17. Object pronoun fronting and the nature of V2 in early English
    Eric Haeberli, Susan Pintzuk, Ann Taylor

Abstract
The Verb Second (V2) phenomenon is characterized by the placement of the finite verb in a position immediately following an initial constituent. In true V2 languages like the modern Germanic ones, V2 order is systematic, at least in main clauses. But it is less straightforward to determine whether other languages are part of the V2 group: although they show V2 word order patterns, the use of V2 is not entirely systematic. The question that such languages raise is how their grammar is related to that of true V2 languages. In this chapter we explore some aspects of this question with respect to early English. As has been discussed extensively in the literature, Old English (OE) and early Middle English (eME) show regular occurrences of surface V2 order, but a wide range of non-V2 word order options are attested as well. We focus on whether early English has the default fronting process Formal Movement (FM), which has been postulated in the literature on V2 as a default fronting process for contexts in which the preverbal position is not filled by some constituent by base generation or by true A-bar movement (TAB). FM is triggered by an EPP-feature on C that attracts whichever element is highest in the structure below C. Given that FM seems to have no other function than to assure that the V2 requirement is met, it has been claimed that early English cannot have FM because it does not have a true V2 system. The claim that early English has no FM makes interesting predictions with respect to the status of clause-initial object pronouns. On the basis of a detailed analysis of such elements, we show that the predictions are not borne out and that fronted object pronouns therefore do not provide counterevidence against the existence of FM. This observation, combined with the support that comes for the existence of FM from the regular occurrence of neutral subject-initial declaratives, leads us to conclude that FM is a property of early English syntax. Early English is therefore similar to a true V2 language with respect to XP-fronting: both require one EPP-feature in the CP-domain; and if the presence of an EPP-feature is not motivated by an active interpretive feature, an EPP-feature is inserted and gives rise to FM. What distinguishes early English from true V2 languages is that in the latter, there cannot be more than one EPP-feature, while in early English, there can be more than one. We relate this difference in the number of EPP features to a difference in verb placement within the CP-domain. Finally, we explore some consequences of our analysis for the diachronic developments in the Middle English period.

17.1 Introduction
The Verb Second (V2) phenomenon is characterized by the occurrence of the finite verb in a position immediately following an initial constituent. In languages like the modern Germanic ones, V2 order is fairly systematic, at least in main clauses. They can therefore be classified as true V2 languages. But for some languages it is less straightforward to determine whether they are part of the V2 group: although they show V2 word order patterns, the use of V2 is not entirely systematic. The question that such languages raise is how their grammar is related to that of true V2 languages. In this paper, we will explore some aspects of this question with respect to early English. As has been discussed extensively in the literature, Old English (OE) and early Middle English (eME) show regular occurrences of surface V2 order, but a wide range of non-V2 word order options are attested as well.

Our main focus will be on the constituents occurring in the left periphery. For a strict V2 language like German, it has been argued by Frey (2006a, 2006b) that the initial XP can be fundamentally of three different types: (a) The XP can be merged in the CP domain; (b) The XP has undergone true A'-movement and it has the properties of being topical or focal, stressed and contrastively interpreted; (c) The XP undergoes formal movement (FM), which is the result of attraction of the highest element of the TP-domain to the CP without any additional intonational, semantic or pragmatic effects. Whereas options (a) and (b) can be found in non-V2 languages, option (c) (postulated also e.g. by Bhatt 1999, Fanselow 2004) is a property that seems to be closely related to the V2 constraint as the purpose of FM is merely to avoid V1 order and to allow the V2 constraint to be met. Strong evidence for FM comes from its ability to account for the high frequency of neutral subject-initial declaratives in V2 languages. The question that arises then is whether a language like OE, which is not strictly V2, shares this property of true V2 languages or whether this may be an area where it differs from them. In the literature, opposing views can be found. Although they do not discuss FM extensively, Speyer (2010) and Walkden (2017) both postulate such a process for OE. Light (2012), however, argues against FM. In this connection, Light makes the interesting prediction with respect to the discourse status of fronted object pronouns in OE that without FM, all fronted objects should be contrastive. So far, this prediction has not been tested.

Following up on Light's work, the aims of this paper are as follows. First, from an empirical point of view, we will shed light on the status of object pronouns in the left periphery of OE and ME, thereby illuminating an area of early English syntax that has not been subject to detailed research in the literature. Second, we will explore the consequences of our empirical observations for the question of the nature of the OE/eME V2 syntax. Finally, we will outline some diachronic consequences of our proposals with respect to both object pronoun fronting and the development and loss of the V2-like syntax in ME.

Our results show that Light's prediction with respect to object pronoun fronting is not borne out, but that this finding only removes a potential counterargument against FM and does not necessarily provide conclusive evidence in favour of such a process. We nevertheless conclude that FM is part of the grammar of early English, given how it allows neutral subject-initial declaratives to be integrated into the analysis of the clausal syntax. We show that under this assumption the part of the V2 constraint that concerns XP-fronting turns out to be very similar in early English and true V2 languages. The main difference between the two types of languages is instead related to the syntax of verb movement.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces some basic aspects of the clausal syntax of early English and of the syntax of V2, as well as discussing the relevance of object pronoun fronting for the analysis of the processes involved in deriving V2. In section 3, we examine the syntax of object pronoun fronting in the history of English, testing the prediction made by Light (2012) with respect to the discourse status of fronted object pronouns. Section 4 explores the consequences of our empirical findings for the analysis of the V2-like syntax of early English and the way it develops subsequently.

17.2 V2 and early English

In early generative work (e.g. van Kemenade 1987), it was suggested that OE can be analysed as a true V2 language. In standard accounts, this means that two processes occur: (i) an obligatory process of fronting one (and at most one) constituent of any type (XP) to CP; (ii)

fronting of the finite verbal element to C.[1] Research over the last three decades has shown, however, that a treatment of OE as a true V2 language is not entirely satisfactory. OE does show true V2, but in very restricted contexts, in particular with fronted wh-elements or clause-initial elements like *þa*, *þonne* 'then', as illustrated in (1).

(1)   a   On hwylcen heowe steah he   up
             In   what   form   rose   he   up
             'In what form did he rise up?'
             (coeluc2,Eluc_2_[Warn_46]:40.31)

        b   Ða   cwædon hi   amen
            Then said   they amen
            'Then they said 'amen' '
            (coaelive,+ALS[Forty_Soldiers]:255.2647)

Contexts like (1), which have sometimes been referred to as operator-fronting contexts, can be analysed in the same way as V2 in a true V2 language,[2] since an initial wh-element or 'then' is systematically followed by the finite verb in OE regardless of the nature of the subject. This option has been maintained throughout the history of English, with changes affecting only the type of element occurring in initial position (e.g. 'then' was lost as a trigger of true V2) and the type of verbal element moving to the C-domain (after the loss of lexical verb movement to T, only auxiliaries could move to C).
        The situation is more complex for clauses containing a non-operator in clause-initial position. With non-pronominal subjects, subject-verb inversion and, hence, the word order pattern expected for a V2 language is very common in OE. This is illustrated in (2).

(2)   eall ðiss aredað se   reccere suiðe ryhte
            all   this arranges the ruler   very rightly
            'The ruler arranges all this very rightly.'
            (cocura,CP:22.169.3.1145)

However, V2 is not rigid in non-operator fronting contexts. With subject personal pronouns, the subject usually occurs between the fronted constituent and the finite verb, as shown in (3)a (cf. e.g. van Kemenade 1987, Pintzuk 1999). But even with full DP subjects, non-V2 orders can be found ((3)b and (3)c)).

(3)   a   æfter his gebede he   ahof   þæt cild   up
             after his prayer   he   lifted the   child up
             'After his prayer, he lifted the child up.'
             (cocathom2,+ACHom_II,_2:14.70.320)

---

[1] In a split-CP framework: (i) fronting of one constituent of any type (XP) to one of the specifiers available in the CP-domain; (ii) fronting of the finite verbal element to a C-related position that is adjacent at the surface to the initial XP.

