer than elsewhere. In any case, the linguistic evidence is clear. In sentences with non-subject topics, the text exhibits almost categorical inversion of subject and verb, in accordance with the requirements of the V2 constraint. Crucially, this inversion occurs whether the subject is a full NP or a pronoun and also independently of the grammatical function or lexical identity of the topic. In other words, the complex conditioning found in Old English and in the Early Middle English of

the South is absent. The syntax of the Benet text is revealed clearly in the following table, which is organized like those in the preceding section.<sup>16</sup>

Preposed element	NP subjects			Pronoun subjects		
	Number inverted	Number uniniv.	% inverted	Number inverted	Number uniniv.	% inverted
NP complements	7	0	100	58	3	95
PP complements	18	0	100	10	0	100
Adjective complements	1	0	100	4	2	67
<i>then</i> (no <i>þa</i> in text)	15	0	100	28	1	97
<i>now</i>	no data			2	0	100
PP adjuncts	42	5	89	73	7	91
all other adverbs	25	1	96	51	5	91

Table 3: V2 in the Northern Prose Rule of Saint Benet.

As can be seen by inspection, there are two major differences between the frequencies of V2 in Benet and those in midlands and southern texts. First, pronoun subjects, instead of failing to invert in most environments, invert nearly as frequently as full NP subjects do; and second, there is no tendency for preposed adverbs and adjuncts to fail to trigger inversion. These differences show that the V2 pattern of the northern dialect differs sharply from the southern. The question we must now answer is how the two grammars differ. One possible difference that we have discussed (Kroch, 1989; Morse-Gagné 1992) is that the grammar of pronouns has changed in the North. Instead of being leftward moving clitics of the Old English sort, they might have become like the pronouns of modern English, behaving syntactically more or less like full NPs. The plausibility of such a change occurring in the North is supported by the fact that it was into the northern dialect that the Scandinavian pronoun *they*, a demonstrative in origin, was first borrowed (Morse-Gagé, 1992); and that borrowing could well have altered the syntactic character of the entire pronoun system. As we will see, however, the syntax of pronouns in Benet does not appear to be different from the syntax of pronouns in the southern texts, apart from those environments where the grammar of V2 is at issue. Pronouns do change character in Middle English, in both the North and the South, losing their tendency to move leftward as they do in Old English and the other West Germanic languages; but this change is apparently not responsible for the differences in V2 patterning between North and South.

The most significant defect of an appeal to pronoun syntax as the source of the differences in the V2 patterns of Benet and the southern texts is that it will not account entirely for the differences between those texts that are apparent from Table 3. In addition to what happens in sentences with pronoun subjects, the table shows nearly categorical inversion of full NP subjects in sentences introduced by adverbs or adjunct PPs. The character of pronouns is irrelevant to this distribution; hence, even if the pronouns in the North had changed character and so came to invert in V2 environments, some additional difference with the South would have to be invoked to account fully for the V2 pattern of the Benet text. The obvious candidate would be the difference between verb movement to I<sup>0</sup> and to C<sup>0</sup>. If the language of Benet were CP-V2, then, like German, it should exhibit inversion more frequently than Old English when preposed adverbial and prepositional phrase adjuncts were attached at the CP level, where they regularly fail to trigger inversion in Old English or southern Middle English. Of course, as in German, there would be cases

<sup>16</sup>The discussion in this section is based on an exhaustive sample of the Benet text, which has been entered in its entirety into our parsed corpus.



of verb-third word order as well; but, in general, we would expect elements that adjoin to CP in Old English to move to Spec,CP in Benet and to trigger inversion from that position. Under this analysis, categorical inversion with pronoun subjects would have to occur even if the pronouns did not change their clitic status, because the verb would always move beyond the CP/IP boundary to C<sup>0</sup>, and so appear to the left of any subject, NP or pronoun. Thus, a single difference between the grammars of Benet and the southern texts would account for both of the differences revealed by our table.

