

Adjuncts and the Syntax of Subjects in Old and Middle English

HAEBERLI, Eric

Abstract

Old English (OE) shows characteristic properties of a Verb Second (V2) language. However, certain phenomena can be found in OE which suggest that V2 in this language cannot be dealt with in terms of analyses that have been proposed for the Modern Germanic V2 languages. Different alternative analyses have therefore been explored in the literature which account for the different properties of OE. Although there seems to be a general consensus on certain points, the different analyses vary with respect to several issues. In this paper, some of these issues are addressed and it is argued that important evidence can be obtained from a comparative analysis of OE, later stages in the history of English and the Modern Germanic languages with respect to phenomena concerning the distribution of adjuncts and subjects. In addition, it is shown not only that the comparative evidence used provides information for the analysis of OE, but also that the OE data contribute to a more detailed understanding of a general Germanic word order phenomenon.

Reference

HAEBERLI, Eric. Adjuncts and the Syntax of Subjects in Old and Middle English. In: S. Pintzuk, G. Tsoulas and A. Warner. *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford : Oxford Universtiy Press, 2000. p. 109-131

Available at:

<http://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:35360>

Disclaimer: layout of this document may differ from the published version.



UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE

Adjuncts and the syntax of subjects in Old and Middle English

Eric Haeberli, University of Geneva¹

Old English (OE) shows characteristic properties of a Verb Second (V2) language. However, certain phenomena can be found in OE which suggest that V2 in this language cannot be dealt with in terms of analyses that have been proposed for the Modern Germanic V2 languages. Different alternative analyses have therefore been explored in the recent literature which account for the distinct properties of OE. Although there seems to be a general consensus on the central points, the different analyses vary with respect to several issues. In this chapter, some of these issues will be addressed and it will be argued that important evidence can be obtained from a comparative analysis of OE, later stages in the history of English and the Modern Germanic languages with respect to phenomena concerning the distribution of adjuncts and subjects. In addition, it will be shown not only that the comparative evidence used provides information for the analysis of OE, but also that the OE data contribute to a more detailed understanding of a general Germanic word order phenomenon.

6.1 Introduction: V2 and the syntax of subjects in OE

Apart from Modern English, all the Modern Germanic languages exhibit what has been called the Verb Second (V2) phenomenon, at least in main clauses. The characteristic property of this phenomenon is that any type of constituent can get fronted to the beginning of the clause and the verb immediately follows this constituent. At first sight, OE seems to share this property with the Modern Germanic languages (example from van Kemenade 1987: 17).

- (1) [Eall ðis] **aredað** se reccere swiðe ryhte (AHTh,I,10,3)
All this arranges the ruler very rightly
'The ruler arranges all this very rightly.'

In (1), an object is fronted and it is immediately followed by the finite verb, in line with the V2 constraint.

However, there is one aspect of the syntax of V2 in OE which cannot be found in the Modern Germanic languages and which suggests that V2 in OE cannot be analyzed in exactly the same way as V2 in the Modern Germanic languages. In OE, pronominal subjects generally precede the

¹ Parts of the material discussed in this paper have been presented at the 5th Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference, University of York (June 1998), and at the 10th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, University of Manchester (August 1998). I would like to thank the audiences at these conferences and in particular the editors of this volume for valuable comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are of course my own.

finite verb even when another constituent has been moved to the front (cf. e.g. van Kemenade 1987: 109ff., Pintzuk 1991: 133ff., 201ff, 1993). This is illustrated in (2) (example from Pintzuk 1991: 202).

- (2) [hiora untrymnesse] [he] **sceal** ðrowian on his heortan (CP, 60.17)
 their weakness he shall atone in his heart
 'He shall atone in his heart for their weakness.'

The example in (2) is parallel to that in (1) in that an object is fronted. But in (2), the subject and the finite verb are not inverted, and instead the pronominal subject also precedes the finite verb, giving rise to a V3 order.

Yet, there is a restricted context in which subject pronouns do follow the finite verb, namely in interrogative clauses, negative clauses, verb-initial clauses and clauses introduced by some adverbs like *þa* ('then') (cf. van Kemenade 1987, Pintzuk 1991, 1993). One of these contexts is illustrated in (3).

- (3) [hwi] **sceole** we oþres mannes niman (ÆLS 24.188)
 why should we another man's take
 'Why should we take those of another man?'

In (3), subject-verb inversion applies although the subject is pronominal.

On the basis of the word order patterns in (1) to (3), it has been concluded in the recent literature that V2 in OE cannot be analyzed simply along the lines generally proposed for the Modern Germanic languages, i.e. in terms of XP-movement to [Spec, CP] and verb movement to C. Instead, the standard analysis within most recent work is that (1) to (3) can be accounted for under the assumption that different types of subjects occur in different structural positions (pronouns, being clitics or weak pronouns, in a higher position than non-pronominal subjects) and that V-fronting in OE targets two possible positions, C in some contexts (cf. 3) and a lower inflectional head, which I will label X for the moment, in cases of topicalization of other elements (cf. Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991, Hulk & van Kemenade 1997, van Kemenade 1998, Kroch & Taylor 1997, Pintzuk 1991, 1993). Schematically, this analysis can be represented as follows (+pro = pronominal; -pro = non-pronominal):

- (4) [CP C [XP SU₁(+pro) X [YP SU₂(-pro) ...]]]

C and X in (4) are two head positions for verb fronting which are used according to the type of element that gets moved to [Spec, CP]. SU₁ and SU₂ are two subject positions which are used by different types of subjects. In terms of (4), (1) is the result of topic fronting, V-movement to X and the occurrence of the subject in position SU₂. In (2), a topic is fronted again

and V moves to X but the subject now occurs in position SU₁. In (3) finally, the verb moves to C and therefore all types of subjects occur postverbally.

Despite the agreement of several authors with respect to the analysis of OE along the lines of (4), there are certain theoretical issues for which there is no general consensus. Three main issues are listed in (5).²

- (5) (I) The nature of the lower landing site of V-movement (X in (4) above: Infl in Pintzuk 1991, 1993; F in Hulk & van Kemenade 1997; Agr1 in Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991; AgrS suggested by Kroch & Taylor 1997).
- (II) The status of the lower subject position ([Spec, YP] in 4 above: [Spec, VP] in Pintzuk 1991, 1993; [Spec, TP] in Hulk & van Kemenade 1997; [Spec, Agr2P] in Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991).
- (III) The position of the topic in (1) and (2) ([Spec, CP] in Hulk & van Kemenade 1997, Kroch & Taylor 1997; [Spec, IP] in Pintzuk 1991, 1993; [Spec, Agr1P] in Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991).

In this chapter, I will argue that by considering the distribution of subjects with respect to adjuncts in OE and Middle English (ME), we can shed some light on the issues in (I) to (III). Furthermore, I will show that a contrast which corresponds basically to that in (4) can also be found in the Modern Germanic languages, but that the contrast in OE/ME provides additional information for the syntactic analysis which cannot be obtained from the Modern Germanic languages.

The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. In Section 2, the word order phenomenon that I will focus on in this chapter will be introduced on the basis of the Modern Germanic languages, and its relevance for OE will be discussed. Section 3 deals with the properties of OE with respect to this word order option. Section 4 then introduces data from later stages of the history of English and Section 5 summarizes the chapter.