[2] But see Trips and Fuß 2009 for an approach where Spec,TP is linked to the discourse anchoring of pronouns and temporal adverbs.

b   Æfter þan   se   ðe   gilti   beo   bidde   him   forgifnysse
    After that   he   who   guilty   is   asks   him   forgiveness
    'After that, the guilty one asks him for forgiveness.'
    (cochdrul,ChrodR_1:16.36.321)

c   Þæne   se   geatweard   læt   in
    That-one   the   goatherd   lets   in
    'That one, the goatherd lets in.'
    (cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:10.3.6596)

In order to account for the contrast between operator and non-operator fronting contexts, Pintzuk (1993, 1999) proposes that the finite verb targets different structural positions in the two contexts, C with operator fronting and I with non-operator fronting. This basic hypothesis has been adopted by most recent work on OE, but IP has generally been split into two independent projections: TP plus a higher projection that has received various labels in the literature (AgrP (e.g. Haeberli 2002a, 2005), FP (e.g. Hulk and van Kemenade 1995; van Kemenade and Westergaard 2012), FinP (e.g. Roberts 1996; Walkden 2014; Haeberli and Ihsane 2016), CP1 (Walkden 2017)). Both of these projections can host the verb in their head and a subject in their specifier. With respect to subjects, it is generally assumed that pronouns have to move to the higher position, while full DP subjects can remain in the lower position. This distinction between subject positions has sometimes been related to properties of information structure, with discourse-given subjects such as pronouns generally occurring in the higher specifier and non-given subjects in the lower specifier (cf. Bech 2001; van Kemenade 2012; van Kemenade and Westergaard 2012). The structural assumptions made so far are summarized in (4). As we will adopt Walkden's (2017) proposals for our discussion in a later section, we will use his labels CP1 and CP2 here for the two projections above TP.

(4)   [$_{CP2}$ XP C2 … [$_{CP1}$ SU1(pro/DP) C1 [$_{TP}$ SU2(DP) T]]]

Using this structure, the main word order properties of OE can be accounted for in the following way:
(i)   True V2 is derived through V-movement to C2 and movement of an operator to the XP position in (4).
(ii)   Surface V2 of the type shown in (2) is the result of fronting of the initial constituent to a position above C1, V-movement to C1 and the occurrence of the full DP subject in the SU2 position.
(iii)   Word orders of the type shown in (3)a are derived as those in (2), the only difference being the placement of the subject pronoun in SU1.
(iv)   Given that even full DP subjects generally do not follow the finite verb in subordinate clauses, the verb stays in T in subordinate clauses (cf. Haeberli 2005).
(v)   Pintzuk (1999) proposes that IP can be head-initial or head-final. This hypothesis can be adapted to the richer structure in (4) by assuming that TP has variable directionality. Together with (iv), this explains the frequent occurrence of verb-late word order in subordinate clauses.
(vi)   Although the finite verb mainly occurs in C2 and in C1 in main clauses, T can also be a possible host. This is suggested by verb-late main clauses (Pintzuk and Haeberli 2008), aspects of adverb placement with respect to the verb (Haeberli and Ihsane 2016:506), and the absence of subject-verb inversion with certain non-discourse-given full DP subjects (van Kemenade and Westergaard 2012:98).

The conclusion we might reach on the basis of (4) and (i) to (vi) above is that, apart from operator fronting contexts, the grammar of OE lacks the properties of a true V2 language. However, such a conclusion may be too hasty. V2 is ultimately made up of two components, which Holmberg (2015:375) describes as follows:

(5) a   A functional head in the left periphery attracts the finite verb.
    b   This functional head wants a constituent moved to its specifier position.

As Holmberg (2015:376) points out, it is conceivable that a language has one of these properties but not the other, and that true V2 occurs when the two coincide. Property (5)a concerns precisely the area where we have non-V2-like behaviour in OE: the differences that we have seen so far between OE and true V2 languages are primarily due to the variable nature of finite verb placement in OE. Verbs can occur in three different positions in main clauses and the two lower ones do not necessarily lead to adjacency between the initial constituent and the verb.

What about property (5)b? In Minimalist terms, (5)b means that one and only one left-peripheral head must carry an EPP-feature that attracts some constituent to the left of the finite verb (cf. e.g. Roberts 2004). According to Frey's (2006a, 2006b) implementation of this idea, which is based on a close analysis of the nature of fronted XPs in German V2 clauses, the EPP-feature can be associated with three different heads of the CP-domain. However, only one EPP-feature can be realized per clause. This analysis allows Frey to account for the observation that there seem to be three types of clause-initial constituents in a V2 language like German:

(6) a   A very limited group of items (e.g. German *kein Wunder* 'no wonder') is base-generated in the CP domain. It can be argued that these items are not fully integrated into the proposition expressed by the clause and therefore that they are licensed directly by C.

    b   Certain elements undergo what Frey calls true A'-movement (TAB). These elements can be topical or focal, but what they have in common is that they are stressed and interpreted contrastively. Frey defines contrast as follows (2006a:246):

        If an expression α in a declarative sentence S is contrastively interpreted, a set M of expressions, $|M| \geq 2$, is assumed to exist which contains α and the expressions which denote salient alternatives to the denotation of α.
        The utterance of a declarative clause S containing a contrastively interpreted expression α has the implicature that S is not true if α is replaced by any $x \in M, x \neq \alpha$.

        What characterizes TAB furthermore is that it allows long cyclic movement out of embedded clauses.

    c   Certain elements undergo formal movement (FM). This type of movement simply attracts the highest element of the TP-domain to the specifier of CP without any additional intonational, semantic or pragmatic effects (cf. also Bhatt 1999, Fanselow 2004). FM cannot trigger long distance movement out of subordinate clauses.

Whereas options (6)a and (6)b are found in other types of languages, option (6)c seems to be closely linked to the V2 property. It ensures that the V2 requirement is met when no other

element occurs in the CP-domain as the result of base generation or TAB. In Frey's analysis, FM is triggered by an EPP-feature on Fin.

The prototypical element undergoing FM is the subject as it tends to be highest in the domain below CP, i.e. in what is referred to as the middle field. FM of the subject gives rise to information-structurally unmarked subject-initial V2 order. Other elements in clause-initial position also give rise to unmarked V2 clauses, in particular, sentence adverbials, frame adverbials and oblique objects of psych verbs (e.g. Frey 2006b). These elements can all be argued to be in a higher position than the nominative argument and therefore to be potential targets of FM. But Frey proposes that FM can also give rise to pragmatically marked V2 order. This is the case for elements which occur highest in the middle field because they have been scrambled to the left of the subject. Since scrambling is pragmatically marked, FM of the scrambled item to clause-initial position preserves the structure's markedness. In this context, a TopP layer that is part of the middle field and occurs between the lowest C head (Fin) and sentence adverbials plays an important role in Frey's account. This layer, which hosts aboutness topics,[3] allows non-subjects to be fronted to CP through FM since they occupy the highest position in the middle field. An illustration of this option is given in (7)B, where a weak pronoun occurs in clause-initial position (based on Frey 2006b:260).

(7)   A: Wo   ist das Lehrbuch "Syntax"?   Ich kann es   nicht   finden.
              where is   the textbook "Syntax"?   I   can it   not   find.
              'Where is the textbook "Syntax"? I can't find it.'

        B: Es   hat leider   jemand   der   Maria ausgeliehen.
              it   has unfortunately someone the.DAT Mary   loaned.
              'Unfortunately, someone loaned it to Mary.'

The 3rd person singular neuter pronoun *es* is necessarily deficient in German, which means that it cannot be stressed and used contrastively. TAB is therefore not an option for *es* in Frey's system, a conclusion that is supported by the fact that *es* cannot undergo long movement. Since base generation is not a plausible option, either, Frey proposes that the word order in (7)B is derived through a combination of scrambling of *es* to TopP and subsequent FM to CP. The object can be the highest element in the middle field and undergo FM here because the subject is non-topical and therefore remains below TopP.[4]

Assuming that Frey's FM is indeed a property characterizing V2 languages and that this process must be distinguished from other types of fronting, let us now return to our question of how a V2-like grammar as found in OE may be related to a true V2 system. If property (5)b is independent of V2, it should be possible for a language without true V2 to have an obligatory EPP-feature in the C-domain and, more specifically, an EPP-feature

---

[3] Frey adopts Reinhart's (1981) 'aboutness concept' of topics, which he defines as follows (2006b:161): "A topic is an expression whose referent the sentence is about. The concept 'topic' is a category of pragmatic aboutness."

[4] As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, however, (7)B is generally considered as highly marked by speakers of German. This is in contrast with simple scrambling of an object pronoun as shown in (i).

