English Language and Linguistics 9.1: 47–62. © Cambridge University Press 2005
doi:10.1017/S136067430500153X Printed in the United Kingdom

Transitional syntax: postverbal pronouns and particles in Old English[1]

WILLEM KOOPMAN
University of Amsterdam
(Received 28 May 2004; revised 15 December 2004)

Based on the occasional presence of personal pronoun objects and particles to the right of the nonfinite verb, Pintzuk (1999) argues that we must allow VO phrase structure in Old English as well as OV phrase structure. This article shows that personal pronoun objects and particles follow the nonfinite verb often enough to indeed assume VO as a genuine option. During the Old English period there is a significant increase in absolute as well as relative frequency. A quantitative analysis reveals that the relevant cases are found particularly often in coordinate contexts (pronouns) and ACI constructions (particles).

1 Introduction

Old English had many different surface word-order patterns that fell out of use in Middle English. This occurred most obviously with verb-final patterns (OV), which were replaced by verb-early patterns (VO). By no means all Old English clauses exhibited OV syntax, however. Main clauses, for instance, were largely, though not uniformly, VO (Koopman, 1995). Main-clause VO can best be understood as due to the effects of a V2 rule (see e.g. Fischer, van Kemenade, Koopman & van der Wurff, 2000), but coordinate main clauses often have OV patterns and subordinate clauses show both VO and OV, with almost equal frequency. We might therefore get the impression that there is little to choose between either order, but this is misleading. A clearer picture emerges when we look at clauses with a finite and a nonfinite verb. This abstracts away from the effects of verb movement of the finite verb and shows a crucial difference between OV and VO patterns (where I use V for the nonfinite verb). Whereas any sentence element can be found before the nonfinite verb, not every sentence element can easily follow it, so that we must conclude that there are restrictions on the use of VO patterns that are not found in OV patterns. In particular, personal pronouns and particles occur freely before the nonfinite verb, but are rarely found after it. (1) and (2) illustrate the typical position of personal pronoun objects and particles before the nonfinite verb (here and in what follows, the relevant pronouns and particles are given in boldface type):

(1) and noldon **him** gold offrian
and not-wanted him gold offer
'and did not want to offer him gold' (*ÆCHom* I.7.238.212)

[1] I am grateful to Ann Taylor, Wim van der Wurff, and two anonymous referees for substantial comments on an earlier version, which resulted in major improvements.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) þonne ne miht þu na þæt mot **ut** ateon
Then not can you not the mote out draw
'Then you cannot draw the mote out' (*ÆHom* 14.153)

The early generative literature (see e.g. van Kemenade, 1987) assumed underlying OV word order for Old English. A rule of verb movement (V2) accounted for surface VO word order in main clauses. In subordinate clauses, it was assumed, there was no verb movement and any surface VO order would be the result of extraposition of whatever element(s) followed the verb.

Pintzuk (1999)[2] was the first to show that the position of particles and personal pronouns in clauses with a finite as well as a nonfinite verb was crucially different from the position of particles and personal pronouns in clauses with only a finite verb. She showed that they could quite regularly be found to the right of the finite verb when there was just one verb, but only sporadically to the right of the nonfinite verb in clauses with two verbs. This is illustrated for particles in (3) and (4) respectively:

(3) Benedictus þa ferde to ðam munte þe is gecweden Casinum, se astihð **up** ðreo mila on heannysse
'Benedict then went to the mountain that is called Cassino, which rises up three miles in height' *(ÆCHom* II, 11.97.171)

(4) He wolde adræfan **ut** anne æþeling
He wanted drive out a prince
'He wanted to drive out a prince' (*ChronB* (82.18–19 (755)); (Pintzuk, 1999: 116)

Such a distribution is difficult to explain if particles and personal pronouns can extrapose (why should they do so in clauses with only a finite verb and not in clauses with a finite and a nonfinite verb?). Therefore, Pintzuk claimed, this is evidence for verb movement in subordinate clauses to INFL, which is then not in final but medial position. As there is also clear evidence for a final position for INFL, she concluded that phrase structures were in competition in Old English. Occasional examples such as (4), however, presented a problem for OV underlying order. As extraposition was clearly not an available option for particles and personal pronouns, the only conclusion could be that these were cases of VO underlying order. Whereas there is evidence that the position of INFL varied throughout the Old English period, Pintzuk found only a few examples such as (4) and she regarded VO phrase structure as an innovation, providing new syntactic options (Pintzuk, 1999: 113–17). Further support for the conclusion that VO phrase structure is an innovation comes from a comparison with the behaviour of full NP objects. In clauses with a finite verb (v) and a nonfinite verb (V) such objects can readily be found to the right of the nonfinite verb, whatever the order of the verb forms: v . . . V, as in (5), vV, as in (6), and Vv, as in (7):[3]

(5) Se mæssepreost sceal mannum bodian *þone soþan geleafan*
The priest must people preach the true faith
'The priest must preach the true faith to the people' (*ÆLet* 2 (Wulfstan 1)175)

[2] In her 1991 thesis. All references are to the published version (Pintzuk, 1999).