6.2 Adjacency of the finite verb and subjects in V2 clauses

6.2.1 A source of crosslinguistic variation...

The starting point for my discussion is an aspect of the syntax of the Modern Germanic V2 languages, and more precisely the variation which

² An additional important issue is the question as to why a non-pronominal subject does not have to move to the subject position occupied by pronouns, i.e. to [Spec, XP] in the structure in (4) or also for example in (7.c) below. Again different proposals can be found in the literature, but for our purposes a detailed analysis of this issue will not be central. I will therefore leave this point aside here. But cf. Haerberli 1999: chapters 7 and 8 for discussion.

can be found with respect to the occurrence of adjuncts in a position immediately preceding subjects. In some languages, we can find word orders of the type 'XP-subject', whereas such orders are impossible in some other languages. This variation is illustrated in (6) with a temporal adverb (but other types of adverbs or adjunct PPs exhibit the same variation; cf. Haerberli to appear, 1999: chapter 4, Vikner 1995 for more details).

- (6) a. Wahrscheinlich **wird** (*später*) **Hans** dieselbe Uhr kaufen (*German*)
 b. Misschien **goa** (**loater*) **Jan** tzelfste orloge kuopen (*W. Flemish*)
 c. Waarschijnlijk **zal** (*%later*) **Jan** hetzelfde horloge gaan kopen (*Du.*)
 d. Wierskynlik **wol** (*letter*) **Jan** itselde horloazje keapje (*Frisian*)
 e. Waarskynlik **sal** (**later*) **Jan** dieselfde oorlosie gaan koop (*Afr.*)
 Probably will (later) John the-same watch (go) buy
 'Probably, John will buy the same watch (later).'
 f. Minastav **vet** (*shpeter*) **Moyshe** koyfn dem zelibkn zeyger (*Yiddish*)
 g. Sennilega **mun** (**seinna*) **Jón** kaupá sama úrið (*Icelandic*)
 Probably will (later) John/M. buy the same watch
 'Probably, John will buy the same watch later.'
 h. Dette ur **vil** (**senere*) **min far** købe (*Danish*)
 i. Den här klockan **hade** (*senare*) **min gamle far** köpt (*Swedish*)
 j. Denne klokka **hadde** (*seinere*) **min gamle far** kjøpt (*Norwegian*)
 This watch will/had (later) my (old) dad buy/bought
 'This watch, my dad will buy/had bought later.'

In German, Dutch, Frisian, Yiddish, Swedish and Norwegian an adjunct can intervene between a fronted verb and a definite subject, whereas this option is not available in West Flemish, Afrikaans, Icelandic and Danish.³

At first sight, it is surprising that a distributional option for adjuncts which occurs in certain languages cannot be found in some other, very closely related languages. The question that arises therefore is how the crosslinguistic variation with respect to V-subject (non-)adjacency can be accounted for. One possibility would be to relate this variation to variation with respect to the placement of adjuncts. Thus, we could assume that the languages which allow 'XP-subject' orders license adjunction to, say, IP whereas in the more restrictive languages such adjunction is banned (cf. e.g. Holmberg 1993, Vikner 1995 for proposals along these lines).

But such an analysis would raise two important problems. The first problem is an acquisitional one which concerns the languages in which 'XP-subject' orders are ungrammatical. Given that, in terms of such an approach, IP-adjunction would be legitimate in principle and given that negative (i.e. ungrammatical) evidence is not part of the language learner's input, it would

³ Note that a similar phenomenon can also be found in Modern English in contexts of 'residual V2':

(i) **Will** (**later*) **John** buy the same watch?

not be clear how in some languages a ban on IP-adjunction could be acquired on the basis of the overt evidence available to the language learner. In other words, we would have what has been referred to as a 'poverty of stimulus' problem because there is no overt evidence for the ungrammaticality of 'XP-subject' orders in the input of learners who acquire the more restrictive languages. Apart from this acquisitional problem, an adjunction analysis also would raise another problem. If the data in (6) simply illustrated a variation with respect to the availability of IP-adjunction, then the choice made by each language basically seems arbitrary and the way in which the Germanic V2 languages are divided into two groups would therefore be random. In other words, no genuine explanation could be provided for the crosslinguistic pattern found in (6).

In order to account for the variation in (6) and its acquisition, it therefore seems to be necessary to derive it from factors which are independent of properties of adjunct placement. An analysis along these lines is proposed in Haerberli (to appear, 1999: chapter 4). The two main hypotheses made there and adopted here are: (A) Adjunction to maximal projections is highly restricted universally, and in particular adjunction to functional projections such as IP or, within a richer clause structure, AgrSP and TP is ruled out; and (B) Contrasts as shown in (6) are obtained through differences with respect to the syntax of subjects; more precisely, there are (at least) two structural positions available for subjects, and adjacency between the finite verb and the subject occurs when the subject has to occupy the highest structural subject position whereas non-adjacency is possible when the subject can remain in a lower subject position in the overt syntax. This variation is illustrated in (7) (e=empty position).

- (7) a. [CP ZP V [XP SU1 ... [YP SU2 ...]]]
 b. [CP ZP V [XP SU ...]] (V-subject adjacency)
 c. [CP ZP V [XP e ... [YP SU ...]]] (V-subject non-adjacency)

One question that remains in terms of (7.c) is what position an adjunct occupies when it occurs between a fronted finite verb and a subject. Given that adjunction to a maximal projection is restricted by hypothesis (cf. hypothesis A above), two main options are available. First, the adjunct could occupy the specifier position of an independent functional projection (FP), in line with proposals made by Alexiadou (1997), Cinque (to appear), Kayne (1994). The second option is that the adjunct is X'-adjoined, an option which is assumed to be available for example by Chomsky (1995: 235). These options are summarized in (8).

- (8) a. [CP ZP V [XP e X [FP *adjunct* F [YP SU ...]]]]
 b. [CP ZP V [XP e [X' *adjunct* [X' X [YP SU ...]]]]]

The main difference between the two theoretical options in (8) is that in (8.a) the adjunct follows the head X whereas in (8.b) it precedes this head. But given that the verb moves on to C in the Modern Germanic V2 languages and that X is therefore not overtly filled, there is no clear empirical evidence from the Modern Germanic languages for choosing between the two options in (8).

Assuming that adjuncts can occur in one of the two positions shown in (8), the variation with respect to 'XP-subject' orders among the Germanic languages can be analyzed in terms of the structures in (7) and hence in terms of variation with respect to the syntax of subjects. Languages of the type (7.b) show adjacency effects whereas languages of the type (7.c) allow V-subject non-adjacency. As argued in Haeberli (to appear, 1999: chapter 4), this structural variation provides the basis for deriving the variation in (6) to a large extent from independent properties of the grammars of the different languages, such as the status of verbal agreement morphology or the licensing of non-overt expletives. For reasons of space, the analyses of the different Modern Germanic languages cannot be discussed here, and I refer the reader to the references cited above for more details. What will be central for our discussion, however, is the structural analysis in (7) and (8) and the observation that this structural analysis provides the basis for an analysis of a word order variation among the Modern Germanic languages.

6.2.2 ... and its relevance for Old English

Given the variation in (6), it would already be of interest from a purely typological point of view to consider what the status of OE is in this respect, in particular since OE has a relatively peculiar status with respect to the syntax of V2 (cf. Section 6.1). However, the data in (6) are also immediately relevant for another reason. In the Modern Germanic languages, there is one important additional restriction with respect to 'XP-subject' orders. As observed for example by Vikner (1995: 103ff.), pronominal subjects (weak pronouns) generally have to occur in a position which is adjacent to the finite verb even in languages like German which license 'XP-subject' orders with non-pronominal subjects. This property of subject pronouns is shown in (9a) which should be compared to (6.a), repeated here in (9b).