(i)   dass es leider   jemand   der Maria ausgeliehen hat.
         that it unfortunately someone the Mary loaned   has
         'that unfortunately someone loaned it to Mary'

While Frey talks about "preservation of markedness", the contrast between (7)B and (i) would rather suggest an increase in markedness, which would be somewhat unexpected in terms of FM. We will return to this issue briefly in fn. 24 below.

triggering FM if no other EPP-feature is available. Opposing views can be found in the literature with respect to the occurrence of FM in early English. After discussing FM in German, Speyer (2010:48) continues: "If the same constraint holds for Old English (and there are no reasons to assume the contrary, as far as I can see), topicalization ... would be nothing else but formal movement of the highest scrambled constituent – the topic – to SpecCP". Speyer argues that this hypothesis could provide an explanation for the fact that topicalization of objects and scrambling seem to decline around the same time in the history of English. FM is also adopted by Walkden (2017: 61-64) in an analysis of recent urban vernaculars of Germanic that he extends to OE. The specific context that Walkden mentions for FM is neutral subject-initial declaratives where fronting of the subject does not seem to have any interpretive effect.

A different view is taken by Light (2012). For Light, FM is a property that is motivated merely by the need to satisfy the V2 constraint and that is therefore intrinsically linked to true V2. OE not being a true V2 language, FM is not available in OE. Elements in the left periphery occur there as the result of the two remaining options that Frey proposes for German, i.e. base generation or TAB. An interesting consequence of this proposal is that elements like objects that clearly undergo leftward movement must all be contrastive as Frey relates TAB to stress and contrastiveness. As Light points out, however, fronted demonstrative pronouns and personal pronouns could be problematic for this hypothesis as they do not always seem to be contrastive. For clause-initial demonstrative pronouns, Light shows that they can be argued to be inherently contrastive in their effect on the discourse and that a TAB analysis may therefore be justified. Such an approach cannot be extended to personal pronouns, however. Furthermore, under the assumption that FM is not available in OE, an analysis along the lines of Frey's for cases like (7)B cannot be adopted, either. Light therefore concludes that the occurrence of non-contrastive personal pronouns in clause-initial position cannot be the result of movement to the CP-domain. Instead, she suggests that "the majority of clauses showing personal pronoun "fronting" in OE are, in fact, Tense-final clauses in which an object pronoun has scrambled to the left edge of the clause" (2012:98).[5] Thus, in terms of the structure in (4) above, clauses with a non-contrastive object personal pronoun in initial position must have the verb in T with TP being realized as head-final (assuming as in (v) above that the directionality of TP is variable). However, Light does not pursue this issue any further and her claim remains to be tested empirically.

The aim of the next section is to evaluate Light's hypothesis by examining the status of object personal pronoun fronting in the history of English in some detail. The main questions to be addressed are the following: (a) Are all fronted object personal pronouns in early English contrastive? (b) If not, can all non-contrastive cases be analysed as involving pronoun scrambling in a head-final structure? If the answer to either (a) or (b) is positive, Light's argument against FM would gain support as all cases of object pronoun fronting could be analysed either as TAB or as scrambling. However, if the answers to (a) and (b) are both negative, an FM analysis of early English along the lines of Frey's for German (7) would be plausible.

17.3 Fronting of object pronouns in the history of English
Speyer (2010) provides a detailed overview of object fronting in the history of English. He observes that in early English this process is relatively common, with frequencies slightly above 10% up to 1250 (2010:27). After that, the rate of fronting declines and remains around

---

[5] Light adopts the constraint on scrambling proposed by Wallenberg (2009): constituents cannot scramble leftward over a functional head, in particular, T. Therefore clauses with scrambled constituents before the subject and the finite verb must be head-final. Note that Light and Wallenberg assume that scrambling involves adjunction to a maximal projection.

4% from the 15ᵗʰ century onwards. A similar picture emerges if we focus on the fronting of object personal pronouns only. Table 17.1 shows the distribution of object personal pronouns in main clauses in two annotated historical corpora: The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE) and The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, second edition (PPCME2). The data in Table 17.1 are main clauses with either finite main verbs or finite auxiliaries. OE conjunct clauses are not included, since they frequently behave differently syntactically from main clauses; conjunct clauses from the Middle English periods are included, as this difference is no longer maintained. The first element (O or S) is not necessarily clause-initial, and the three elements (O, S and V) are not necessarily adjacent; e.g. OSV includes (XP) O (YP) S (ZP) V; SOV includes (XP) S (YP) O (ZP) V.

Table 17.1: Frequency of pronominal object fronting (OSV+OVS) in finite main clauses

Period	OSV+OVS		SOV		SVO		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
OE	484	13.1%	2205	59.6%	1008	27.3%	3697
M1	78	7.7%	421	41.7%	510	50.5%	1009
M2	42	5.0%	146	17.3%	655	77.7%	843
M3	39	2.3%	77	4.5%	1597	93.2%	1713
M4	3	0.2%	33	2.2%	1450	97.6%	1486

The figures in Table 17.1 show that object pronouns in OE occur before the subject and the finite verb in over 13% of the cases. This frequency is nearly halved in the period 1150-1250 (M1), and halved again in the period 1250-1420 (M2/M3). By the 15ᵗʰ century (M4), the fronting of object pronouns has become a very low-level pattern.

In the following subsections, we will take a closer look at the status of object fronting in the history of English. In view of Light's hypothesis, special attention will be paid to the discourse status of the fronted object pronouns. We will first focus on data from OE (section 17.3.1) and the earliest ME period M1 (section 17.3.2) as both of these stages are similar in their behaviour with respect to V2 (cf. Kroch and Taylor 1997). The developments after early ME will then be discussed in section 17.3.3.

17.3.1 Old English
Table 17.2 below shows the distribution of pronominal objects in OE clauses containing an overt subject and a finite main verb or auxiliary. To avoid issues that may arise concerning the analysis of other clause-initial elements, which are not of our primary concern here, we include only clauses with the object or the subject in clause-initial position. This is in contrast to Table 17.1, which provides a more general overview of the distribution of object pronouns and includes other clause-initial XPs. As a further contrast to Table 17.1, Table 17.2 distinguishes between clauses with pronominal subjects and those with full DP subjects since the nature of the subject plays an important role with respect to subject-verb inversion in clauses with fronted non-subject constituents (cf. examples (2) and (3)a above).[6]

---

[6] As in Table 17.1, the three elements (V, S and O) are not necessarily adjacent. Clauses with the indefinite subject *man* are not included.

Table 17.2: The distribution of fronted pronominal objects in OE main clauses

	OSV		OVS		SOV		SVO		
Subject type	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total
Pronoun	30	2.6%	1	0.1%	588	51.4%	526	45.9%	1145
Full DP	24	2.0%	131	11.0%	884	74.2%	153	12.8%	1192

Object pronoun fronting is possible with both pronominal and full DP subjects, but it is more frequent with the latter: (30+1)/1145 = 2.7% for pronouns vs. (24+131)/1192 = 13.0% for full DPs. When object fronting occurs, the order of the subject and the finite verb are as expected in the V2-like syntax of early English summarized in (4): subject-verb inversion is virtually absent with pronominal subjects, with only one attested example; in contrast, inversion is strongly predominant in clauses containing a full DP subject, with 84.5% (131/(24+131)) of all clauses with a fronted object pronoun featuring inversion. Examples are given in (8), where the fronted pronoun is bolded, the finite verb underlined and the nominative constituent italicized.