## 6 Dating the CP-V2 Grammar

If, as we have supposed, the difference in syntax between Benet and our southern texts is due to Scandinavian influence, it must be that the language of the North acquired its properties much earlier than Benet. Indeed, we would expect such influence to date to the 10th century or earlier, the time of the contact and mixing of the Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon populations. Unfortunately, there are no Old English texts from the area of contact, except for two glosses of the Latin Vulgate Bible; but these texts, the Lindisfarne and Rushworth glosses, turn out to be informative. They consist of inter-linear Old English glosses added above a previously written Latin text. The Lindisfarne gloss is in Northumbrian and was added to the Latin manuscript around 950 by the priest Aldred, probably in Durham. The Rushworth gloss is in two (contemporary) hands. All of Matthew and up to Mark 2:16, as well as John 18:1-3 are written by a priest named Farman in a dialect which differs little from the West Saxon standard and is probably Mercian, while the rest is written by Owun in the Northumbrian dialect. The Rushworth gloss depends on the Lindisfarne to some extent and it dates from the latter half of the 10th century.

Although word-for-word glosses ought not to give evidence regarding word order, there was one particular context in which the glossers of the Vulgate had to make word order choices, and in this context we see a pattern which gives some evidence for the existence of CP-V2 in the North at an early date. The relevant context is the tensed sentence with a preposed sentence-initial constituent and a pronoun subject. Because Latin was a pro-drop language and Old English was not, the glossers routinely added subject pronouns in the gloss that were absent in the original. While most added pronouns occur in the canonical position before the verb, there are a significant number of cases where the Latin word order places a constituent in sentence initial position, with the verb immediately following, thereby permitting interpretation of the sentence as a Germanic-type topicalization context. In such cases, the northern glossers often write the subject pronoun after the verb. By contrast, in the Early West Saxon translation of the gospels, the standard Old English pattern with the pronoun in pre-verbal position obtains. Below are two examples from Skeat (1881–1887) with the relevant verbs indicated in boldface and their pronoun subjects in italics<sup>17</sup> For comparison we give the corresponding sentences in the Early West Saxon full translation:

- (15) LATIN:           dominum deum tuum adorabis  
 LINDISFARNE: drihten god ðin **worða** *ðu*  
 RUSHWORTH: drihten god ðinne **wearða** *ðu*  
 WEST SAXON: drihten þinne god *ðu* **geead-metst**

‘You will worship the Lord your God.’ (Luke 4.8)

<sup>17</sup>Note that the negated verbs in these examples are not relevant as they would have moved to C<sup>0</sup> in even in the southern dialect. The example from Luke is equivocal because the verb is interpretable as an imperative, though the Latin original has 2nd person future.

- (16) a. LATIN: oculos habentes non uidetis  
 LINDISFARNE: ego **habbað** gie ne geseað gie  
 RUSHWORTH: ego **habbas** ge ne gi-seas ge  
 WEST SAXON: Eagan ge **habbað** & ne ge-seoð

‘Having eyes, do you not see?’ (Mark 8.18)

- b. LATIN: aures habentes non auditis nec recordamini  
 LINDISFARNE: & earo gie **habbað** ne geherað gie ne eft ðohto gie  
 RUSHWORTH: earu **habbas** ge ne gi-heras ne eft ðohtun ge  
 WEST SAXON: & earan & ne gehyrað ne ge ne þencaþ

‘and having ears, do you not hear? And do you not remember?’ (Mark 8.18)

The following table summarizes our findings for the Lindisfarne and Rushworth glosses and compares them to the Early West Saxon translation:

	Topic appears in both Northumbrian and West Saxon texts	Topic appears in Northumbrian only
Inversions in Northumbrian	5 out of 58	14 out of 82
Inversions in West Saxon	0 out of 58	–

Table 4: Pronoun subject inversions in the Northumbrian glosses and West Saxon gospels.

We see from the table that in approximately 10-20% of the cases where the Latin text can be interpreted as having a preposed topic, the pronoun inverts in the Northumbrian glosses. In contrast, in the West Saxon text, which follows the standard Old English pattern, inversion of pronouns never occurs following a topic. As the glosses date from late in the period of Scandinavian settlement, it appears that the CP-V2 grammar of the North is old enough to have arisen out of contact with Scandinavian. Of course, an early date for the north’s CP-V2 grammar does not guarantee that contact brought it into being. It might, for one thing, actually antedate the arrival of the Scandinavians. Unfortunately, the few fragments of pre-contact northern text that have survived contain no contexts relevant to the CP/IP-V2 contrast (Whitelock, 1967). Thus, in its present state, the textual evidence supports the possibility that contact with Scandinavian was responsible for the northern CP-V2 grammar but does not prove it.