- (9) a. Wahrscheinlich **wird** (**später*) **er** dieselbe Uhr kaufen. (German)
 Probably will (later) he the-same watch buy
 b. Wahrscheinlich **wird** (*später*) **Hans** dieselbe Uhr kaufen
 Probably will (later) John the-same watch buy

The contrast between (9.a) and (9.b) can be analyzed by assuming that weak subject pronouns have to occupy the highest subject position even in languages like German ([Spec, XP] in 7.c and 8). This means that we get

exactly the same kind of contrast in the Modern Germanic languages as the contrast shown in (4) for OE. The only difference is that the presence of two subject positions is not determined on the basis of a head position between the two subject positions as in OE when the verb does not move to C but on the basis of the presence of an adjunct position. This parallelism is illustrated in (10), where (10.a) represents the OE contrast based on the data in (1) and (2) and (10.b) represents the Modern Germanic (MGer.) contrast based on data such as (9.a) and (9.b) for German.

- (10)a. OE: [CP ... [XP SU1(+pro) V [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]
 b. MGer.: [CP ... V [XP SU1(+pro) **adjunct** [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]

Thus, the OE variation with respect to pronominal vs. non-pronominal subjects has a very close equivalent in the Modern Germanic languages. But note now that OE can provide additional evidence for the analysis of the Modern Germanic languages and more particularly for the open issue concerning the placement of adjuncts shown in example (8), repeated below.

- (8) a. [CP ZP V [XP e X [FP *adjunct* F [YP SU ...]]]]
 b. [CP ZP V [XP e [X' *adjunct* [X' X [YP SU ...]]]]]

In (8), two options for adjunct placement are presented. One of the two options involves a maximal projection between XP and YP (8.a), and the second option involves adjunction to X' (8.b). These two options make different predictions for OE now. As mentioned above, OE has V-fronting to two distinct positions, C (in interrogative clauses etc.; cf. 3) and the functional head X which occurs right below C (in all other types of clauses, cf. examples 1, 2 and the structure in 10.a). This means now that if a pre-subject adjunct could only occur in an X'-adjoined position (cf. 8.b), then V-subject non-adjacency could only occur in cases in which the verb moves to C. In all other contexts in which the verb only moves to X, V-subject non-adjacency would not be possible because a constituent adjoined to X' would precede rather than follow the verb. In terms of a functional projection between X and YP however (cf. 8.a), V-subject non-adjacency should be possible regardless of whether the verb moves to C or to X. OE therefore allows us to test at least one of the two hypotheses shown in (8).

Thus, we have seen two initial motivations for considering the status of OE with respect to the variation shown in (6). First, the question arises as to where OE is situated in this typological split and, secondly, OE can provide evidence for the structural analysis of this variation. However, we will see that several additional results can be obtained on the basis of an investigation of V-subject (non-)adjacency in OE (and Middle English), in particular results which are relevant for the open issues raised in (5) above.

6.3 V-subject non-adjacency in Old English⁴

Let us start by considering the typological issue, i.e. the question whether OE is a language in which verb fronting leads to adjacency between the verb and a non-pronominal subject or whether OE belongs to the group of Germanic languages which allow 'XP-subject' orders after a fronted finite verb.

6.3.1 Some preliminary remarks

A brief look at the OE data shows that subjects do not need to be adjacent to fronted finite verbs. However, not all data are of equal importance for the crosslinguistic issues raised in Section 6.2. I will distinguish three main types of constructions in which a subject is not directly right-adjacent to the finite verb:

(A) Another predicative element intervenes between the finite verbal form and the subject (generally the participle in passives as in 11, but sometimes also other non-finite verb forms, adjectives or particles).

- (11) þy ilcan geare **wæs gecoren** **Æþelheard abbud** to biscepe
(ChronA, 54.790.1)
the same year was chosen Ae. abbot to bishop
'In the same year, the abbot Aethelhard was chosen as bishop'

(B) An argument (generally a pronoun) occurs between the finite verb and the subject.

- (12) þonne **mot hine se hlaford** gefreogean (Laws Ine, 120.74.1)
then may him the master liberate
'Then, the master may liberate him.'

(C) The subject follows an adjunct.

- (13) þa **blon micelre tiide se biscopdom** (Bede 252.7)
then ceased much time the bishopric
'Then, the bishopric was vacant for a long time'

For our comparative analysis of the syntax of subjects in OE, only Type C is crucial. As for Type A, it presumably involves a different position than the [Spec, YP] subject position in the structures in (4) or (10). For example in the passive construction in (11), the subject can be argued to occupy an

⁴ If not mentioned otherwise, the OE data are taken from the 1998 version of the Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English, a syntactically parsed and morphologically tagged corpus of OE.

underlying object position if we assume (as e.g. Roberts 1997, Pintzuk 1998) that OE allows VO base orders. As for Type B, its occurrence may not be related to the syntax of subjects but rather to distributional properties of pronouns. This observation is based on the fact that in languages like Icelandic and West Flemish which generally require V-subject adjacency (cf. examples 6.b and 6.g) object pronouns nevertheless can intervene between a fronted verb and a subject (cf. e.g. Hellan & Platzack 1995:59 for Icelandic, Haegeman 1996:142 for West Flemish). The most plausible analysis for these two languages is that, since V-subject non-adjacency is restricted to contexts involving pronouns, the properties of subjects create an adjacency configuration but that pronominal objects have properties which allow them to intervene between the verb and the subject, possibly as the result of head movement. Given these crosslinguistic observations, data of Type B may not be central for determining the syntax of subjects.

Given these observations, I will consider neither Type A nor Type B constructions here in my discussion of the syntax of subjects in OE (but cf. Haerberli 1998 for additional observations concerning these constructions). Instead, I will focus on Type C constructions. But since, as discussed in Section 6.1, V-fronting targets two positions in OE, we have to distinguish two contexts with respect to V-subject (non-)adjacency, namely V-to-C movement contexts and contexts involving V-movement to the projection below CP (cf. structure 4). The next section deals with the former context.

6.3.2 V-subject non-adjacency with V-movement to C

V-movement to C occurs in interrogative, negative and V1 clauses and in clauses introduced by adverbs like *þa*. That subjects do not have to be adjacent to the fronted verb in these contexts has already been observed sometimes in the literature. Pintzuk (1991:214) and Koopman (1996) for example point out that adverbs can intervene between a verb in C and the subject. This option is shown in (14).

- (14)a. Ne **dorste** *swa þeah se mæssepreost* þone bisceop geaxian for
 hwan... (GD3, 58.22.58.3)
 not dared however the mass-priest the bishop ask why...
 'However, the priest did not dare to ask the bishop why...'
- b. **gielden** *syððan his mægas* þone wer (Law2, 120.74.1)
 pay afterwards his male-kinsmen the man's-legal-value
 'Afterwards, his relatives should pay the man's legal-value.'

PP adjuncts can also occur in this position (cf. also 13 for a DP adjunct):

- (15)a. & ðonne **wyrð þurh Godes mihte sona deofol** swyðe geyrged
 and then gets through God's power soon devil very-much terrified
 'Then, soon, the devil is very much terrified through God's power.'
 (WHom, 176.28)
- b. þa **wæs in þa tid Uitalius papa** þæs apostolican seðles aldorbiscop
 then was in that time Vitalius pope the apostolic see's high-priest
 'At that time, Vitalius was chief bishop of the apostolic see.'
 (Bede, 1.252.10)

6.3.3 V-subject non-adjacency with V-movement to the head below C (X)

Having considered V-subject non-adjacency in V-to-C contexts, let us now turn to contexts in which the verb only moves to the head below C. As the following examples show, adverbs and PP adjuncts can occur between the fronted verb and the subject even in these contexts in OE.