(8)   a   **Him**   ða   <u>wæron</u>   *heo*   þær   gemeldode
          To-him   then   were   they   there   announced
          'They were then announced there to him.'
          (cobede,Bede_4.18.308.13.3119)

      b   **Þe**   *ic*   <u>andette</u>   mid   muðe   and   mid   minre   heortan
          To-you   I   confess   with   mouth   and   with   my   heart
          'I confess to you with my mouth and heart'
          (coaelive,+ALS[Agnes].236.1872)

      c   **ðe**   <u>biddað</u>   *manega ðeoda*   ðines   ðincges   to   læne
          you   ask   many   people   your   things   as   loan
          'Many people ask you to lend your things'
          (cootest,Deut.28.12.4859)

      d   Hwæt,   **þe**   *ealle gesceafta*   <u>heorsumiað</u>
          Lo,   you   all   things   obey
          'Lo, all things obey you'
          (coboeth,Bo.4.10.14.123)

Let us now take a closer look at the nature of the clause-initial objects in Table 17.2. Several types of objects can be distinguished. First, there are oblique DPs that are merged in a position above the nominative argument: a) arguments of experiencer or impersonal verbs; b) arguments of passive ditransitives; and c) DPs that co-occur with the nominative argument of an unaccusative verb. We will refer to these three categories collectively as "high obliques". They are illustrated for OE in (9):

(9)   a   experiencer / impersonal verb:
          me   þincað   *þa*   swiðe   hefige   and   swiðe   manifealde
          to-me   seems   those   very   serious   and   very   complicated
          'Those seem to me very serious and very complicated'
          (cogregdH,GD_2_[H].3.108.22.1079)

b   passive ditransitive verb:
    ðe   <u>bið</u> *seo bodung*   oftogen
    from-you is   the   preaching withdrawn
    'The preaching is withdrawn from you'
    (cocathom2,+ACHom_II__41.306.46.6946)

c   unaccusative verb:
    Him   <u>com</u> ða *se cwealm* swa swa se   engel   gecwæð
    to-them came then the death   just as   the angel   said
    'Death came to them just as the angel said'
    (coaelive,+ALS_[Maur].347.1695)

For present purposes, we assume that the occurrence of the oblique pronominal DP before the nominative DP is the unmarked word order due to the order in which the DPs are merged (cf. e.g. Allen 1995, who argues that oblique arguments may be subjects in such contexts). These clauses are equivalent to clauses in which a nominative subject occupies the clause-initial position, and they therefore do not involve true object fronting (cf. also fn. 15 below). Among the 186 OSV/OVS clauses in Table 17.2, 61 (32.8%) can be included in this category; the remaining 125 clauses are non-passives with transitive or ditransitive verbs.

The second type of fronted object pronouns is oblique arguments that are straightforwardly contrastive in terms of (6)b above as they have a salient alternative that is explicitly mentioned in the context; examples are given in (10). In these examples, the preceding context is shown where necessary to clarify the reference relations; the fronted pronominal object and the constituent to which it refers or with which it is in contrast are bolded and underlined.

(10) a **<u>Hine</u>** geswencte seo wædlung &   afeormode, **<u>þone oðerne</u>** gewelgode
        Him   afflicted   the poverty and purified,   the   other   enriched
        his genihtsumnys and bepæhte
        his abundance   and deceived
        'The poverty afflicted and purified him, his abundance enriched and deceived the other'
        (cocathom1,+ACHom_I__23.367.79.4591)

    b **<u>Me</u>**   gehyrð se ðe **<u>eow</u>**   gehyrð
        To-me listens   he who to-you listens
        'He who listens to you, listens to me'
        (cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp].10.16.4478)

    c Preceding context:
        Soðlice symble ge   habbað **<u>þearfan</u>** mid eow & þonne ge wyllað
        Truly   always you have   poor-men with you and when you will
        ge   magon **<u>him</u>** teala don
        you may   them   good do
        'Truly, you always have poor men with you, and you may do them good when you will'

10

<div align="center">

Me ge   symble nabbað
Me you always not-have
'me you do not always have'
(cowsgosp,Mk_[WSCp].14.7.3278)

</div>

d   **hym** ic me befeste,   and **hys welwylnesse** ic me bebeode.
    to-him I   me commit, and to-his kindness   I   me entrust
    'To him I commit myself, and to his kindness I entrust myself'
    (cosolilo,Solil_1.49.7.630)

In addition, there are 12 clauses with a minor pattern: that is, clauses with vocatives and fronted pronominal objects that are coreferent with the vocative. Since there is no explicit evocation of a set in these cases, the fronted object pronouns do not meet the exact definition of contrastiveness found e.g. in Frey (2006a, 2006b) and Light (2012). However, it could be argued that, as a result of the use of a vocative, the pronoun in this case is focalized and contrasts the addressee of the direct speech with any other human being. Examples are given in (11).

(11) a   Ða   nam he hyre hand &   cwæð, **Mæden**, **þe**   ic secge aris.
       Then took he her hand and said, Maiden, to-you I   say   arise.
       'Then he took her hand and said "Maiden, I say to you 'Arise' " '
       (cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp].8.54.4321)

   b   **þu þe ðam   winterdagum selest scorte tida & þæs sumeres**
     you who to-the winterdays   give   short   times and the   summer's
     dahum langran … Hwæt, **þe**   ealle gesceafta heorsumiað,
     days   longer … Lo,   you all   things   obey,
     'You who give a short amount of time to the winter days and a longer (amount) to the summer days … Lo, all things obey you.'
     (coboeth,Bo.4.10.14.123)

This leaves us with 107 clauses with what seem to be non-contrastive fronted pronominal objects that are not in initial position by default. However, a somewhat broader interpretation of the notion of contrastiveness could reduce this number. Taking into account proposals made by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007 (F&H), we can divide the remaining 107 examples into two groups based on F&H's distinction between aboutness topics and familiar topics. An aboutness topic is "what the sentence is about" (Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994). Aboutness topics have the characteristic of 'newness': they are either "newly introduced, newly changed or newly returned to" (F&H: 88). Since aboutness topics are new to, or at least not fully active in, the discourse, they may be used for topic shift. They could therefore be considered contrastive, in the sense that they introduce a new topic that contrasts with the one of the previous clause.[7] Examples are given in (12).

---

[7] It is not entirely clear, however, whether we are indeed dealing with "salient alternatives" here and whether the cases shown in (12) are therefore truly contrastive in the sense of Frey's (6)b. For our purposes, we do not necessarily have to settle this issue; our aim here is simply not to reject Light's hypothesis too hastily and to reduce our data set to cases which cannot reasonably be considered as contrastive regardless of exactly how we define this notion.

(12) a   Preceding context:

He   astah   of   heofonum for middangeardes alysednysse,
He descended from heaven   for world's   redemption,
and wæron forði   his fet niðer   awende
and were   therefore his feet downward turned
'He descended from heaven for the redemption of the world, and his feet were
therefore turned downward'

me he clypað nu   to his rice
me he calls   now to his kingdom
'He calls me now to his kingdom'
(coaelhom,+ACHom_I__26.397.260.5192)

b   Preceding context:

&   þa   ferdun sume of   urum to þære byrgyne &   swa
and then went   some from ours to the tomb   and (they) thus
gemetton swa þa wif   sædon
found   as   the women said
'and then some of us went to the tomb and found as the women said'

hine hig ne gesawon
him they not saw
'They did not see him'
(cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp].24.24.5683)

c   Preceding context:

Ic bletsige **ðe** **fæder bodingendlic god** þæt   ic þurh   fyr
I   bless   thee father to-be-celebrated god so-that I   through fire
unforht to **ðe**   faran mot. þæt þæt   ic gelyfde þæt ic geseo.
unfearful to thee go   may. That which I believed that I see.
ðæt þæt   ic gehihte þæt ic hæbbe nu
That which I hoped,   that I have   now.
'I bless thee, father, god to be celebrated, so that I may go unfearful through fire
to you. That which I believed, that I see. That which I hoped, that I now have.'

Þe   ic andette mid muðe and mid minre heortan
To-you I   confess with mouth and with my   heart
'I confess to you with my mouth and heart'
(coaelive,+ALS[Agnes].236.1872)

Familiar topics, on the other hand, are given: they are d-linked, unstressed, and usually
realized as pronouns (F&H: 88). Familiar topics are generally used for topic continuity: the
object simply refers to the aboutness topic (typically the subject) of the previous clause. In
such cases, any contrastive effect is clearly lacking. Examples are given in (13).[8, 9]

---

[8] In cases like (13)a, we consider the clause in direct speech as being embedded under the higher verb
of saying. It is therefore the higher subject (*se abbud* 'the abbot' in (13)a) that is analysed as the aboutness topic
of the clause immediately preceding the clause containing object pronoun fronting.

[9] Some support for the distinction we make here between familiar topics as shown in (13) on the one
hand and F&H's aboutness topics illustrated in (12) as well as the contrastive fronted elements in (10) and (11)
on the other hand comes from a syntactic difference that we can observe between these two classes of items.