## 7 Further Comparisons of North and South

### 7.1 “Doubly-filled COMP” Sentences

Several additional pieces of grammatical evidence support the hypothesis that Benet and the southern texts differ in the syntactic domain of V2. The first is provided by the presence of “doubly-filled COMP” sentences of a type also attested in the modern Germanic languages, as well as in languages of other families, including Latin and modern dialects of Spanish (Iatridou & Kroch, 1992). These are subordinate clauses introduced by an overt complementizer, in which a constituent has been preposed to the immediate left of C<sup>0</sup>, as in (17):

- (17) a. I sal yu lere þe dute of god, **his wille** þat 3e may do. (Benet 2.5)  
I shall you teach the duty of God, his will that ye may do.
- b. ilkain sal take discipline at oþir, als **hir mastiresse** þoz scho  
each-one shall take discipline of (the) other, as her mistress though she  
ware.... (Benet 10.7)  
were
- c. Lauerd, we prai þe for þi misericorde þat we mai sua yeme þis reul o  
Lord, we pray thee for thy mercy that we may so take this rule of  
mekenes, **In þe felazscap of þin angels** þat we may be. (Benet 11.25)  
meekness in the fellowsip of thine angels that we may be

There are 10 examples of this sort in Benet, while in the much more extensive midlands and southern material in our corpus, there are only two possible cases, one of which is doubtful. The Benet examples are all cases where the clause in which the topicalization occurs is not governed by a verb. Hence, the examples look very much like certain cases in Bavarian described by Bayer (1983) and Fanselow (1987).<sup>18</sup> The following examples, quoted by Santorini (1989) in her discussion of these cases, illustrate the Bavarian construction:

- (18) a. **Die Franca** daß du kennst glaube ich nicht.  
the Franca that you know believe I not  
'I don't believe that you know Franca.'
- b. **Die Franca** daß geheiratet hat ist nicht wahrscheinlich.  
the Franca that married has is not likely  
'It's unlikely that Franca has married.'

<sup>18</sup>Constructions similar to one we have found in Benet are not hard to find in the Germanic dialects. Thus, in Bavarian, in addition to the cases cited in the text, we also find doubly-filled COMPs in indirect questions and relative clauses, as in the following examples (from Santorini (1989)):

- (i) a. Ich frage mich, wer daß Maria heiraten könnte.  
I ask myself who that Maria marry could
- b. ... der Mann der wo Pferde stehlen will...  
... the man who that horses to-steal wants ...

In modern Dutch such sentences are also found as indirect questions, and in a form more directly parallel to the Benet cases, as exclamatives:

- (ii) a. Gelachen dat we hebben!  
Laughed that we have  
'How we laughed!'
- b. een boek dat ik gelezen heb!  
one books that I read have  
'What a lot of books I read!'

The singular article with plural import in (iib) is characteristic of exclamatives. We thank Jack Hoeksema for drawing our attention to all of these cases.

The most straightforward analysis of the Benet examples is the one given by Fanselow for Bavarian, under which the boldface constituent has been preposed into the specifier position of the complementizer of its clause. If this analysis is correct<sup>19</sup>, simplicity directs that we apply it also to matrix clauses with preposed complements and adjuncts. Hence, the position of the preposed constituent in a matrix clause must be Spec,CP. Furthermore, economy and minimality considerations force the conclusion that Spec,IP in this dialect is not a topic position, even in the limited sense in which it is in Old English (see note 10). Therefore, subjects are licensed in Spec,IP by case and/or agreement, not simply by predication. Hence, subjects must move to Spec,IP in all clauses. Then, word order by itself forces the conclusion that the position of the tensed verb in matrix topicalized sentences is C<sup>0</sup>.