- (16)a. Him **geaf ða se cyngc** twa hund gildenra pænega (ApT, 42.51.20)
 Him gave then the king two hundred golden coins
 'Then, the king gave him two hundred golden coins.'
- b. & hine **hæfde ær Offa Miercna cyning & Beorhtric Wesseaxna cyning** afliemed iii gear ... (ChronA, 62.836.1)
 and him had before Offa Mercians king and Beorhtric West-Saxons king expelled three years
 'Offa, the Mercian king, and Beorhtric, the West-Saxon king, had expelled him for three years.'
- c. Ac mycel **gepolode ðurh his mildheortnesse Crist** for ure þearfe
 But much suffered through his loving-kindness Christ for our need
 'But through his kindness, Christ suffered much for us.'
 (Whom, 227.34)
- d. In ða tid **wæs in Mercna mægðe Wulfhere** cyning
 In that time was in Mercians' country Wulfhere king
 'At that time, Wulfhere was king in Mercia.'
 (Bede, 3.260.22)

In (16.a-b) an object is fronted and the verb therefore only moves to the inflectional head below C (cf. Section 6.1). Finally, in (16.c-d), adjuncts are fronted which do not trigger V-movement to C, either. We therefore can conclude that 'XP-subject' orders are possible when the verb moves to the head below C.

In summary, the data in (14) to (16) show that 'XP-subject' orders occur in OE regardless of the position to which the finite verb moves. OE thus

clearly patterns with the more permissive Germanic languages in (6) which do not require adjacency between a fronted verb and the subject.⁵

6.3.4 A theoretical consequence: the placement of adjuncts

As discussed in Section 6.2.2, both OE and the Modern Germanic languages show evidence for two subject positions in the overt syntax, one occupied by pronominal subjects and one occupied by non-pronominal subjects. But the diagnostics for the presence of these two subject positions are not the same. In OE, the distributional contrast can be identified on the basis of the position of the finite verb, whereas in the Modern Germanic languages, it is the placement of adjuncts which allows us to distinguish the two subject positions. This contrast is repeated here in (17) (cf. 10).

- (17)a. OE: [CP ... [XP SU1(+pro) V [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]
 b. MGer.: [CP ... V [XP SU1(+pro) **adjunct** [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]

As discussed in Section 6.2.1, the Modern Germanic languages do not provide clear evidence for establishing the position occupied by the adjunct in (17.b). Given that the crosslinguistic variation with respect to V-subject non-adjacency may best be analyzed in terms of a restrictive system of adjunction, i.e. a system in which adjunction to XP and YP in (17b) is ruled out, there are two remaining options for the placement of the adjunct in (17b): Either it is adjoined to X' or it occupies a specifier position of an independent functional projection between XP and YP (cf. example 8). As pointed out already in Section 6.2.2, OE can shed some light on this issue.

⁵ For some of the OE examples of V-subject non-adjacency, it could be argued that they do not illustrate the syntactic structure shown in (10b) for the Modern Germanic languages but that they are obtained as the result of rightward movement of the subject. Such a conclusion certainly would be plausible for clause-final heavy subjects as for example in (i).

(i) Mycele mede **geearnað** æt þam ælmihtigan Gode, **se þe him clænlice þenað æt his clænume weofode.** (ÆLet3, 174.74)

Great reward earns at the almighty God he who him purely serves at his clean altar

'He who purely serves the almighty God at his altar earns a great reward with God.'

(i) could be argued to involve movement of the heavy subject to the right edge of the clause, and such an example would therefore not provide any relevant information concerning the placement of the adjunct.

If we assume that such a postposition process is available for subjects, it may not always be entirely clear whether V-subject non-adjacency is the result of the structure (10b) proposed for the Modern Germanic languages or of postposition of the subject. However, I will assume here that rightward movement is restricted to a large extent to heavy subjects. Most of the examples given in (14) to (16) therefore do not seem to be plausible candidates for postposition analyses, and the conclusion reached in the text, i.e. that OE allows V-subject non-adjacency of the Modern Germanic type, can be maintained. The same observations also hold for the examples discussed in (21) and (22) below.

As the data in (16) show, the order 'XP-subject' is possible in OE even if the verb only moves to X and not to C. This means that the adjunct in pre-subject position cannot occur in an X'-adjoined position but must occur in an independent projection between X and YP.⁶ Thus, we obtain the following structure for 'XP-subject' orders with V-movement to X:

(18) ... [XP e V [FP *adjunct* F [YP SU ...]]]

The structure in (18) corresponds to the option shown in (8.a) above. The OE data thus show that an adjunct in pre-subject position must be able to occupy an independent functional projection between XP and YP. OE therefore provides evidence for the details of the structural analysis of adjuncts which cannot be obtained from the Modern Germanic languages. The reason why OE allows us to draw more precise conclusions is that in OE we can combine the distribution of adjuncts with the distribution of a head, given that OE has V-movement into the domain which is relevant for our purposes. OE thus contributes to a more detailed understanding of a general word order phenomenon found in the Germanic languages.⁷

⁶ The fact that PPs can precede the subject (cf. 16.c-d) suggests that a pre-subject adjunct also cannot simply be an element which has been cliticized to the verb for example. Cf. also Vikner 1995:106 for arguments against treating pre-subject adjuncts as clitics in the Modern Germanic languages.

⁷ There may be some additional data which are relevant for the issues discussed here however. The observations made in the text show that option (8.a), i.e. adjunct placement in a projection between X and YP, must be available, but they of course do not mean that option (8.b), i.e. X'-adjunction, must be ruled out. X'-adjunction cases could indeed be argued to exist in OE. Consider the following example.

(i) [mid þy] [ða] [ongon] [firenlust] weaxan
(Bede, 48.27; Pintzuk 1991:213)

with that then began riotous-living increase

'With that, riotous living then began to increase

In (i), the adverb *þa* occurs between a topic and a fronted finite verb. Assuming that the verb is in X and that, as argued in the following subsection, the topic occurs in [Spec, CP], we could say that the adverb is adjoined to X' in such examples. The conclusion thus would not be that one of the two options for adjunct placement shown in (8) is not available in the grammar but that both options occur.

However, there may be an alternative analysis for (i) which does not depend on X'-adjunction of the second adjunct. It could be argued that the topic position in the CP domain is not a unique position but that multiple topics are possible (cf. e.g. Rizzi 1997:290f., 295ff. on recursive topic positions in the CP domain). Hence, both adjuncts in (i) occupy topic positions, i.e. specifier positions in the CP domain, and (i) would therefore not provide evidence for X'-adjunction.

The point made in the text does not depend on the status of (i) however. OE provides evidence for the option of inserting an adjunct in a specifier position between XP and YP and such evidence cannot be found among the Modern Germanic languages. As for the status of X'-adjunction and hence of data like (i), I will leave it open for future research.

6.3.5 An additional observation: pronominal subjects and topics

In the previous section, I showed that V-subject non-adjacency in OE provides evidence for the analysis of a more general Germanic word order phenomenon. In this section, I will argue that the OE data concerning V-subject non-adjacency are also relevant for one of the issues raised in (5) which are specific to OE, i.e. the question as to what position topics occupy.