[3] The frequency of postverbal NP objects is much higher after vV clusters (Koopman, 1992: 326).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(6) he sceal gerihtlæcan *godes folc*
'he must cure God's people' (*ÆCHom* I, 8.244.79)

(7) þæt hi urum godum geoffrian magon *þancwurþe onsægednysse*
that they our gods offer may grateful sacrifice
'that they may offer grateful sacrifice to our gods' (*ÆCHom* I, 38.516.259)

All postverbal pronouns and particles occur in clauses with v . . . V order, as in (8), or vV order, as in (9), which can all be analysed as INFL-medial.

(8) and we wyllað sceortlice secgan **eow** þæt andgit
and we want briefly say you the meaning
'and we want briefly to explain the meaning to you' (*ÆHom* 4.56)

(9) We willað secgan **eow** sum byspel
we want say you some parable
'we want to tell you a parable' (*ÆCHom* I, 14.1.294.111)

Clauses with Vv order can only be analysed as INFL-final and there are no clear examples with postverbal pronouns or particles in them.[4]

Although Pintzuk (1999) makes a strong case for analysing Old English word order in terms of variable underlying order (OV and VO, INFL-medial and INFL-final), there are other theoretical approaches that can be taken. In a Kaynian approach, using VO word order as basic, OV surface word order is the result of leftward movement, triggered in some way. Light elements such as pronouns and particles undergo this leftward movement almost without exception. Full noun phrases are not nearly as often affected, and can be freely found to the right of the nonfinite verb. Under this analysis, the occurrence of particles and pronouns in postverbal position in Old English shows that the mechanism that triggers leftward movement sometimes fails.

Whatever theoretical approach one takes, it is clear that clauses such as (4) should be regarded as innovations. In Middle English this word order became the dominant one, and light elements such as pronouns and particles are freely found in postverbal position, consistent with VO underlying order. Some examples from Middle English (see also Kroch & Taylor, 2000: 146):

(10) Oðet he habbe iȝetted **ou** al þet ȝe wulleð
'Until he has granted you all that you desire'
(*Ancrene Riwle*; Kroch & Taylor, 2000: 145, example 15c)

(11) He þonkede him & heo wes icleopet **forð**
'He thanked him and she was called forth' (*St Juliana* (Bod) 9.93)

(12) ah, whuch se ha euer beo, let bringen hire **forð**
but, who so she ever be, let bring her forth
'but, whoever she is, let her be brought forward' (*St Kath.* (1) 30.5)

[4] There is in my material only one case of a particle following the nonfinite verb in a Vv cluster (i), and a somewhat unclear example with a postverbal pronoun (ii), which is a case of ellipsis, so that we cannot be certain that the ellipted finite verb actually followed the infinitive.

(i) Ða het Godes engel þæt he gan sceolde forð mid ðam mannum
Then ordered God's angel that he go should forth with the men (ÆLS (Book of Kings) 261)

(ii) þæt hi swimman magon and secan him fodan
so that they swim can and seek themselves food (ÆHex 250)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(13) þat þei wold gan **awey** . . .
'that they would go away. . . '
(*MKempe* 19.31; Fischer et al., 2000: 203, examples 24c-e)

At some point in the history of English a reanalysis took place, which allowed VO word order with personal pronouns and particles as an option. It probably started in Old English (though my material does not allow us to draw this conclusion with certainty), and became the norm in the Middle English period, whereas OV syntax gradually disappeared (for the survival of OV see Fischer et al., 2000: chapter 5, Foster & van der Wurff, 1995; Moerenhout & van der Wurff, 2005).

In this article I intend to shed more light on this innovation by establishing how many instances there are in Old English, in which constructions they are most frequently found, and what diachronic development took place. We may thus hope to gain some insight as to where the change began.

2 Data

2.1 Corpus and method

The data I have collected come from the YCOE prose corpus (Taylor, Warner, Pintzuk & Beths, 2003), supplemented by various searches on the Toronto Old English electronic corpus. The YCOE corpus makes it possible to do a quantitative analysis, which will be discussed below.

Not every instance of a personal pronoun or particle in postverbal position was analysed as an example of VO underlying syntax. As full NPs can occur in postverbal position through extraposition, we want to exclude anything that could potentially be analysed as a full NP. We are looking for examples of light elements in postverbal position and the categories below have – at least potentially – heavy elements. It should also be noted that personal pronoun objects can typically occupy positions that other NPs cannot, such as e.g. between a complementizer and a full NP subject or between the finite verb in C and a full NP subject, illustrated in (14) and (15) (see also Koopman, 1997). Categories 1–5 below are never found in any of these positions.