(13) a   Preceding context:
           Þa   acsode **se abbud** hine   þus cweþende: hwider wilt þu   gangan?
           Then asked   the abbot him (Libertinus) thus saying: where will you go?
           'Then the abbot asked him, saying thus: Where will you go?'

           Him   þa   Libertinus andswarode
           Him (the abbot) then Libertinus answered
           'Libertinus then answered him'
           (cogregdC,GD_1_[C].2.21.16.212)

      b   Preceding context:
           Hie   þa   þæt to ræde   ærest fundon, þæt **hie** ciricean aræðdon be
           They then that as counsel first found,   that they church   raised   by
           eastan   þære stowe, &   þa gehalgodan on Sancte Petres naman,
           east (of) the   place, and (they) it consecrated in Saint   Peter's name,
           þæs halgan Cristes ðegnes. &   þær gedydon twa weofedu in, &
           the   holy   Christ's disciple, and (they) there put   two altars   in, and
                   gehalgodan on Sanctæ Marian noman Cristes modor, &   oðer on
           (they) consecrated in Saint   Mary's name   Christ's mother, and other in
           Sancte Iohannes   Baptistan, Cristes   fulwihtfæder.
           Saint John   (the) Baptist,   Christ's baptismal-father.
           'They then first found as counsel that they raised a church to the east of the place,
           and they consecrated it in the name of Saint Peter, the disciple of the holy Christ,
           and they put two altars in there, and they consecrated (one) in the name of Saint
           Mary, Christ's mother, and the other in the name of Saint John the Baptist,
           Christ's baptismal father.'

           Him   þa   se heora arwyrða   bisceop eadiglice &   halwendlice geðeaht
           To-them then the their venerable bishop happy   and successful   plan
           forðbrohte,
           proposed,
           'Their venerable bishop then proposed a happy and successful plan to them'
           (coblick,LS_25_[MichaelMor[BlHom_17]].205.153.2624)

      c   Preceding context:
           oþþe hi   man ofsloge   mid swurde þærrihte.
           or   **them** [the brothers] one would-slay with sword   immediately.
           'or one would slay them immediately with a sword'

Whereas fronted object pronouns can immediately precede a subject pronoun in (10) to (12) (OproSproV order,
cf. examples (10)c-d, (11)a and (12)a-c), this word order is entirely absent in our data with the 65 examples of
the type shown in (13). Thus, fronting past a subject pronoun seems to be ruled out with familiar topics but not
with contrastive items. We will come back to this point in section 17.4.1, as it may be of some importance for
the structural analysis of the two types of fronted objects.

Hi lædde þa Maximus swa se manfulla het mid
them [the brothers] led then Maximus as the wicked-man ordered with
oþrum cwellerum to þære cwealmstowe.
other torturers to the place-of-execution
'Then Maximus led them as the wicked man ordered with other torturers to the place of execution'
(coaelive,+ALS_[Cecilia].225.7249)

d   Preceding context:
Hwæt ða **Eugenia** hym eallum gebysnode mid goddre gedrohtnunge to
Well then Eugenia them all set-example with good devotion to
Godes þeowdome and mid carfulnysse þonne hyred gewissode
God's service and with care the community governed
'Well then, Eugenia set them all an example with good devotion to God's service and (she) governed the community with care'

Hyre geuðe þa se ælmihtiga wealdend þæt heo untrume menn
her granted then the almighty lord that she infirm men
mihte gehælan, swa hwylcne swa heo geneosode licgende on sare
might heal, so which so she visited lying in sickness
'The almighty lord then granted her that she might heal sick men, whichever she visited who were lying in sickness'
(coaelive,+ALS_[Eugenia].128.266)

e   Preceding context:
He læg singallice, and næfre sittan ne mihte, ne hine on
He lay constantly and (he) never sit NEG could, nor himself on
oðre sidan bewendan, ne his handa to his muðe geræcan
other side turn, nor his hands to his mouth reach
'He constantly lay, and couldn't ever sit or turn himself on his other side or reach his hands to his mouth'

Him ðenode his moder and broðer.
him served his mother and brother.
'His mother and brother served him.'
(cocathom2, +ACHom_II__6.58.17.1163)

f   Preceding context:
Hwæt ða, **Quintianus, Cristes wiðerwinna**, ferde on sciþe ofer
Lo then, Quintianus, Christ's adversary, went in ship over
Semithetum embe Agathen æhta, and eac wolde gehæftan ealle hire
Semithetus about Agatha's possessions, and also would apprehend all her
mægðe, ac **he** ne moste for Criste
kinsmen, but he NEG could for Christ
'Lo, then, Quintianus, Christ's adversary, went in a ship over the river Symaethus about Agatha's possessions, and (he) would also apprehend all her kinsmen, but he couldn't because of Christ.'

> **Hine** gelæhte an hors, þa ða he læg on ðam scipe, hetelice mid toðum
> Him seized   a horse, when he lay in the ship, savagely with teeth
> 'When he (Quintianus) lay in the ship, a horse seized him savagely with its teeth'
> (coaelive, +ALS[Agatha].211.2145)

When we eliminate the 42 cases like those in (12), we are left with 65 cases of familiar topics, as in (13): fronted object pronouns that must clearly be considered as non-contrastive under any interpretation of the notion of contrastiveness. According to Light's (2012) hypothesis, these clauses should all have head-final TPs with scrambled object pronouns.

For OSV clauses this could be argued to be correct, e.g. (13)a-b. For example in (13)a, the verb *andswarode* could be in the head of a head-final TP, the subject *Libertinus* is in Spec,TP and the initial object pronoun scrambled to the left of the subject (and the discourse particle *þa*). The same analysis can be argued to hold for (13)b. In this case, the head-final analysis is further supported by the fact that an object occurs between the verb and the subject.

But scrambling in a head-final structure is a considerably less likely analysis for OVS clauses like (13)c-f. To derive OVS order from a head-final structure, the subject would have to undergo postposition. Among the 65 cases of familiar topics in our data, 46 have this word order, which corresponds to a rate of subject postposition of 70.8%. This frequency, however, is in striking contrast with subject postposition in other contexts. The estimated rate of subject postposition in head-final transitive main clauses,[10] for example, is 3.1% (13/422), well below the 70.8% that would be needed to derive all OproVS clauses through subject postposition. Examples like (13)c-d add a further important problem to a head-final analysis of OVS clauses. In these examples, the finite verb is followed not only by the subject but also by *þa* 'then', an element that has been analysed as a discourse particle (cf. van Kemenade and Los 2006). In terms of a head-final structure, *þa* would also have to be analysed as being postposed. However, postposition would be unexpected for a discourse particle, and a look at clearly head-final structures of the type VAux shows that there is indeed no evidence for *þa* postposition in OE. Among 188 (main and subordinate) clauses containing a non-finite main verb, a finite auxiliary and *þa* in the YCOE, there are no cases in which *þa* follows the main and auxiliary verbs.[11] Thus, postposition of *þa* generally seems to be ruled out, and a head-final analysis for (13)c-d is implausible.

These observations suggest that pronominal object fronting cannot always be derived by scrambling within a head-final clause structure, because postposition processes would have to be assumed for which there is very little or no evidence. We therefore conclude that clause-initial non-contrastive object pronouns do not occur only as the result of scrambling in a head-final structure, but that object pronouns can also move to the left of a verb in a head-initial projection.

17.3.2 Early Middle English
Let us now turn to the status of object pronoun fronting in Early Middle English (eME, 1150-1250). Table 17.3 provides a quantitative overview of eME main clauses with an object in clause-initial position. As in Table 17.2, clauses with finite main verbs and finite auxiliaries are included, and the data are divided according to subject type since, as shown by Kroch and

---

[10] The estimate is based on non-conjoined main clauses containing a non-negative subject, an object that is case-marked accusative, and a non-finite main verb followed by a finite auxiliary.

[11] A search of the YCOE for such cases does throw up one example. However, in that example, *þa* is combined with *giet* (*þa giet* 'yet, still'), and it therefore does not have the same status as the discourse particle in examples (13)c-d.