One of the observations that we can make with respect to V-subject non-adjacency in OE is that in cases where (weak) pronominal subjects occur postverbally (i.e. in V-to-C contexts) the subject pronoun is always adjacent to V. I have not found a single example in my corpus in which a constituent intervenes between the finite verb and a postverbal pronominal subject. Thus, it seems that the following restriction holds even in contexts where V occupies C.

(19) * **V(finite) - adjunct - pronominal subject**

This observation is relevant for issue (5.III) which concerns the position occupied by topics in OE as for example in (1) above, repeated here in (20).

- (20) [Eall ðis] **aredað** se reccere swiðe ryhte (AHTh,I,10,3)
All this arranges the ruler very rightly

One option that has been proposed, on the basis of analyses of languages like Icelandic and Yiddish, is that topics occupy a position below CP in OE ([Spec, XP] in the structures used so far, [Spec, IP] in Pintzuk's 1991, 1993 analysis and [Spec, Agr1P] in Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991). Thus, [Spec, XP] in (20) is an A'-position. Furthermore, in order to obtain the order *Topic-pronominal subject-V* (cf. 2 above), it has to be assumed that the pronominal subject somehow can occur between the specifier and the head X. Pintzuk (1991, 1993) and Cardinaletti & Roberts (1991) therefore argue that subject pronouns can cliticize to a position between [Spec, XP] and the verb in X. However, such an assumption is problematic for deriving (19). (19) should be possible as the result of: (a) placement of an adjunct in [Spec, XP] given that [Spec, XP] is an A'-position; (b) cliticization of the subject pronoun to the right of the element in [Spec, XP]; (c) movement of the verb to C. Given these possible derivational steps, it seems to be difficult to rule out the word order pattern shown in (19).⁸

⁸ Some cases of (19) could possibly be ruled out as Relativized Minimality violations. For example a *wh*-element generally cannot move past a topic (cf. e.g. Vikner 1995:73ff.). However, for V-initial cases, such an approach is more difficult to motivate. If V1 is analyzed in terms of an empty operator in [Spec, CP] (e.g. an interrogative operator in yes/no questions or different types of operators in declarative and negative V1), the most straightforward assumption would be that this empty operator is generated in [Spec, CP] (in the same way that even certain *wh*-elements seem to be generated in CP, cf. Vikner

In terms of an alternative analysis of topicalization in OE, however, i.e. in terms of topicalization to [Spec, CP], the adjacency requirement between the verb in C and a pronominal subject can be accounted for straightforwardly in terms of a restrictive system of adjunction to maximal projections. Assuming still that adjunction to XP is restricted (cf. Section 6.2.1), the adjacency required by (19) is obtained through movement of the pronominal subject to [Spec, XP] (i.e. position SU1 in example 4, which is repeated below) and movement of the verb to C.

(4) [CP C [XP SU1(+pro) X [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]

In summary, the distribution of adjuncts and pronominal subjects supports an analysis of topicalization in OE in terms of movement to CP.

6.4 V-subject non-adjacency in Middle English and dialect variation⁹

Having considered the status of OE with respect to 'XP-subject' orders, let us now turn to the distribution of adjuncts and subjects in Middle English (ME). I will focus here mainly on the two ME dialects that Kroch & Taylor (1997) have identified on the basis of the syntax of V2, and I will show that the two dialects also seem to vary with respect to the phenomena discussed here, i.e. with respect to the occurrence of adjuncts between a fronted verb and the subject. Furthermore, I will argue that the ME data also provide evidence for dealing with the issues (I) and (II) raised in (5) above.

6.4.1 The southern dialects

Kroch & Taylor (1997) (henceforth KT) show that the V2 syntax of OE as illustrated in (1) to (4) is maintained to a large extent in the early ME (EME) of the West Midlands and the South. Pronominal subjects still follow the finite verb in the contexts shown in (4.c) (interrogatives etc.) but they precede the finite verb in all other contexts. Non-pronominal subjects generally follow the fronted verb in both contexts. Thus, southern EME can still be analyzed in terms of V-movement to C or to X and in terms of different positions for pronominal and non-pronominal subjects (cf. 4).

If we now consider the distribution of adjuncts and subjects, we can again observe that southern EME patterns like OE. Adjuncts still can occur in a position between the finite verb and a postverbal non-pronominal subject, and again this word order option can be found in contexts of V-

1995:75f. on *how*). Thus, it would not be clear why and from where empty operators would have to move past the topic for ruling out (19).

⁹ The ME data are all taken from the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, a syntactically parsed corpus of ME (cf. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/mideng>).

movement to C as well as in contexts of V-movement to X. This is shown in (21) (V-to-C) and (22) (V-to-X).

- (21)a. **Wende þa porphire** to freinen þis meiden (Kathe, 39.328)
 turned then Porphire to question this maiden
 'Then Porphire turned to question this maiden'
- b. Ne **don swa ðe heðene?** (Vices1, 77.338)
 not do so the heathens
 'Do not the heathens do so?'
- (22)a. þis **singeð þenne iweddede** (Hali,142.221)
 this sing then wedded
 'The wedded sing this then.'
- b. Forði us **menegeð allre þinge arst ure laurde** of ðesre eadi mihte
 For-this us admonishes all things first our lord of this blessed virtue
 'Therefore, our lord admonishes us of this blessed virtue first of all things.'
 (Vices1, 121.544)
- c. Se þicke **is þrinne þe posternesse** þt ... (Sawles, 171.80)
 so thick is therein the darkness that ...
 'The darkness is so thick in there that ...'

6.4.2 The northern dialect

Considering the *Northern Prose Rule of St. Benet*, a text from around 1400 which is the oldest surviving prose document from the North, KT argue that the northern dialect of ME differs significantly from the southern dialects with respect to the syntax of V-movement. The Benet text exhibits basically a regular V2 syntax as found in the Modern Germanic languages, instead of the complex V2 pattern found in OE and southern EME. Thus, when some constituent is fronted in the Benet text, subject-verb inversion applies regardless of whether the subject is a pronoun or a full DP. The OE/southern EME contrast between subject pronouns (no inversion except in certain syntactic contexts) and non-pronominal subjects (generally inversion) therefore cannot be found in the northern dialect.¹⁰

As KT (1997:314) point out, the categorical subject-verb inversion pattern of the northern dialect can best be accounted for by assuming that

¹⁰ As Warner (1997:389f.) points out, there may be an alternative to KT's conclusion however. Since KT's claim is based on a single text, it could be argued that Benet is simply a stylistically marked text rather than a text representing the grammar of a different dialect. Yet, the points discussed below may provide some support for analyzing the Benet text as a text with a different grammar. As we will see, the distinct behavior of the Benet text with respect to V2 seems to coincide with another syntactic peculiarity, namely the absence of 'XP-subject' orders. In terms of a stylistic interpretation of the V2 pattern in the Benet text, the co-occurrence of the two phenomena would seem accidental. However, as I will argue below, an analysis of the Benet text in terms of a distinctive grammatical property allows us to link the two phenomena to a common underlying source. I will therefore continue using KT's distinction between different dialects.

the verb always moves to C in this dialect, as it has been proposed for Modern Germanic V2 languages. The difference between the southern and the northern dialect would therefore be that while in the southern dialect (and OE) the verb can occur in two distinct positions when it is fronted (C or X), V-fronting always targets C in the northern dialect.