(14) swa swa **him** se engel bebead
as him the angel commanded
'as the angel commanded him' (*ÆCHom* I, 13.284.98)

(15) þa andwyrde **hire** se halga mid twylicere spræce
then answered her the saint with ambiguous speech
'then the saint answered her with ambiguous words' (*ÆCHom* II,10.87.217)

The following categories were therefore excluded:

1. pronouns followed by a form of *self*:

(16) and þu nelt geseon **þe sylf** þone beam þe bið on ðinum eagan?
and you not-want see yourself the beam which is in your eyes?
'and do you not see the beam in your own eyes?' (*ÆHom* 14.24)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. pronouns with possessive function combining with a *to*-PP. In (17) the pronoun is not an object of the verb. Although the correct analysis of such cases is far from clear, pronoun and PP are nearly always adjacent and the combination never appears in the clitic positions illustrated in (14) and (15).

(17) ac uton gewyrcan him gemacan **him to fultume** & to frofre
but let us make him a mate him to help and to comfort
'but let us make him a mate for help and comfort' (*ÆCHom* I, 1, 181.86)

3. coordinated pronouns and particles (there were only a few cases in the material examined):

(18) þa andwyrde se heretoga. Ic hate healdan **hi and eow**
Then answered the leader. I order hold them and you
'Then the leader answered: I will order you and them to be held'
(*ÆCHom* II, 38.281.37)

4. pronouns followed by an appositive noun phrase (12 cases):

(19) Middre nihte ic aras þæt ic wolde herian **þe,** Drihten . . .
Middle night I rose so-that I wanted praise you, Lord . . .
'In the middle of the night I rose to praise you, Lord' (*ChrodR* 1.14.3)

In addition I have also excluded:

5. pronouns which can be interpreted from the context as contrastive and stressed, as in (20). It is possible that more pronouns following the nonfinite verb were stressed, but unless the context clearly showed this I have treated them as instances of VO syntax and they are included in my database.

(20) Swa swa min fæder asende **me**: Swa wylle ic eac sendan **eow**.
Just as my father sent me: so will I also send you
'Just as my father sent me: so I will also send you' (*ÆCHom* I, 16.307.8)

6. particles that can be analysed as part of a following PP, illustrated in (21), where the particle *up* modifies *on ðone hehstan cnoll*:

(21) Se þe wille fæst hus timbrian ne sceal he hit no settan **up** on ðone
he who wants solid house build not must he it not set up on the
hehstan cnoll
highest hill
'he who wants to build a solid house, must not place it on the highest hill'
(Bo 12.26.22)

I have generally followed the annotating practice in the YCOE corpus in deciding which particles modify following PPs.

Where there are identical examples, as in different versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, I have counted them only once. With these restrictions the numbers in my database are as shown in table 1. As can be seen from these figures, the total numbers are not very large (certainly when one considers the high number of personal pronoun

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *Particles/personal pronouns following the nonfinite verb*

Pronouns	250
Particles	114

objects found in texts) but at the same time they are not insignificant either. We are clearly dealing with a genuine option in the grammatical system. With the help of the YCOE corpus we can calculate its frequency.

2.2 Reliability of the data

The Toronto Old English electronic corpus contains virtually all the Old English that survives, but the YCOE corpus has not syntactically annotated all of it. Many texts survive only in late copies (sometimes in manuscripts that were copied well into the Middle English period). In addition, some texts are based on Latin texts. The question therefore arises how reliable the data are and how far they provide information about Old English usage.

2.2.1 Late manuscripts

Texts that were copied during the Middle English period and of which no earlier versions survive, even though the presumed date of composition is firmly in the Old English period, present us with a problem. How can we be certain that the scribe copied faithfully and did not modernize the text? In other words, does the position of the particle or personal pronoun following the nonfinite verb represent the language of the author of the text and therefore give evidence of Old English syntax or does it represent the language of the scribe copying the text and therefore Middle English syntax? To attempt an answer is beyond the scope of this article and would involve among other things detailed work on variant readings, on the relationship between the various manuscripts of a single text, and on the extent to which scribes modernized the texts they copied. Such an investigation might throw light on this problem and might also unearth further examples of particles and personal pronouns following the nonfinite verb that may lie hidden in the variant readings not now included in the Toronto Old English electronic corpus.[5]

If we take as a cut-off date the end of the eleventh century and use the dates of the manuscripts as given by Ker (1957), we get the following distribution:

[5] A thorough search through the various glossed texts could also reveal relevant material. I happened to find one example of a particle following the nonfinite verb which translates a single Latin verb form:

. . . hy sien ahafen up
. . . they are raised up
Latin: . . . exaltentur (PsGIL(Lindelöf) 139.9)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. *Particles/personal pronouns following the nonfinite verb*

	In manuscripts to end of 11th C	In later manuscripts[6]	Total
Pronouns	198	52	250
Particles	96	18	114

Excluding examples from manuscripts copied after ca. 1100 reduces the numbers in my database, but we can still conclude that putting the particle or the personal pronoun in postverbal position was a genuine option in Old English syntax.