Since the Benet text is the translation of a Latin original and since Latin allowed doubly-filled COMPs, we might think that the presence of the construction in Benet reflected the literary influence of Latin.<sup>20</sup> If so, its occurrence would tell us little or nothing about the nature of V2 in the indigenous northern language. In fact, however, it is unlikely that the construction reflects Latin influence, and for two reasons. First, the conditions on the preposing are not the same in Latin as they are in Benet. In Latin, unlike in Benet or in Bavarian but just as in certain modern Romance dialects, the preposing may occur in governed subordinate clauses rather than being limited to ungoverned ones. Second, we know that none of the examples in Benet is a translation of a Latin doubly-filled COMP sentence. Indeed, the Benet text is a very free rendering of St. Benedict's Rule, with much omitted and with considerable commentary, not identified as such, that is absent from both the Latin original and the Old English version. As it happens, almost all of our examples come from such sections of commentary and, therefore, are not translations of any material in the originals. None of the examples corresponds to any sentence in the Latin or Old English versions that could have served as a model for its syntax.<sup>21</sup>

## 7.2 A Comparative Idiom

Another source of evidence lies in the syntax of a common but marked construction of English, the "more... more" construction, a modern example of which is given in (19):

- (19) The more (that) he drinks, the drunker he gets.

This construction also occurs in Benet, as the following example shows:

- (20) for þe **mare** þat sho est hezid our toþir    þe **mare** aʒh sho at halde þe  
for the more that she is raised over the-other the more ought she to hold the  
cumandement of þe reule. (Benet 44.4)  
commandment of the rule

Tellingly, the first clause of the construction is introduced by a 'that' complementizer and does not exhibit inversion of the subject and verb, while the second clause has no introductory complementizer and does exhibit inversion. Given the close parallelism between the two clauses in this construction, it seems reasonable to suppose that the phrase 'the more' occurs in the same position in both clauses. If so, that position must be Spec,CP, given that the phrase occurs to the left of a complementizer in the first clause. It is instructive

<sup>19</sup>Santorini gives reasons to modify Fanselow's analysis, but in a way that does not affect our reasoning here.

<sup>20</sup>We thank Harm Pinkster for bringing this possibility to our attention.

<sup>21</sup>We thank Don Ringe for help with the syntax of Latin and for checking our examples against the Latin and Old English texts in Logeman's (1888) edition of St. Benedict's Rule.

to compare the construction in (20) to a corresponding construction found in the southern texts<sup>22</sup>, illustrated by the example in (21):

- (21) for eauer se        ʒe nu   her   meared me mare se mi crune schal beon  
 for ever   so (= as) ye now here damage me more so my crown shall be  
 brihttre ba   &   fehere (St. Juliene 101.19)  
 brighter both and fairer

Here we find that the comparative particle ‘so’ which introduces the parallel clauses does not trigger inversion of subject and verb in either clause. If we assume that ‘so’ is in C<sup>0</sup> in both cases, we will not expect inversion after it. Compare, moreover, the sentence in (22) –

- (22) &   eauer se þu   mare hauest se þe        schal mare trukien                    (Hali  
 and ever   so thou more has        so to-thee shall more fail  
 Meiðhad 131.11)

In this sentence, in which a dative pronoun has moved to Spec,IP, the subject and verb have inverted within IP inside the second clause. Such cases, where the dative acts as a subject of predication, are the only ones in Old English where subordinate clause V2 is possible. We do not find such examples in Benet.

### 7.3 Scrambling

A final piece of evidence in support of our hypothesis is given by the examples in (23) – (25):

- (23) a. Bot yef it **sua** bi-tide, þat any falle in    mis-trouz; þan sal    scho pray  
 but if   it so   betide   that any fall   into mistruth   than shall she   pray  
 gerne        to god. (Benet 19.30)  
 earnestly to God.  
 b. Yef yt **sua** may be, alle sal    lie in a hus,    þat ilkain wite of        oþir.  
 if   it so   may be all   shall lie in a house that each   know of (the) other  
 (Benet 20.18)
- (24) a. And for to ʒeme charite, þat þer    nan iuil lares        by-gynne, Bot þat haly  
 and for to take   care        that there no   evil teachings begin        but that holy  
 kirke    ʒow lokis. (Benet 4.4)  
 church you   protects  
 b. þan sal    þi hert liht    be, in godis trouht yef þu    **it** se. (Benet 4.7)  
 then shall thy heart light be, in God’s truth   if   thou it see  
 c. for ye sal    vmbepinke yu                    what resun fallis to þis vers, when ye **it**  
 for ye shall bethink    yourselves what reason falls   to this verse when ye it  
 saie. (Benet 18.34)  
 say