What is interesting for our purposes now is that the dialect variation described by KT also seems to be reflected in the distribution of adjuncts and subjects. As discussed in Section 6.4.1, the southern dialect behaves like OE with respect to this issue, since adjuncts still can occur in a position between the finite verb and a postverbal non-pronominal subject in contexts of V-movement to C as well as in contexts of V-movement to X. In the northern text, however, the situation is substantially different. Within the entire text, not a single instance of the word order pattern *V-adjunct-subject* can be found. The only examples in which a subject is non-adjacent to a fronted finite verb are cases which I classified as Type A and Type B in Section 6.3.1, i.e. cases with passivized verbs and with intervening pronouns. Illustrations of these two constructions are given in (23).

- (23)a. And eftir **sal be redde þe lescun of þapostils** wid gude deuocion
 And afterwards shall be read the lesson of the apostles with good devotion
 'And afterwards, the lesson of the apostles shall be read with devotion.'
 (Benrul, 16.441)
- b. In þis first sentence **bidis us sain benet** ... (Benrul, 1.7)
 In this first sentence commands us Saint Benet
 'In this first sentence, Saint Benet commands us...'

As discussed in Section 6.3.1, (23.a) can be argued to involve a subject in its underlying object position, whereas (23.b) may not be related to properties of subjects but rather to the syntax of pronominal elements. Hence, neither of the two cases in (23) are genuine cases of V-subject non-adjacency as discussed in the earlier sections (i.e. 'XP-subject', Type C). As for Type C non-adjacency, it is entirely absent from the Benet text.

The question that arises then is how to interpret the absence of Type C examples in the Benet text. In particular, we may wonder whether the absence of 'XP-subject' orders in the northern dialect is the manifestation of an underlying grammatical property which bans such orders (as for example in West Flemish, Afrikaans, Danish or Icelandic, cf. example 6) or whether the absence of 'XP-subject' orders is simply due to a gap in the corpus, possibly because the corpus is not large enough. Based on statistical evidence, I will argue here that the latter option is not very likely.

In order to test whether the absence of 'XP-subject' orders in the Benet text is simply due to the size of the corpus, I compared the northern text to several OE and southern EME text samples with respect to the frequencies of V-subject non-adjacency. More precisely, for each text, I counted the

number of examples in which the subject follows the finite verb and an 'XP-subject' order therefore could have occurred, and the actual occurrences of such orders. The relevant numbers are given in the tables 1 through 3 below. Four different figures are given in these tables. The first figure represents all the cases in which V-subject non-adjacency could have occurred because a non-pronominal subject follows the finite verb (listed under 'Total V-SU' in the tables).¹¹ Then, I counted the number of occurrences of the three types of V-subject non-adjacency among the 'V-SU' cases (Type A, B and C). As mentioned above, the crucial pattern is Type C, but I added Types A and B for comparative purposes. Apart from the absolute numbers for the different types of V-subject non-adjacency, I have also given their frequencies in each text, calculated on the basis of the total number of 'V-SU' orders. Table 1 shows the results for the OE period, Table 2 the results for southern EME and Table 3 the results for the northern ME Benet text.

Table 1 *V-subject non-adjacency in some OE texts*

	Total V-SU	Type A		Type B		Type C	
ÆLet	91	7	7.7%	2	2.2%	16	17.6%
ÆLS	97	6	6.2%	1	1.0%	11	11.3%
ApT	99	2	2.0%	4	4.0%	6	6.1%
Bede	92	4	4.3%	9	9.8%	19	20.7%
Boethius	78	2	2.6%	1	1.3%	5	6.4%
ChronA	364	15	4.1%	4	1.1%	16	4.4%
GDC	37	2	5.4%	1	2.7%	2	5.4%
GDH	48	6	12.5%	4	8.3%	11	22.9%
Laws	144	1	0.7%	11	7.6%	19	13.2%
Orosius	95	8	8.4%	4	4.2%	7	7.4%
WHom	144	5	3.5%	0	0.0%	19	13.2%
average % ¹²			5.2%		3.8%		11.7%

¹¹ Thus, VS orders with pronominal subjects are not included in my counts. Clauses containing the indefinite element *man* ('one') are also not included in the totals of VS orders, since this element seems to have pronoun-like syntactic properties (cf. van Bergen 1998).

¹² The average percentage is calculated purely on the basis of the percentages obtained for the individual texts and not on the basis of the total number of the examples in all texts. The aim of calculating the percentages this way is to give each text sample the same weight, independently of its size. If the percentages were calculated on the basis of the total number of examples in the entire OE corpus, the figures would be slightly lower:

Total V-SU: 1289

Total Type A: 58 (=4.5%)

Total Type B: 41 (=3.2%)

Total Type C: 131 (=10.2%)

Table 2 *V-subject non-adjacency in some southern EME texts*

	Total V-SU	Type A		Type B		Type C	
AncRiw	42	3	7.1%	1	2.4%	3	7.1%
Hali	63	4	6.3%	2	3.2%	12	19.0%
Kathe	49	5	10.2%	6	12.2%	9	18.4%
Lambeth	118	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	7	5.9%
Sawles	28	1	3.6%	2	7.1%	7	25.0%
Trinity	48	2	4.2%	1	2.1%	2	4.2%
Vices	110	4	3.6%	3	2.7%	7	6.4%
average % ¹³			5.2%		4.6%		12.3%

Table 3 *V-subject non-adjacency in the Northern Prose Rule of St. Benet*

	Total V-SU	Type A		Type B		Type C	
St. Benet	126	6	4.8%	3	2.4%	0	0.0%

Tables 1 to 3 show that, compared to the other text samples, the number of contexts in which 'XP-subject' orders could occur (cf. 'Total V-SU') is relatively high in the Benet text. Several other texts have considerably lower figures for 'V-SU' orders but they nevertheless all contain at least two examples of Type C, in contrast to the Benet text which does not contain a single example of this type.

The contrast between the Benet text and the other texts can also be illustrated by calculating the expected number of occurrences of the different word order patterns for the Benet text on the basis of the average frequencies found in the other texts. As shown in Table 1, the average frequency for Type A is 5.2%, for B 3.8% and for C 11.7% in OE. For southern EME, the averages are 5.2% (A), 4.6% (B) and 12.3% (C) (cf. Table 2). For both OE and southern EME, this gives average frequencies of 5.2% (A), 4.1% (B) and 11.9% (C). On the basis of these frequencies, we would expect the following numbers of occurrences in the Benet text.^{14, 15}

¹³ In terms of the total numbers of occurrences in all EME text samples together, the percentages would again be slightly lower (cf. also fn. 12 for OE):

Total V-SU: 458

Total Type A: 21 (=4.6%)

Total Type B: 18 (=3.9%)

Total Type C: 47 (=10.3%)

¹⁴ Here, the question may arise however as to whether Tables 1/2 and Table 3 are entirely comparable. As discussed earlier, 'V-SU' orders in OE and southern EME can be the result of V-movement to X or to C. In northern ME however, the verb always moves to C in 'V-SU' orders according to KT's analysis. Thus, one may wonder whether the inclusion of V-to-X contexts in the OE/EME data has undesirable effects for the comparison with northern ME since northern ME only has V-to-C.