Taylor (1997), texts from the eME period maintain the subject-verb inversion syntax of OE. Table 17.3 differs from Table 17.2, however, in that conjoined main clauses are included as they are no longer clearly distinct from non-conjoined ones in their word order properties.[12]

Table 17.3: The distribution of fronted pronominal objects in eME main clauses

Subject type	OSV	OVS
Pronoun	11	3
Full DP	0	16

The eME data closely mirror the OE data: pronominal subjects favour OSV order, while DP subjects favour OVS.[13] Of the 30 examples with a clause-initial object pronoun, 11 are of the high oblique type, and thus correspond to the unmarked word order. Of the remaining 19 examples, the fronted pronoun is 'thee' in 10 cases, as illustrated in (14). These are of the same type as the OE examples in (11) above, and could be argued to involve some form of contrast triggered by the use of the vocative.

(14)   Preceding context:
         iweole &   i   wunne is nu   þet ich wunie. Ne nes   me   neauer se
         in-joy and in delight is now   that I   dwell nor NEG-was to-me never so
         wa;   as   me is wel nu
         woeful as   to-me is well now
         'I now dwell in joy and in delight. Nor was it to me ever so woeful as it is fortunate to me now'

         þe   ich hit þoncki **þolemode lauerd**
         thee I   it   thank, patient   lord
         'you I thank for it, patient Lord'
         (CMMARGA,72.286)

Four additional clauses with a fronted object pronoun are plausibly cases of topic shift, as illustrated in (15) where the aboutness topic shifts from *ich* 'I' in the clause preceding the OSV clause to *him* in the OSV clause. There are no cases of explicit contrastiveness in the eME data, but examples do occur in the later periods. (16) is an example from the M2 period (1250-1350).

(15)   Preceding context:
       ȝe   qð he hwet godd hehest &   herest tu?   Ich hehe qð   ha
       yea, said he, what god   praise and glorify thou? I   praise, said she,
       heh-feader healent in heouene &   **his deorwurðe sune iesu crist hatte**
       high-father saviour in heaven   and his dear   son, Jesus Christ called
       'Yea, said he, what God do you praise and glorify? I praise, said she, the high Father, saviour in heaven and his dear Son, called Jesus Christ'

---

[12] For simplicity's sake, we once again include only clauses with an object or a subject in clause-initial position here (cf. also Table 17.2). 38 of the cases from Table 17.1 have an XP in first position (XP-O-S-V or XP-O-V-S) and are therefore excluded from Table 17.3.
[13] Note that, among the three examples of OVS with pronominal subjects, two are negative. In negative clauses, the verb is plausibly in a position above the higher subject position, i.e. in C2 in the structure in (4) (cf. e.g. Pintzuk 1993: 25 for OE).

        &   **him** ich habbe meiden mi meiðhad   iȝettet
        and him I   have   maiden   my maidenhead given
        'and to him, I, a maiden, have given my maidenhead'
        (CMMARGA,58.63.2623)

(16)   Preceding context:
        and aȝens   we were of   fader   and moder ybore, ȝit **me** he hatede
        and although we were of   one father and mother born,   yet me he hated
        'and although we were born from one father and mother, nevertheless me he hated'

        and **þe** he louede
        and you he loved
        'and you he loved'
        (CMAELR3,52.846)

    Finally, five of the clauses included in Table 17.3, i.e. 26.3%, have a fronted object that can be considered the continuation of the aboutness topic of the previous sentence and, thus, as unequivocally non-contrastive. Two examples are given in (17).

(17) a   Preceding context:
        þu art an þt al   maht & nult   nawt   bute riht.
        you are one that everything permits and NEG-desires nothing but   justice.
        I-blescet beo **þu**. eaure.
        Blessed be   you. ever.
        'you are the one that can do everything and desires nothing but justice. Blessed be you forever.'

        þe ah   eauer euch þing heien &   herien
        you ought ever   each thing praise and glorify
        'everything ought to praise and glorify you always'
        (CMJULIA,120.423)

    b   Preceding context:
        and **he** schal beon weordfeste and wise lare   lusten
        and he shall be   reliable   and wise counsel desire
        'and he shall be reliable and desire wise counsel'

        Hine scule þa   gode men lufie for his liðnesse
        Him   shall the   good men love for his gentleness
        'The good men shall love him for his gentleness'
        (CMLAMBX1.111.1065)

Clauses with an object pronoun in initial position could in principle still involve scrambling, as head-final TP remains a marginal option in eME (cf. e.g. Kroch and Taylor 2000). However, in all the five cases like (17) with a non-contrastive object pronoun in initial position, the order is OVS. A scrambling analysis would therefore raise the same problem as examples (13)c-f above for OE in that they would have to involve rightward movement of the full DP subject, a process for which there is hardly any evidence elsewhere. Light's (2012)

hypothesis that initial object personal pronouns should either involve contrastiveness (TAB) or scrambling is therefore disconfirmed by eME as well.

17.3.3 From Late Middle English to Late Modern English
As can be seen in Table 17.1, the frequency of clause-initial fronted object pronouns reduces quite rapidly through the Middle English period, to an almost negligible number in M4. Excluding cases with an initial XP in front of the pronoun, we obtain the numbers shown in Table 17.4 (equivalent to Table 17.3) for the remaining ME periods. The figures in parentheses give the numbers excluding the high oblique type. These figures are slightly smaller, and have reduced to zero by the latest period M4.

Table 17.4: The distribution of fronted pronominal objects in lME main clauses

Period	Subject type	OSV	OVS
M2	Pronoun	5 (5)	0
	Full DP	0	3 (2)
M3	Pronoun	4 (4)	0
	Full DP	0	8 (6)
M4	Pronoun	1 (0)	0
	Full DP	0	0

A small number of cases from later ME still seem to represent topic continuity. One example is from the period M2 (mid 14th century), and the two remaining examples are from the period M3 found in the same late 14th century text. As in eME, cases of topic continuity generally have OVS order and a DP subject. Two examples are given in (18).

(18) a Preceding context:
      And þeruore / **he** vil uram heuene: and becom dyeuel. and **he** / and all
      and therefore   he fell from heaven and became devil,   both he   and all
      his uelaȝrede.
      his fellowship
      'And therefore he fell from heaven and became a devil, both he and all of his fellowship'

      Hym anlikneþ / alle proude   / þet   ...
      him   imitate   all   proud-men   who …
      'All proud men imitate him who …'
      (AYENBI.16.227) (M2)

    b Preceding context:
      Aldelm   bisshop of Shireborne deide,
      Aldhelm, bishop   of Sherbourne, died

      hym buried Egwynus
      him   buried Egwynus
      'Egwynus buried him'
      (CMPOLYCH.VI_181.1280) (M3)

It is not entirely certain, however, how representative these examples are of their period. In (18)a, the verb is followed by a very long (30-word) subject, so inversion would have been a stylistically natural choice. In addition, object pronoun placement before the verb is nearly systematic in subject-initial clauses in this text (the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*), and it is not unlikely that influence of the French source text may have played a role here (Haeberli 2018). A similar account would also be conceivable for (18)b and a further example from John Trevisa's *Polychronicon*, a close translation from Latin. We leave a more detailed investigation of the influence of Latin in these cases for future research.

Regardless of the status of the examples in (18), it is clear that fronting of clearly non-contrastive object pronouns is on its way out during the later ME period. This is confirmed by data from corpora covering the period 1500 to the 20th century (*The Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence*, *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English*, *The Penn Parsed Corpus of Late Modern British English*). Only two further examples could be argued to involve topic continuity,[14] but overall this no longer seems to be a productive option in post-ME.

The remaining instances of fronted object pronouns in Table 17.4 and in the post-ME corpora are all of the contrastive or topic shift type. The decline in the fronting of object pronouns shown in Table 17.1 cannot be related only to the loss of non-contrastive object pronoun fronting, however; the frequency of contrastive fronting must also decline during the ME period.[15] As Speyer (2010) shows, fronting of all objects, including full DPs, becomes less and less frequent after the eME period. The fact that the frequency of fronting with object pronouns seem to be even lower than with full DP objects may simply be related to differences with respect to the likelihood of pronouns and full DPs being able to occur in the pragmatic context that allows fronting of objects.

17.4 Analysis

In section 17.3, we showed that the fronting of object pronouns to clause-initial position was not uncommon in OE. After the OE period, this option declines in frequency. Contrastive fronted object pronouns become considerably less frequent when measured against the total number of clauses containing a pronominal object, but they remain possible up to today. As for fronting of clearly non-contrastive object pronouns, this process seems to be lost entirely during the ME period. In this section, we will explore some theoretical consequences of these findings for the analysis of the V2-like syntax in early English and its loss in ME.