<sup>22</sup>Examples like (20) are almost non-existent in the southern texts. We have found only three, of which two are from the “Ayenbite of Inwit” and so are quite late.

- (25) a. Yef ye **þe voice of god** herd o day, yure hertis ware noht hard; (Benet 2.1)  
 if ye the voice of God heard today, your hearts were not hard  
 b. þat **erīn** hauis, herkins wat þe haly spirt sais in haly writ. (Benet 2.4)  
 whoever ears has harkens what the holy spirit says in holy writ.  
 c. Yef we **þe painis of helle** will fle, ... þanne full-fille we his wille. (Benet  
 if we the pains of hell will flee, ... then fulfill we his will  
 3.33)

In all of these examples we find a constituent, highlighted in boldface, which appears immediately to the left of the tensed verb and to the right of the subject in a subordinate clause. Such examples are also found in the southern texts, where they can be plausibly be analyzed as the result of leftward scrambling and adjunction to some INFL projection. The same analysis can be applied to the northern examples, under the assumption that the dialect exhibits V-to-I movement (see below for further discussion).<sup>23</sup> Given that the tensed verb in the southern dialect moves only to I<sup>0</sup>, we expect to find examples like these in both main and subordinate clauses; and we do. The examples in (26) are main clauses and those in (27) are subordinate:

- (26) a. Halie alde ances **hit** maȝe don summes weis. (Ancrene Riwe 58.23)  
 holy old anchors it may do to some extent  
 b. Ah þu **witlese wiht** wurchest as þu art wurde blodles &  
 but thou senseless things fashions as thou are deserving bloodless and  
 banles. (St. Margarete 84.16)  
 boneless  
 c. þe driueles unduhtie **swa** duden sone þt te hude snawhwit swartede....  
 the drudges unworthy so did soon that the hide snowwhite blackened  
 (St. Margarete 84.24)
- (27) a. ȝef we **hire** haldeð þenne ga we sikerliche (Sawles Warde 176.4)  
 if we her hold then go we surely  
 b. As ha **þeos bone** hefde ibeden com akempe of helle on englene heowe  
 as she this boon had asked came a warrior of hell on English appearance  
 (St. Juliene 107.3)
- c. ah loke nu biliue hweðer þe beo leouere don þet ich þe leare  
 but look now quickly whether to-thee be preferred to-do what I thee teach  
 ant libben ȝef þu **swa dest**.... (St. Katerine 120.834)  
 and live if thou so doest

<sup>23</sup>As Bernhard Rohrbacher points out to us, this analysis is problematic, as it requires adjunction to a non-maximal projection. Pintzuk treats these cases in Old English as cases of subordinate clause topicalization to Spec,IP. Since her analysis is not available for the northern dialect, insistence that scrambled phrases always adjoin to maximal projections will force the conclusion that the verb there remains in situ (or moves to some low functional head). The conclusion is attractive, given the dialect's minimal inflectional paradigm; but the facts of negative placement and object shift cited by Roberts (1993) would have to be accounted for before it could be accepted.