2.2.2 Latin source texts

Some of the texts in the Old English corpus are relatively close translations of Latin. The position of the pronoun or particle could well be influenced by the word order in the source text. I have looked in particular at biblical translations, as they were fairly well represented in the database. Frequently the position of the pronoun corresponds to that in the Latin (see (22) and (23)). But sometimes the Old English has a pronoun where there is no pronoun in the Latin, as in (24), and significantly, there are also some where the Latin has the pronoun before and the Old English after the verb, illustrated in (25) and (26):

(22) *Vton timbrian* ***us*** ceastre
let-us build ourselves town
'let us build ourselves a town'
Latin: *faciamus nobis* ciuitatem (Gen 11.4)

(23) ac ic wylle gan & *awreccan*[7] ***hyne*** *of slæpe*
'but I will go and awake him from sleep'
Latin: sed vado ut a somno *exsuscitem eum* (Jn (WSCp) 11.11)

(24) & he het ða sona wylian to ðam scræfe micele weorcstanas & *beclysan*
and he ordered then at-once roll to the grave huge hewn stones and close
hi ðærinne, oððæt hi comon eft & setten him weardas ofer . . .
them therein, until they come again and put them guards over . . . . .
'and he ordered huge hewn stones to be rolled at once before the grave and to close them in it, until they returned and put guards over them . . .'
Latin: Volvite saxa ingentia ad os speluncae et *ponire* viros industrios, qui clausos custodiant (Josh 10.18)

(25) gif þu wylt ðu miht *geclænsian* ***me***
'if you want you could cleanse me'
Latin: si vis, potes *me mundare* (Mk (WSCp) 1.40)

(26) gyf hwa wylle *fyligean* ***me***
if anyone wants follow me
'if anyone wants to follow me'
Latin: si quis vult *post me venire* (Mt (WSCp) 16.24)

[6] Some of the late texts are the *Peterborough Chronicle, Soliloquies*, a number of Saints' Lives, Homilies, and some Charters.

[7] The scribe at this point seems to have made an error in copying *aweccan.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

With particles we find much the same picture. In (27) there is no source in the Latin for the particle, while in (28) the particle corresponds to *foras* in the Latin:

(27) & het heora ælcne geniman anne æmtigne sester oððe anne wæterbuc
and ordered of-them each take a empty vessel or a water-pot
to þam gewinne **forð**
to the battle forth
'and ordered each of them to take an empty vessel or water pot with them to the battle'
Latin: no clear source (Judg 7.16)

(28) Ða cwæð Cain to Abele his breðer: *Vton gan* ***ut***
Then said Cain to Abel his brother: Let us go out
'Then Cain said to Abel: Let us go out'
Latin: *egrediamur foras* (Gen 4.8)

The position of the pronoun or particle often corresponds to the position of a word in the Latin text after the verb (usually a single verb in Latin). However, as there is as yet no full-scale investigation of the influence of the Latin source texts on the word order of the translations,[8] it is hard to know whether this can be ascribed to direct influence from the source texts. Such influence can of course not be ruled out. On the other hand it is clear that the translator(s) did not slavishly follow the source text, as is shown by instances where there is no clear source for the pronoun in Latin or where the word order in Old English does not follow the Latin.

3 Analysis of the data

3.1 General characteristics

The total number of examples definitely from the Old English period is 198 for pronouns and 96 for particles. These occur in manuscripts that can be dated before the end of the eleventh century. The clauses in question have the following general characteristics:

1. They can all be analysed as INFL-medial.[9] In addition, many clauses have the finite and nonfinite verb adjacent.
2. The great majority have other clause material following the particle or the pronoun, so that they are rarely in absolute final position. Some examples have both a pronoun and a particle following the nonfinite verb (29):

(29) God bebead on ðære ealdan æ his folce þæt hi sceoldon him ofrian
God ordered in the old law his people that they must him sacrifice
ælc frumcenned hysecild oððe alysan **hit ut** mid fif scyllingum
each first-born male child or redeem it out with five shillings
'In the old law God ordered his people to sacrifice each first-born child to him or to redeem it with five shillings' (*ÆCHom* I, 9.251.59)

[8] Taylor (2004) finds translation effects on the word order of PPs with a pronominal complement.
[9] But see note 4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.2 Constructions with pronouns

Both postverbal argument pronouns and nonargument pronouns are found in the database. A pronoun after a nonfinite verb is found 36.8 per cent (73/198) of the time after a coordinated nonfinite verb, as in (30) and (31).[10]