If we distinguish between V-to-C contexts and V-to-X contexts in the OE and southern EME text samples studied here, we obtain the following results with respect to Type C orders. In OE, the likelihood of Type C is almost equally high in V-to-X contexts as in V-to-C contexts. In southern EME, however, there is a slight contrast between the

Table 4 *Expected and observed occurrences in St. Benet based on all V-SU clauses*

	Total V-SU	Type A	Type B	Type C
Expected	126	6.6	5.2	15.0
Observed	126	6	3	0

While the numbers for Type A and Type B constructions are very close to the expected numbers, there is a considerable discrepancy with respect to Type C constructions. Instead of the expected 15 examples showing 'XP-subject' orders, we do not find a single example of this type.

However, there is one additional aspect which should be considered at this point. A closer investigation of the St. Benet data shows that many 'V-SU' clauses are characterized by the fact that they contain a fronted constituent, the verb and the argument(s) but no additional adjunct(s) which could intervene between the finite verb and the subject. Thus, many clauses contain no additional adjunct(s) at all or they only contain heavy adjuncts like adjunct clauses or adjuncts modified by an entire clause which generally do not occupy the XP-position in 'XP-subject' orders in OE/EME. Leaving aside such heavy adjuncts, we can observe that in the Benet text only 31 out of the 126 'V-SU' clauses or 24.6% contain an adjunct in a position following the finite verb, and hence that in terms of the elements which are available in the clause, only 24.6% of the 'V-SU' clauses could have given rise to a Type C order.

The question that arises then is whether the absence of 'XP-subject' orders in the Benet text is a consequence of the general low frequency of adjuncts in postverbal position. The answer to this question seems to be negative. A comparison with OE and southern EME text samples shows that the low frequency of postverbal adjuncts among 'V-SU' orders cannot be identified as a clear factor determining the absence of Type C orders in

two V-movement landing sites. 'XP-subject' is found more frequently in V-to-C contexts than in V-to-X contexts (roughly 15% vs. 10%). Thus, if V-to-X movement contexts were eliminated from the OE/EME data, the expected number in northern ME for Type C would be slightly higher than shown in Table 4 (17.3 expected examples of Type C rather than 15.0). The distinction between V-to-X and V-to-C contexts would thus reinforce the point made in the text below, since the gap between the expected number of 'XP-subject' orders in northern ME and the observed number would be even bigger.

However, given the fact that a contrast between V-to-C and V-to-X can only be identified clearly in the EME data but not in OE, and given that the contrast in EME is relatively small, I tentatively conclude here that the contrast between V-to-C and V-to-X contexts is not a substantial general factor determining the status of 'XP-subject' orders, and I will therefore base my quantitative data for OE and EME on both V-to-C and V-to-X contexts.

¹⁵ In terms of total numbers for the OE and EME texts (cf. fn. 12 and 13), the expected figures would be slightly lower. Among the 1747 'V-SU' examples in the OE and EME text samples studied, 79 are of Type A (4.5%), 59 of Type B (3.4%) and 178 of Type C (10.2%). The expected numbers for northern ME would therefore be as follows: Type A: 5.7; Type B: 4.3; Type C: 12.9.

the Benet text. Two observations are relevant here. First of all, although the frequency of postverbal adjuncts is indeed lower in the Benet text than in the OE/EME text samples studied here (24.6% vs. 43.0%), the Benet text is by no means exceptional in terms of absolute numbers. Three OE and five EME text samples contain fewer instances of 'V-SU' order with a postverbal (non-heavy) adjunct than the Benet text (Boethius 29 examples; GDC 13; GDH 27; Ancriw 14; Kathe 20; Sawles 16; Trinit 13; Vices 21). Furthermore, three OE and two EME text samples show similar numbers as Benet (ÆLS 38; ApT 34; Bede 39; Hali 33; Lambet 37). Finally, there are only five OE text samples which show considerably higher numbers of 'V-SU' orders with postverbal adjuncts (ÆLet 52; ChronA 147; Laws 77; Or 47; WHom 66). Hence, most OE/EME text samples have comparable or lower numbers of postverbal adjuncts in V-SU structures. On the basis of the absolute numbers, it would therefore not be expected that the Benet text is the only text among those considered here which does not contain any Type C orders.

The conclusion that the low frequency of 'V-SU' orders with postverbal adjuncts does not seem to be a clear source of the absence of Type C orders in the Benet text is supported by a calculation of the expected number of Type C orders on the basis of the OE/EME data. For each OE/EME text, I calculated the percentage of Type C orders among those cases of 'V-SU' which contain all the necessary elements for potentially giving rise to Type C orders (i.e. cases which contain at least one non-heavy adjunct following the finite verb). I then calculated the average percentages for OE, EME and OE/EME together. The results are as follows. Among the OE text samples, the average percentage for Type C orders among the 'V-SU' clauses containing a postverbal adjunct is 25.6%. For EME, the average percentage is 29.5% and for OE/EME together 27.1%. On the basis of the OE/EME figure, we obtain the following expected and observed numbers of Type C orders in the Benet text.¹⁶

Table 5 *Expected and observed occurrences of Type C in St. Benet based on V-SU clauses containing a postverbal adjunct*

	Total V-SU with a postverbal adjunct	Type C
expected	31	8.4
observed	31	0

Although the discrepancy between the expected and the observed figures is smaller in Table 5 than in Table 4, the difference is still considerable.

¹⁶ In terms of the alternative methods of calculation discussed in footnotes 12 to 14, the figures would again be slightly different. First, if we use percentages based on the total numbers of OE and EME examples rather than average percentages (cf. fn. 12 and 13), the expected number of occurrences of Type C in Benet would be a bit lower, namely 7.6. However, if only V-to-C movement contexts are taken into account in the OE/EME text samples (cf. fn. 14), the expected number would be 9.4.

In summary, the OE and EME data studied here would lead us to expect 15 or, calculated in a more restrictive way, 8.4 examples of Type C in the Benet text (cf. Tables 4 and 5). Instead, we do not find a single instance of such an order. Although it is not possible to determine the ungrammaticality of a construction conclusively on the basis of positive evidence as found in corpus data, the difference between the expected and observed numbers of Type C is high enough to suggest that the absence of 'XP-subject' orders in the Benet text is not simply an accidental gap in the data, but that it is the result of a restriction on such orders in the grammar of the northern dialect of ME.

The conclusion thus is that the only OE or ME text studied here which shows a clearly distinct V2 syntax (cf. KT) also shows a clearly distinct behavior with respect to V-subject non-adjacency. The question that arises now is whether the two phenomena are related. In the remainder of this section, I will argue that a uniform account of the two phenomena is indeed possible on the basis of KT's proposals and the assumptions made so far.

One important property of northern ME is that, compared to OE and southern ME, it has a very impoverished verbal agreement system. The only morphological ending that remains in the Benet text is an *-(e)s* ending in the present tense of the 2nd and 3rd person singular and of the 3rd person plural. In the past tense, no agreement distinctions are made in this text (cf. Kock 1902: xlvii §120, Haeberli 1999:391). KT (1997:317ff.) propose that the fact that the Benet text only exhibits V-movement to C but no V-movement to the position below C (i.e. X in structure 4) can be related to the impoverished agreement system of the northern dialect. Such a correlation is possible under the assumption that the lower V-fronting position in OE (i.e. X) is AgrS and that weak agreement does not trigger V-movement to AgrS any more. As a consequence, V-fronting can only be obtained through V-movement to C in the northern dialect. This dialect therefore does not exhibit the characteristic properties of OE illustrated in (1) to (4) because these properties depend on the availability of two landing sites for V-fronting.