The question that arises is whether examples like (26) occur in Benet. The answer is that they do not, just as one would expect if the verb in matrix clauses moved beyond the IP/CP boundary in that dialect, and so beyond any scrambled constituent.<sup>24</sup>

## 8 Learnability of the Northern Dialect

Roberts (1993) points out that sentences like (28) below indicate that northern Middle English exhibited V-to-I movement:

- (28) þe barnis þat ere yunge þat vnderstandis noht what paine fallis til  
 the children that are young that understand not what punishment falls to  
 cursing... (Benet 23.101)  
 cursing

Since the negation in (28) is in a relative clause (not a domain for CP-recursion), the order of tensed verb and ‘not’ must be due to movement of the verb to a lower functional projection than C<sup>0</sup>; that is, to I<sup>0</sup> under the phrase structure we have been assuming. Not only is the word order in (28) possible, it is obligatory for all verbs, as one would expect if it reflected V-to-I movement. Further effects of this movement are exemplified in a sentence like (29), in which the order of pronoun object and ‘not’ reflect Scandinavian-type object shift, which is also obligatory:

- (29) rennes fast do wilis ye haue liht þat þe mirkenes o ded our-take þe  
 run fast while ye have light so-that the murkiness of death overtake thee  
**noht.** (Benet 2.6)  
 not

These data indicate that the northern dialect does not share the apparent lack of V-to-I movement characteristic of modern mainland Scandinavian, despite the relatively impoverished verbal inflections of the dialect (see Roberts, 1993 for further discussion). From our perspective, the most interesting question raised by a grammar in which CP-V2 coexists with V-to-I movement is how a learner comes to the conclusion that V2 sentences are CPs. Some of the evidence we presented in the previous section is from marked constructions that might be rare or be treated by a learner as exceptional. For instance, the “more....more” might not be taken as indicative of the behavior of the language as a whole. However, one source of evidence we have discussed is extremely robust; namely, the scrambling evidence. Sentences like those in (23) – (25) above are common, and their significance is unmistakable. Leftward scrambling occurs in both matrix and subordinate clauses in Benet but only in subordinate clauses can the scrambled constituent move past the tensed verb. In matrix clauses the scrambled constituent appears instead to the right of the tensed verb, as in (30):

- (30) a. þai sall **nan euil** do. (Benet 5.30)  
 they shall no evil do

<sup>24</sup>There is one exception to this statement in the text, a case where a prepositional phrase with a pronominal object appears before the tensed verb and after the subject. It is not surprising that Benet should contain a few sentences that are inconsistent with its dominant grammar, given its late date and given that its author was, of course, open to influence by writings in other dialects, including other English translations of St. Benedict’s rule. As discussed above, none of the texts of Middle English on which we rely for our knowledge of the language are entirely pure representations of a single dialect.

- b. sua sal ye **yure sinnes** les. (Benet 9.9)  
 so shall ye your sins lose
- c. eftir tua wukis sal **hir** be red þis reule of þordir... (Benet 38.11)  
 after two weeks shall to-her be read this rule of the-order.

Infinitives, on the other hand, ordinarily show scrambling to a position immediately before the infinitive marker, as in (31):

- (31) Lauerd, þu giue vs **sua vre office** at do and **resun** at yelde, þat we may  
 Lord thou give us so our office to do and reason to yield that we may  
 cum til ioy þat lasts ay. (Benet 20.13)  
 come to joy that lasts forever

If, as is standardly assumed, the infinitive marker occupies  $I^0$ , the behavior of infinitives, like that of tensed subordinate clauses indicates a position to the left of  $I^0$  as a landing site for scrambled constituents. Hence, the learner must conclude that the tensed verb in main clauses has moved further than  $I^0$ .

## References

- d'Ardenne, S.T.R.O., ed. (1977). *The Katherine Group. Edited from Ms. Bodley 34.* Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège, Ccxv. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- d'Ardenne, S.R.T.O. & E.J. Dobson, eds. (1981). *Seinte Katerine, Re-edited from Ms Bodley 34 and the Other Manuscripts.* London: Early English Text Society, S.S. vol. 7.
- Bayer, Josef (1983). "COMP in Bavarian syntax". *The Linguistic Review* 3:209–274.
- Behaghel, Otto (1932). *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung.* Heidelberg: Winter.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Barriers.* Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1992). "A minimalist program for linguistic theory", in K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Darby, H. C. (1936). "The economic geography of England, A.D. 1000-1250", in H. C. Darby, ed., *An Historical Geography of England before A.D. 1800*, 165–230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diesing, Molly (1990). "Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8, pp. 41–79.
- Dobson, E.J., ed. (1972). *The English Text Of The Ancrene Riwe.* London: Early English Text Society, O.S. 267.
- Ebert, Robert P. (1986). *Historische Syntax des Deutschen II: 1300–1750.* (Bern: Lang.