(30) And he sceal forgifan eallum þam mannum, þe him ær abulgon, and
and he must forgive all the men who him before offended and
biddan **hym** forgifnysse
ask them forgiveness
'and he must forgive all the men who had offended him and ask them for forgiveness'
(*ÆLet* 3 (Wulfstan 2) 17)

(31) þa heton þa consulas Hasterbale þæt heafod of aceorfan, & aweorpan
then ordered the consuls Hasdrubal the head off cut and throw
hit beforan Hannibales wicstowe
it before Hannibal's camp
'Then the consuls ordered Hasdrubal's head to be cut off and to be thrown before Hannibal's camp' (Or 4.10.105.34)

Of the 73 pronouns in postverbal position in coordinated contexts 26 (35.6 per cent) occur in coordinated *uton* constructions, illustrated in (32), and 14 (19.1 per cent) in coordinated ACI constructions (33):

(32) Uton nu faran on þisse nihte, and begitan **us** þæt halige fulluht Cristenra
Let us now go in this night and get us the holy baptism of Christian
manna
men
'Let us now go this night and get the holy baptism of Christian men'
(LS 8. (Eust)85)

(33) þa het he niman Claudium and lædan to sæ, and wurpan **hine** ut mid
then ordered he take Claudius and lead to sea and throw him out with
anum weorcstane
a hewn stone
'then he ordered Claudius to be taken out and led to the sea and thrown in with a hewn stone' (*ÆLS* (Chrysanthus) 222)

Constructions involving *uton*[11] are much favoured by Wulfstan and he always puts a personal pronoun after the infinitive, as in (34), whereas Ælfric prefers the position before the infinitive, as in (35):

[10] If we also take into consideration examples from manuscripts written after ca. 1100, the figures in coordinated clauses are 90/250 (36.0 per cent). The percentage is virtually identical.

[11] See also Ogura (2000).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(34) Ac utan warnian **us** georne
But let-us warn ourselves well
'But let us take warning well' (*WHom* 4.86)[12]

(35) Uton **hine** biddan þæt he us ðingige to þam lifigendan gode
Let us him pray that he us intercedes with the living god
'Let us pray to him to intercede with the living God' (*ÆCHom* II, 39.1.297.329)

A number of factors can be distinguished in the placement of a pronoun after the nonfinite verb:

1. There is often a NP object after the nonfinite verb in the first half of a coordinated sentence (see (30) and (24), repeated here) so that parallelism may have played a role.
2. The pronoun is frequently accompanied by other clause material and is rarely found alone in postverbal position. Thus, it is often one of the two objects in a double-object construction, as in (36), or is followed by other clause material, as in (37):

(30) And he sceal forgifan eallum þam mannum, þe him ær abulgon, and
And he must forgive all the men who him earlier offended and
biddan **hym** forgifnysse
ask them forgiveness
'and he must forgive all the men who had offended him and ask them for forgiveness'
(*ÆLet* 3 (Wulfstan 2)

(24) & he het ða sona wylian to ðam scræfe micele weorcstanas & beclysan
and he ordered then at-once roll to the grave huge hewn stones and close
hi ðærinne
them therein
'and he ordered huge hewn stones to be rolled at once before the grave and to close them in it' (Josh 10.18)

(36) We habbað anfealdlice gesæd **eow** nu þis godspell
We have simply told you now this gospel
'We have now told you this gospel unadorned' (*ÆHom* 3.46)

(37) He nolde genyman **us** neadunge of deofles anwealde.
He not-wanted take us forcibly from devil's power
'He did not want to take us forcibly from the devil's power' (*ÆCHom* I, 1.188.272)

3.3 Constructions with particles

With particles the distribution is somewhat different. Almost half occur in ACI constructions (46/98 = 46.9 per cent)[13] (see (38) and (39)) with only a few in coordinated constructions (13/98 = 13.2 per cent) (see (40), which repeats (33)):

[12] There is a reflexive pronoun here, but Wulfstan also puts nonreflexive pronouns in postverbal position. In general, reflexive pronouns do not form a large percentage of postverbal pronouns.

[13] If we include the manuscripts written after 1100, the figures are 52/116 (44.8 per cent).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(38) ac ða apostoli heton lædan **forð** þone diacon and þæt cild forð
but the apostles commanded lead forth the deacon and the child forth
beran þe ðær acenned wæs
carry which there born was
'but the apostles ordered the deacon to be brought forth and the child which had been born there' (*ÆCHom* II, 38.284.158)

(39) and het oðerne munuc awurpan **ut** þæt glæsene fæt mid ele mid ealle
and ordered another monk throw out the glass vessel with oil with all
'and ordered another monk to throw the glass vessel out complete with oil'
(*ÆCHom* II.104.422)

(40) þa het he niman Claudium and lædan to sæ, and wurpan **hine** ut
then ordered he take Claudius and lead him to sea and throw him out
mid anum weorcstane
with one hewn stone
'Then he ordered to seize Claudius and take him to the sea and throw him in it with a stone' (*ÆLS* (Chrysanthus) 222)

As with pronouns, there is usually other clause material that follows the particle.