17.4.1 Old English

Our overview of the placement of pronominal objects in OE shows that, even if one uses the notion of contrastiveness in a very broad sense, there remains a considerable number of clauses in which a non-contrastive object pronoun occurs in clause-initial position, and a large number of these cases are unlikely to involve scrambling (cf. our discussion of the examples in (13)). Hence, Light's (2012) hypothesis that fronted object pronouns in OE are either scrambled or undergo true A'-movement (TAB, linked to contrastiveness) is not confirmed, and the possibility that OE does have FM can again be seriously considered. Thus, it is conceivable that Frey's analysis of German examples like (7)B above can be extended to cases of non-contrastive object pronoun fronting of the OVS type in OE.

As discussed earlier, Frey argues that V2 clauses with a weak object pronoun in clause-initial position in German are the result of scrambling and subsequent FM, with FM being a

---

[14] Both are from versions of the bible from *The Penn Parsed Corpus of Late Modern British English* (PURVER-NEW-1764-2_9_1A and NEWCOME-NEW-1796-1_6_40J).

[15] In addition, a third change plays a role in the decline of clause-initial object pronouns, namely the loss of unmarked word order with a high oblique in initial position (cf. e.g. Allen 1995 for experiencer verbs).

default process that attracts the highest XP below C for the purposes of satisfying the V2 constraint, if no other constituent is fronted. Let us now consider how this approach could be applied to the OE structure in (4), repeated here as (19).

(19) [$_{CP2}$ XP C2 … [$_{CP1}$ SU1(pro/DP) C1 [$_{TP}$ SU2(DP) T]]]

In terms of (19) , the derivation of OVS order would look as follows. TP is head-final and thus allows scrambling (TP-adjunction in Wallenberg 2009) of the object pronoun to the left of SU2. The finite verb moves to C1 and C1 attracts the closest XP, i.e. the scrambled object, to its specifier position through FM by default. The subject remains in the SU2 position, and we thus obtain OVS order with the pronoun in initial position.

     Although this analysis gives the right results for OVS clauses, a closer look at the data in Table 17.2 sheds some doubts on whether non-contrastive object pronoun fronting in OE should indeed be considered to involve FM. Table 17.2, which provides an overview of the frequencies of all the different word order patterns found in main clauses containing an object pronoun in OE, shows that by far the most common order in these clauses is SOV. Although a certain number of these SOV clauses may very well involve head-final TP and the verb in T, the fact that finite verbs occur in a head-initial projection in a large majority of OE main clauses (cf. Pintzuk and Haeberli 2008) suggests that SOV with object pronouns must regularly be derived in a head-initial context. This is confirmed by examples in which the order SOV with an object pronoun is followed by elements such as particles or pronouns, which have been shown not to undergo rightward movement in OE (cf. Pintzuk 1999, 2005; Pintzuk and Haeberli 2008).

(20)   ic ðe   forgyfe hi.
       I   you forgive them.
       'I forgive you for them.'
       (cootest,Josh:8.18.5391)

Given that the direct object pronoun in (20) cannot have moved to the right, the projection hosting the finite verb must be head-initial. In such cases, object pronoun fronting to the left of the verb could not be the result of last-resort FM since the EPP-feature triggering FM would already have been checked by the subject. Conceivably, then, another process is required to front the object in SOV order, and thus, that same process might also give rise to OVS when the subject is not fronted.

     Accounts of SOproV orders in OE frequently invoke cliticization. For example, Wallenberg (2009:269ff.) argues that object pronouns preceding the finite verb in SOV clauses are head-adjoined clitics on Tense. Wallenberg does not consider OVS clauses but a cliticization approach would be possible for these as well under the assumption that the subject can remain in a lower position. However, an account along these lines is problematic for the following reason. If object pronouns can cliticize to T, one would expect them to be carried along with the verb when it moves from T to C1 or C2. Hence, as in languages with clear head clitics, such as French (cf. example (21)), one would expect to find, for example, interrogative clauses in which subject-verb inversion occurs and an object pronoun intervenes between the fronted wh-element and the verb (wh-Opro-V-S).

(21)   Comment l'as-tu   fait?
       How   it'have-you done
       'How did you do it?'

Such orders are not attested in OE clauses with a fronted operator (and, hence, the verb in C2). Among the 311 wh-questions in the YCOE that contain an object pronoun, there is not a single one in which the object occurs between the wh-element and the finite verb. A cliticization approach to object pronoun placement does therefore not seem to be attractive.

A more promising approach can be found in Walkden (2014, 2017). Walkden's analysis is based on split-CP structures of the type proposed by Benincà and Poletto (2004) and Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) as shown in (22).

(22) a. ForceP > Hanging Topic > Scene Setting > Left dislocation > List interpretation > Contrastive Focus (adverbs/objects) > Contrastive Focus (circumstantial adverbs) > Information Focus > FinP   (Benincà and Poletto 2004: 71)

   b. ForceP > ShiftP > ContrP > FocP > FamP* > FinP
      (F&H 2007: 112-113)

Following Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) and, more specifically in the context of V2, Hsu (2017), Walkden (2017) assumes that languages may vary with respect to whether contiguous items of hierarchies like those shown in (22) appear as separate projections or whether they are bundled on a single head. For OE, he proposes that there are two CP projections, one combining Fam and Fin in (22)b and a second one combining everything from the focus field upwards to ForceP. Walkden refers to the former as CP1 and the latter as CP2. Spec,CP1 is the landing site of familiar topics, while Spec,CP2 is multifunctional and includes "at least focus and some high types of topics" (2017: 63). With respect to recent urban vernaculars of Germanic, Walkden specifically mentions scene setting adverbs and focalized circumstantial adverbs from (22)a and ContrP from (22)b. If no other element occurs in Spec,CP2, the highest XP in the TP domain is attracted by default to CP2. Walkden thus introduces Frey's FM at the CP2 level. The overall result of this system is that both V2 orders (in which only one CP specifier is occupied) as well as V3 orders (in which both specifiers are filled) can be derived. The structure proposed by Walkden (2017) for urban vernaculars of Germanic and OE can be summarized as shown in (23):

(23) $CP2_{[Force/Scene/Contr/Foc…]} - CP1_{[Fam/Fin]} - TP$

In line with our discussion of the clausal syntax of OE in section 17.2, we will assume furthermore that the verb generally occupies the C1 head in OE main clauses and that movement to C2 is restricted to operator fronting contexts.

Walkden's discussion of OE is relatively short and focuses on the major word order patterns. Here we will adopt Walkden's basic framework and explore its consequences further by considering how it can deal with object pronouns. Before returning to the issues raised by SOV, let us start with OVS orders of the type shown in (13)c-f above, where the fronted object is clearly non-contrastive and corresponds to what F&H call a familiar topic. As stated above, a familiar topic in F&H's framework is a given, D-linked constituent that is typically (but not necessarily) realized in a pronominal form and used for topic continuity. Within Walkden's clause structure, a non-contrastive fronted object pronoun in OVS clauses could thus be argued to occupy the Spec,CP1 position due to the presence of a Fam feature in C1. Using minimalist feature checking terminology, let us therefore assume that C1 carries an EPP-feature that is related to Fam on C1.[16] A prediction of this analysis is that, when Fam on

---

[16] In the context of interpretively driven movement, Walkden does not make use of EPP-features, but refers to criteria being active (cf. Rizzi 1996). However, feature checking terminology is then referred to in

C1 probes for a familiar topic, the object would have to be the closest element carrying a Fam feature for OVS order to be derived. If the subject qualified as a familiar topic, it would be attracted first due to Attract Closest and we would obtain SVO order. In the cases we have identified as containing a clearly non-contrastive object pronoun, the requirement that the object is the closest element carrying a Fam feature is always met. There are no examples in which the subject is a pronoun (cf. fn. 8 above). Rather, the subject is either a discourse-new full DP (e.g. clauses with indefinite subjects as in (13)f, repeated as (24)a) or, in the case where the subject is discourse-given (e.g. clauses with definite subjects like (13)a, repeated as (24)b), topic continuity is always established by the object pronoun, which therefore has a higher degree of familiarity than the subject.