- Ekwall, E. (1936). "The Scandinavian settlement", in H. C. Darby, ed., *An Historical Geography of England before A.D. 1800*, 133–164. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1987). *Konfiguralität. Untersuchungen zur Universalgrammatik am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 29. Tübingen: Narr.
- Haan, Ger de, & Fred Weerman (1986). "Finiteness and verb fronting in Frisian", in H. Haider & M. Prinzhorn, eds., *Verb Second Phenomena in the Germanic Languages*, 77–110, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Haberli, Eric and Liliane Haegeman (1992). "Word Order in Old English: Evidence from Negative Concord". Ms., Université de Genève.
- Heycock, Caroline (1991). *Layers of Predication: the Non-lexical Syntax of the Clause*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Heycock, Caroline & Anthony Kroch (1993). "Verb movement and the status of subjects: implications for a theory of licensing". *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, No. 36, 1–28.
- Heycock, Caroline & Beatrice Santorini (1992). "Head movement and the licensing of non-thematic positions". *Proceedings of WCCFL 11*, to appear.
- Holmberg, Anders, & Christer Platzack (1988). "On the role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, No. 42, 25–42.
- Iatridou, Sabine, & Anthony Kroch (1992). "The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, No. 50, 1–24.
- Jespersen, Otto (1938). *The Growth and Structure of the English Language* (ninth edition). Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- van Kemenade, Ans (1987). *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- van Kemenade, Ans (1993). "V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English". Manuscript, Free University of Amsterdam.
- Kock, E. A., ed. (1902). *Three Middle English Versions of the Rule of St. Benet*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Kroch, Anthony (1989a). "The loss of the verb-second constraint in Middle English and Middle French". Paper delivered at NWAVE 18, Montreal
- Kroch, Anthony (1989b). "Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change". *Language Variation and Change*, 1: 199–244.
- Lightfoot, David (1991). *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Logeman, H., ed. (1888). *The Rule of S. Benet. Latin and Anglo-Saxon Interlinear Version*. London: Early English Text Society, O.S. No. 90.
- McIntosh, Angus, M.L. Samuels, & M. Benskin. (1986). *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. New York: Aberdeen University Press.

- Morse-Gagné, Elise (1992). "The borrowing hierarchy in the English acquisition of Scandinavian pronouns". Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
- Morse-Gagné, Elise (1993). "The grammar of Viking pronouns on both sides of the North Sea". Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1990). "Change in Old English base word order". Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1991). *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pintzuk, Susan, & Anthony Kroch (1989). "The rightward movement of complements and adjuncts in the Old English of Beowulf". *Language Variation and Change*, 1: 115–143.
- Platzack, Christer (1987). "The Scandinavian languages and the null-subject parameter". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 5, pp. 377–401.
- Platzack, Christer, & Anders Holmberg (1990). "The role of AGR and finiteness in some European VO languages". Manuscript, University of Lund.
- Roberts, Ian (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Roegvaldsson, Eiríkur, & Hoskuldur Thráinsson (1990). "On Icelandic word order once more", in J. Maling & A. Zaenen, eds., *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 3–40, San Diego: Academic Press.
- Rohrbacher, Bernhard (1993). "V-AGR-raising in Faroese", in *Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the Formal Linguistic Society of Midamerica*, 281–296. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Santorini, Beatrice (1989). *The Generalization of the Verb-second Constraint in the History of Yiddish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Santorini, Beatrice (1992). "Variation and change in Yiddish subordinate clause word order". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 10: 595–640.
- Skeat, Walter W. (1871–1877). *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stenton, Frederick M. (1967). *Anglo-Saxon England* (second edition). Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Taylor, Ann (1990). *Clitics and configurationality in Ancient Greek*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Vikner, Sten (1993). "Finite verb movement in Scandinavian embedded clauses", in N. Hornstein & D. Lightfoot, eds., *Verb Movement*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, J. E. (1916). *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Whitelock, Dorothy (1967). *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.