4 Diachronic development

If we assume that the construction we are investigating is an innovation and possibly one that started in Old English, we should try to determine whether there are significantly more instances in later texts than in early texts. The YCOE allows us to establish for each text in the corpus the exact number of relevant clauses, i.e. those with a nonfinite verb and a pronoun and/or particle. We can then calculate the percentage of pronouns/particles in postverbal position.

There are only a few substantial prose texts that can reliably be assigned to the early Old English period. They are the translation of the *Cura Pastoralis*, the translation of Orosius, and Chron A, the Parker ms. of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to 924 (Hogg, 1992: 7). All three texts are in the YCOE corpus. Figures for these texts are given in table 3A. There are also texts that were composed early, but have been preserved in later manuscripts. Figures for some of these texts are given in table 3B. Combined figures of tables 3A and 3B are given in table 3C. The data for some later texts appear in table 3D.

It is clear from table 3A that postverbal pronouns are rare in early texts and that there are only three examples of postverbal particles. The syntactic option that allowed postverbal pronouns and particles at this time appears to have been marginal. The figures are very low and in order to make it possible to investigate any diachronic development we should try and increase the numbers. A chi-square test for pronouns (the figures for particles are too low to do this) shows that there is no significant difference between the early texts (table 3A) and the early composition texts (table 3B). It seems therefore justified to combine tables 3A and 3B in table 3C, which can be used to compare with the figures from later texts given in table 3D.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. *Postverbal pronouns and particles in Old English texts*

A. Early texts	Pronouns	% postverbal	particles	% postverbal
CP[14]	3/346	0.8%	0/33	–
Or	3/205	1.4%	1/25	4.0%
ChronA[15]	0/21	–	2/11	18.1%
Total	6/567	1.0%	3/69	4.3%
B. Early composition texts only surviving in later manuscripts[16]				
	Pronouns	% postverbal	particles	% postverbal
GD (C)	8/303	2.6%	7/98	7.1%
GD (H)[17]	5/102	4.9%	1/28	3.5%
Bede	1/245	0.4%	0/34	–
Total	14/650	2.1%	8/160	5.0%
C. A and B combined				
	Pronouns	% postverbal	particles	% postverbal
Total	20/1222	1.6%	11/229	4.8%
D. Later texts				
	Pronouns	% postverbal	particles	% postverbal
Ælfric[18]	65/1542	4.2%	38/107	35.5%
VercHom	9/240	3.7%	2/30	6.6%
WSGosp	11/257	4.2%	1/16	6.2%
WHom[19]	22/85	25.8%	0/3	–
Total	107/2124	5.0%	41/156	26.2%

A comparison of tables 3C and 3D shows that there is an increase in absolute as well as relative frequencies. The differences are statistically significant for pronouns as well as for particles.[20]

[14] The Hatton manuscript.

[15] The portion of the text up to 924. The YCOE gives separate figures for the various scribes distinguished by Bately (1986: xxi–xliii).

[16] I have excluded The *Soliloquies* which survive only in a twelfth-century manuscript. The figures for this text are: pronouns 4/130 (3.0%), particles: 1/1 (100%).

[17] An anonymous reviewer points out that as GD (H) is a revision of GD (C) it is possible that some of the revisions may indicate diachronic changes (see Yerkes, 1982). A chi-square test on the numbers for pronouns shows that the difference is not statistically significant, so that no diachronic development can be shown for postverbal pronouns and particles. I have therefore included GD (H) among the group of texts of early composition date but preserved in later manuscripts.

[18] The texts are ÆHom, ÆLS, ÆCHom 1 & 2, and ÆLet1–6.

[19] The high percentage is due to Wulfstan's frequent use of the *uton* construction, where he always places the object pronoun after the infinitive.