I will pursue KT's proposal here, but I will adapt it to Thráinsson's (1996) system according to which impoverishment or absence of verbal agreement can mean the absence of the AgrSP level (cf. also Bobaljik 1995, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998). Assuming again that XP in (4) corresponds to AgrSP, the absence of AgrSP means that one of the two V-fronting options found in OE have disappeared from the syntax of the northern dialect, in line with KT's analysis. However, the absence of AgrSP also has a second consequence. Reconsider first the structure (4) (repeated in 24.a) and the same structure in (24.b) under the assumption that XP is AgrSP and hence that YP is presumably TP (cf. also e.g. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996 for analyzing AgrSP and TP as distinct subject positions).

- (24) a. [CP C [XP SU1(+pro) X [YP SU2(-pro) ...]]]
 b. [CP C [AgrSP SU1(+pro) X [TP SU2(-pro) ...]]]

Recall furthermore that I have been assuming that 'XP-subject' orders occur when the subject occurs in the lower one of the two subject positions in (24) (cf. examples 8 and 18). What is crucial now is that once AgrSP disappears, we also lose a subject position. The lower subject position in (24) therefore becomes the highest subject position and, assuming still that adjunction is restricted (cf. Section 6.2.1), this position then becomes a position which is adjacent to V.

The change described above is illustrated in (25).

- (25) a. OE/ME(South): [CP ZP V [AgrSP SU1 V [TP SU2 ...]]] ==>
 b. ME(North): [CP ZP V [TP SU ...]]]

Once AgrSP is lost in the North, we not only lose a position for V-fronting but we also lose the higher subject position. V-fronting therefore has to target C and the subject in TP is now adjacent to V in C.

The phenomenon of V-subject (non-)adjacency and in particular its development within ME thus provides evidence for the analysis of issues (5I) and (5II), i.e. for the question what the nature of the projections below CP is in the structure in (4) (i.e. 24.a). By identifying XP as AgrSP and YP as TP, the specific syntactic properties of the northern dialect can be directly linked to its morphological properties, and the contrast to OE and southern ME can be accounted for.

One additional point remains to be addressed however. V-subject adjacency in (25.b) means that FP, which occurs above TP and hosts adjuncts (cf. 8.a or 18), has to disappear together with AgrSP. I propose that this result can be obtained in terms of an analysis of AgrSP as a "proxy category" (cf. Nash & Rouveret 1997), i.e. a category which has no features of its own but gets created in the course of a derivation for the purposes of feature checking. More precisely, I propose that FP in (8.a) or (18) is a proxy category which gets created for AgrS checking but which can be occupied "parasitically" by an adjunct due to the lack of intrinsic features of proxy categories. Hence, once no AgrS checking is necessary, no proxy categories above TP get created, and FP therefore disappears together with AgrSP (cf. Haerberli 1999: chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion of this point).

6.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have considered the status of OE and ME with respect to a word order pattern which gives rise to considerable variation among the Modern Germanic V2 languages, i.e. the occurrence of adjuncts between a

fronted finite verb and a subject ('XP-subject'). I showed that OE and southern EME allow 'XP-subject' orders regardless of the position to which the finite verb moves. The northern dialect of ME, however, seems to be more restrictive in this respect, and 'XP-subject' orders cannot be found in this dialect. This dialect variation coincides with a dialect variation identified by Kroch & Taylor (1997) with respect to the syntax of V2.

I have argued that the data related to V-subject (non-)adjacency provide evidence for several theoretical issues related to the analysis of OE and to the more general structural analysis of adjuncts in pre-subject position. First, I argued that the absence of 'XP-subject' orders with pronominal subjects can be used as an argument in favor of analyzing topics as occupying a position in the CP-domain in OE rather than a position in the inflectional domain, as it has sometimes been proposed for symmetric V2 languages such as Icelandic or Yiddish. And secondly, on the basis of the dialect variation in ME, I proposed that the projection below CP in OE and southern EME should be identified as AgrSP, because such a clause structure allows us to relate the peculiar syntactic properties of the northern dialect of ME directly to the impoverished agreement morphology in this dialect. Finally, the OE data also provided evidence for the analysis of pre-subject adjuncts as occupying a specifier position of an independent projection, and I showed that this type of evidence can only be obtained from OE but not from the Modern Germanic languages. Hence, a comparative study of V-subject (non-)adjacency in the history of English not only provides evidence for the analysis of OE, but also contributes to a better understanding of a more general word order phenomenon found in the Germanic languages.

References

- Alexiadou, A. 1997. *Adverb Placement. A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bergen, L. van. 1998. The indefinite pronoun *man*: 'nominal' or 'pronominal'? Paper presented at the 10th International Conference of English Historical Linguistics, University of Manchester.
- Bobaljik, J. 1995. *Morphosyntax: The Syntax of Verbal Inflection*, Ph.D. diss., MIT.
- Bobaljik, J. and D. Jonas. 1996. Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.195-236.
- Bobaljik, J. and H. Thráinsson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1.37-71.
- Cardinaletti, A. and I. Roberts. 1991. Clause structure and X-Second. MS. University of Venice and University of Geneva.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. to appear. *Adverbs and the Universal Hierarchy of Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Haerberli, E. 1998. Some aspects of the distribution of non-pronominal subjects in Old and Middle English. Paper presented at the 10th International Conference of English Historical Linguistics, University of Manchester.
- Haerberli, E. 1999. *Features, Categories and the Syntax of A-positions. Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in the Germanic Languages*, Ph.D. diss., University of Geneva.
- Haerberli, E. to appear. On the Word Order 'XP-Subject' in the Germanic Languages. To appear in *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*.
- Haegeman, L. 1996. Clitics in West Flemish. In A. Halpern and A. Zwicky, eds. *Approaching Second*. 135-164. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Hellan, L. and C. Platzack. 1995. Pronouns in Scandinavian languages: An overview. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 56.47-69.
- Holmberg, A. 1993. Two subject positions in IP in Mainland Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 52.29-41.
- Hulk, A. and A. van Kemenade. 1997. Negation as a reflex of clause structure. In P. Hirschbuehler and M. Rivero, eds. *Negation: Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kemenade, A. van. 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kemenade, A. van. 1998. Sentential negation and clause structure in Old English. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade, G. Tottie and W. van der Wurff, eds. *Negation in the History of English*. 147-165. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kock, E. A. 1902. Introduction. In E.A. Kock. *Three Middle English Versions of the Rule of St. Benet*. London: Early English Text Society OS 120.
- Koopman, W. 1996. Evidence for clitic adverbs in Old English: An evaluation. In D. Britton, ed. *English Historical Linguistics 1994*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kroch, A. and A. Taylor. 1997. Verb movement in Old and Middle English: dialect variation and language contact. In A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds. *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. 297-325. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nash, L. and A. Rouveret. 1997. Proxy categories in phrase structure theory. *NELS* 27. 287-304.
- Pintzuk, S. 1991. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*, Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Pintzuk, S. 1993. Verb seconding in Old English: Verb movement to Infl. *The Linguistic Review* 10.5-35.
- Pintzuk, S. 1998. From OV to VO in the history of English. MS. University of York.

- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman, ed. *Elements of Grammar*. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, I. 1997. Directionality and word order change in the history of English. In A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds. *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. 397-426. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thráinsson, H. 1996. On the (non-)universality of functional categories. In W. Abraham et al., eds. *Minimal Ideas*. 253-281. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Warner, A. 1997. The structure of parametric change, and V-movement in the history of English. In A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds. *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. 380-393. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.