[20] Pronouns: table 3C vs table 3D: chi square = 24.5, $p \leq 0.001$; particles: table 3C vs table 3D: chi square = 36.6, $p \leq 0.001$. If we exclude WHom from the comparison because of the high percentage of postverbal pronouns, the difference is still significant (chi square = 16.1, $p \leq 0.001$).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. *Postverbal pronouns and particles in specific syntactic contexts with a nonfinite verb*

A. Pronouns	Coordinated	Other	Total
'early' texts	4/43 (9.3%)	16/1179 (1.3%)	20/1222 (1.6%)
later texts	42/178 (23.5%)	65/1946 (3.3%)	107/2124 (5.0%)
Total	46/221 (20.8%)	81/3125 (2.5%)	127/3346 (3.7%)
B. Particles	ACI	Other	Total
'early' texts	4/28 (14.2%)	7/201 (3.4%)	11/229 (4.8%)
later texts	22/41 (53.6%)	19/122 (15.5%)	41/163 (25.1%)
Total	26/69 (37.6%)	26/323 (8.0%)	52/392 (13.2%)

How should we interpret these findings? What table 3 suggests is that postverbal pronouns and particles are becoming significantly more frequent during the Old English period and the conclusion that the material shows diachronic development seems justified. We should, however, keep in mind that we have been able to use only a few texts from the early period, which have quite low numbers, and that we had to combine them with texts that were composed early but survive only in later manuscripts. We should also take into account that there might have been stylistic differences between texts. This certainly appears to be the case with Wulfstan, the only text in the YCOE corpus with more than 10 per cent of postverbal pronouns. Ælfric has a much higher percentage of particles in postverbal position than the other texts in table 3D, but there are other texts in the YCOE corpus with high percentages as well,[21] so that it is less likely that Ælfric is not representative.

Above (sections 3.2 and 3.3) we have seen that many personal pronoun objects in postverbal position occur in coordinate clauses, and that the chance of finding a particle after a nonfinite verb is greatest in ACI constructions. In this section we use the YCOE corpus to investigate whether the type of construction is a significant contributing factor to the placing of a pronoun/particle after the nonfinite verb. The relevant figures are given in table 4A for pronouns and table 4B for particles. The figures are based on tables 3C ('early' texts) and 3D (later texts).

The figures in table 4 show that coordinate sentences make up 6.6 per cent (221/3346) of all the potential contexts with a pronoun in preverbal or postverbal position, but they contain 36.2 per cent (46/127) of all postverbal pronouns. There are 69 ACIs with a particle, which is 17.6 per cent (69/392) of all relevant clauses with a particle, but 50.0 per cent (26/52) of all postverbal particles occur there. Coordinate clauses therefore form an important context for postverbal pronouns and ACIs for particles. The low

[21] ChronC has 7/15 (46.6%), ChronD 5/16 (31.2%), Med 3 (Lacnunga) 4/4 (100%), and Lch II (1), Lch II (2), Lch III 12/37 (32.4%).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. *Percentage of pronouns after the nonfinite verb in clauses with auxiliary verbs*

West Midlands (Ancrene Riwle & Katherine Group)	55%
South East Midlands (Trinity Homilies & Vices and Virtues)	10%

figures in the 'early' texts do not allow us to determine whether postverbal pronouns in coordinate clauses are significantly more frequent than in other types of clauses, but a chi-square test for later texts shows that the difference between coordinate clauses and other types of clauses is significant.[22] The same is true for particles, where the difference between ACI clauses and other types of clauses is significant for later texts.[23] It could of course be argued that in order to prove that coordinate clauses (for pronouns) and ACI clauses (for particles) are the 'key' environments for postverbal placement, we need to distinguish more types of clauses and not group all noncoordinated and non-ACI cases together. I have not attempted this, as my database does not show any other type of clause with a substantial number of postverbal pronouns or particles and the eventual numbers are likely to be too low to make meaningful generalizations possible. The only conclusion that we can draw from table 4 is that there are apparently two contexts in which postverbal placement is favoured.

Later texts in Old English have on average 5.0 per cent of pronouns after the nonfinite verb, which makes this still very much a minority pattern. In the Middle English period there is a substantial increase, as we can see from the figures for early Middle English given in table 5, adapted from Kroch & Taylor (2000: 146).

These percentages are considerably higher than in Old English and they continue to rise, so that in later Middle English it is the norm that personal pronouns follow the nonfinite verb. Pronouns before the nonfinite verb become increasingly rare as OV word order declines in Middle English (see Foster & van der Wurff, 1995).

A syntactic innovation is often the result of some kind of reanalysis in a context where this is possible (Harris & Campbell, 1995). Given that full NP arguments can be extraposed in Old English (see (5)–(7)), there is a context in which VO phrase structure could be deduced. The results would be shown in the position of light elements such as pronouns and particles.

Can we say something about where the reanalysis started? We have seen that coordinate structures are a context favouring postverbal placement of pronouns in later texts. If this was the context in which the reanalysis took place, we should expect the (admittedly few) postverbal pronouns in the 'early' texts to occur predominantly there. This is, however, not the case. Only 4 of the 20 instances occur in coordinate contexts. Similarly, ACI clauses are favourable environments for postverbal particles in later texts, but only 4 out of the 11 postverbal particles in the 'early' texts occur in them. This does not allow us to draw any conclusions about where the reanalysis took

[22] Chi square 104.4, $p \leq 0.001$.
[23] Chi square 23.6, $p \leq 0.001$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

place. It is of course possible that it was not restricted to one particular context and that the favourable environments in later texts would have to be explained differently. What they share is that they lack a finite verb form as part of their structure. Why this should favour postverbal placement is not clear and crosslinguistic data would be needed to see whether innovations involving word order are particularly likely in such contexts.

5 Theoretical implications

The data presented here make clear that postverbal pronouns and particles were a genuine option in Old English syntax, at first rather marginal, but later becoming more prominent. In later Old English texts, postverbal pronouns reach a low but significant percentage and the frequency of postverbal particles can even be called considerable. Theoretical approaches need to take this into account. The material presented here shows that we must allow for VO phrase structure rather more often than Pintzuk (1999) does, thus providing further support for her theory of phrase structures in competition in the Old English period. Not only is there competition between INFL-final and INFL-medial, but also between OV and VO phrase structure. Pintzuk (1999) states explicitly that this variation is only found in INFL-medial clauses and the data make it clear that the reanalysis making this variation possible can indeed only have taken place in INFL-medial clauses, as there are no clear examples of postverbal pronouns and particles in INFL-final clauses. This raises the question of why the reanalysis did not take place in INFL-final clauses, where there was also a context with postverbal arguments such as full NPs. Perhaps frequency was crucial here: postverbal arguments are a great deal less frequent in INFL-final clauses than in INFL-medial clauses (see Koopman, 1992). The syntactically annotated YCOE corpus could be used to gain more insight here.

A Kaynian approach faces considerable challenges in accounting for my data, because it is difficult to account for variation in the linguistic data within this framework. In a uniform VO phrase structure different surface word orders have to be the result of some form of movement, and this must be triggered. It is clear that the trigger(s) for Old English sometimes don't work and the reason is not immediately clear.

6 Conclusions

There are only a few instances in early Old English texts of postverbal pronouns and particles, but later texts have considerably more. Postverbal pronouns remain at a fairly low percentage throughout the Old English period, but particles reach a higher percentage, particularly in ACI constructions. The data do not allow us to draw firm conclusions about where this innovation started, but a favourable environment in later Old English texts for postverbal pronouns is after a coordinated nonfinite verb and for postverbal particles after an infinitive in an ACI construction.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Author's address:
University of Amsterdam
English Department/ACLC
Spuistraat 210
1012 VT Amsterdam
The Netherlands
w.f.koopman@uva.nl

References

Bately, J. M. (ed.) (1986). *The Anglo-Saxon chronicle: a collaborative edition*, vol. 3. *MS A*. Cambridge: Brewer.

Fischer, O., A. van Kemenade, W. Koopman & W. van der Wurff (2000). *The syntax of Early English*. Cambridge Syntax Guides 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foster, T. & W. van der Wurff (1995). The survival of object-verb order in Middle English: some data. *Neophilologus* **79**: 309–27.

Harris, A. C. & L. Campbell (1995). *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hogg, R. M. (1992). *A Grammar of Old English*, vol. 1: *Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kemenade, A. van (1987). Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English. PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht.

Ker, N. R. (1957). *A catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Koopman, W. F. (1992). The distribution of verb forms in Old English subordinate clauses. In Rissanen, M., O. Ihalainen, T. Nevalainen & I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *History of Englishes: new methods and interpretations in historical linguistics*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 319–35.

Koopman, W. F. (1995). Verb-final main clauses in Old English prose. *Studia Neophilologica* **67**: 129–44.

Koopman, W. F. (1997). Another look at clitics in Old English. *Transactions of the Philological Society* **95**: 73–93.

Kroch, A. & A. Taylor (2000). Verb-object order in Early Middle English. In Pintzuk, S., G. Tsoulas & A. Warner (eds.), *Diachronic syntax: models and mechanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 132–63.

Moerenhout, M. & W. van der Wurff (2005). Object-verb order in early sixteenth-century English prose: an exploratory study. This issue.

Ogura, M. (2000). '*Gewat* + infinitive' and '*uton* + infinitive'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* **101**: 69–78.

Pintzuk, S. (1999). *Phrase structures in competition: variation and change in Old English word order*. New York: Garland Publishing (with minor corrections this is her 1991 University of Pennsylvania PhD thesis).

Taylor, A. (2004). Some evidence for the effects of translation from Latin on Old English syntax. Paper presented at the 3rd York–Holland symposium on the history of English syntax. University of York, 22–25 April 2004.

Taylor, A., A. Warner, S. Pintzuk & F. Beths (2003). *The York–Toronto–Helsinki parsed corpus of Old English prose*. York, UK: Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York. Available through the Oxford Text Archive.

Yerkes, D. (1982). *Syntax and style in Old English: a comparison of the two versions of Wærferth's translation of Gregory's Dialogues*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430500153X Published online by Cambridge University Press