(24) a   Preceding context:
            Hwæt ða, **Quintianus, Cristes wiðerwinna**, ferde on scipe ofer
            Lo   then, Quintianus, Christ's adversary,   went in ship over
            Semithetum embe Agathen æhta,   and eac wolde gehæftan ealle hire
            Semithetus about Agatha's possessions, and also would apprehend all her
            mægðe, ac **he** ne moste for Criste
            kinsmen, but he NEG could for Christ
            'Lo, then, Quintianus, Christ's adversary, went in a ship over the river Symaethus about Agatha's possessions, and (he) would also apprehend all her kinsmen, but he couldn't because of Christ.'

            Hine gelæhte an hors, þa ða he læg on ðam scipe, hetelice mid toðum
            Him seized a horse, when he lay in the ship, savagely with teeth
            'When he (Quintianus) lay in the ship, a horse seized him savagely with its teeth'
            (coaelive, +ALS[Agatha].211.2145)

      b   Preceding context:
            Þa   acsode **se abbud** hine   þus cweþende: hwider wilt þu
            Then asked   the abbot him (Libertinus) thus saying: where will you
            gangan?
            go?
            'Then the abbot asked him, saying thus: Where will you go?'

            Him   þa Libertinus andswarode
            Him [the abbot] then Libertinus answered
            'Libertinus then answered him'
            (cogregdC,GD_1_[C].2.21.16.212)

     One question that remains to be addressed with OVS orders where the object is non-contrastive is what the status of Walkden's CP2 level is. As pointed out above, Walkden assumes that CP2 either attracts some element for interpretive reasons, or if no such movement occurs, CP2 triggers FM. In the situation in which the object pronoun is non-contrastive, it occupies the position for familiar topics in Spec,CP1 and Spec,CP2 remains empty. According to Walkden's hypothesis, at this point, FM should be triggered and apply to the constituent that is closest to C2; in this case, the familiar object pronoun in Spec,CP1. However, it is commonly assumed that elements that have undergone movement for

---

connection with FM (Edge Feature). Following the literature cited in section 17.2, we will continue referring to EPP as the trigger of movement here.

interpretive reasons cannot be moved any further ("criterial freezing", cf. Rizzi 2006). Thus, once an object pronoun has been fronted to Spec,CP1 to check an EPP-feature related to familiarity, it should not be able to move to CP2. Furthermore, given that the object in our OVS clauses is in absolute initial position, no other element can have been attracted by CP2, either. This type of OVS clause, therefore, does not provide evidence for supposing that FM is involved in object pronoun fronting in OE, and indeed appears to preclude it. Thus, in contrast to what Frey claims for German, object pronoun fronting to the left of the finite verb does not require FM in OE.

      However, an important function of FM in Frey's (2006a, b) or Fanselow's (2004) analyses of German is to derive discourse-informationally neutral subject-initial declaratives, and this is also the main role that Walkden (2017: 61) attributes to it. If we adopt the structure in (19), repeated here as (25), the same need for a way to derive discourse-informationally neutral subject-initial declaratives arises.

(25) [$_{CP2}$ XP C2 … [$_{CP1}$ SU1(pro/DP) C1 [$_{TP}$ SU2(DP) T]]]

As mentioned earlier, the finite verb generally occupies C1 in main clauses if no operator is fronted, and thus, without FM, we would expect V1 word order whenever none of the features with an interpretive effect on C1 and C2 are activated. Although V1 indeed exists in OE, it does not occur with the frequency one might expect of a neutral word order. Furthermore, since subject pronouns generally precede the verb when it occupies C1 (cf. example (3)a) and V1 occurs with both full DP subjects and subject pronouns, V1 has generally been analysed as being the result of V-movement to C2 as also found in operator fronting contexts (e.g. Pintzuk 1993:25). Given these considerations, it would be plausible to assume that a verb in C1 does not license V1, but rather must be preceded by at least one constituent; FM would ensure that the subject, as the highest element, is fronted if no other element has undergone leftward movement.[17]

      The situation in OE thus appears reminiscent of what happens in German, according to Frey's (2006a, 2006b) account. Frey proposes that German must have one EPP-feature in the CP-domain. If this EPP-feature is not carried by a projection attracting contrastive items or by a projection hosting base-generated elements, the EPP-feature is inserted under Fin and then attracts the highest element in the inflectional domain through FM. A similar assumption for OE would require an EPP-feature to be inserted somewhere in the CP-domain. If this happens in connection with a Fam feature under C1, no further EPP-feature is needed and FM does not have to occur. If, however, neither Fam (on C1) nor any of the possible features hosted by C2 is associated with an EPP-feature, an EPP-feature is inserted by default,[18] and this feature then triggers FM.[19]

---

[17] Similarly, what we have called high obliques may also be derived through FM (cf. also Fanselow 2004, Frey 2006b for German). Alternatively, these could involve movement to CP1 if they are of the familiar type.

[18] Given that the fronted element is the only one in the CP domain, there does not seem to be any empirical evidence that would allow us to determine whether the EPP-feature is inserted under C1 or under C2. From a theoretical point of view, insertion on C2 seems be more attractive, however, as this option would be more in line with a derivational last resort account: if, by the time C2 is merged no EPP-feature has been checked in the CP-domain, EPP is inserted on C2.

[19] An issue that may arise here is how V1 clauses can be derived in terms of this account. Under the assumption that V1 involves V-movement to the highest verbal landing site, i.e. C2, it could be argued that in such cases C1 carries an EPP-feature that is checked by the subject and that this therefore allows C2 to remain without a specifier. However, we will have to leave a closer analysis of V1 within the framework adopted here for future research.

What distinguishes OE from German is that, whereas in German there must be one and only one EPP-feature in the CP-domain, in OE there may be more than one. In our dataset, evidence for this conclusion comes from SOV clauses, which, as pointed out earlier, are unlikely to all be derived by head-final structure. Let us start by considering SOV clauses with subject pronouns, as shown in (20), repeated here as (26).

(26) ic ðe   forgyfe hi.
      I   you   forgive them.
      'I forgive you for them.'
      (cootest‚Josh:8.18.5391)

For both the pronominal subject and the pronominal indirect object to occur to the left of the finite verb, it would be plausible to assume that C1 carries two EPP-features associated to Fam, one attracting the subject and one attracting the object. Here we may make the same assumption as Frey (2006a, 2006b) for scrambling below his Fin-head in German, i.e. that the moved arguments target the same projection and that the structurally highest argument moves to the outer specifier whereas the lower argument(s) "tuck in" below (cf. Richards 1997). Thus, both pre-verbal pronouns in (26) occur under CP1. This hypothesis captures the idea that Fam is recursive (cf. F&H's structure (22)b).[20]

With respect to subject pronouns, a more general observation should be made here. As discussed in section 17.2, subject pronouns generally precede the finite verb even if some other XP is fronted to clause-initial position. This suggests that subject movement to CP1 is to a large extent compulsory in OE. In terms of our analysis, we therefore have to assume that the nature of the Fam feature on subjects is such that it must occur in a local configuration with Fam on C1 in the same way that a wh-element has to be fronted in a wh-movement language.[21] This together with the "tucking-in" hypothesis for multiple attraction would then lead us to expect that non-contrastive object pronouns cannot move past a subject pronoun. As pointed out in fn. 8 and the discussion preceding example (24), this expectation is indeed borne out. While OproSproV can be found with contrastive or topic shifting object pronouns (cf. examples (10)c-d, (11)a, (12)a-c), we have found no case of this word order with clearly non-contrastive pronominal objects in our OE and ME data (cf. examples in (13)). Assuming that the contrastive or topic shifting object pronouns are attracted to CP2, whereas the

---

[20] Given this slight modification of Walkden's system, one may wonder whether something similar holds for the CP2 level or whether, as Walkden proposes, a single position is sufficient. There are clauses that suggest at first sight that more than one XP-position is available above CP1 (examples from Haeberli 2002b: 248).

(i) a On þæm dagum on Tracia þæm londe wæron twegen cyningas ymb þæt rice   winnende.
      In those days in Thrace the land were two   kings   about that kingdom fighting
      'In those days, in Thrace, two kings were quarrelling about that kingdom.'
      (coorosiu,Or_3:7.63.7.1218)
   b Ðysne yrming   æfter his forðsiðe wurðodon þa hæðenan eac for   healicne god
      This poor-wretch after his decease worshiped the heathens also instead-of high   God
      'After his decease, the heathens also worshiped this poor wretch instead of God.'
      (cowulf,Whom_12:60.1194)

The verb and the subject are preceded by two scene-setting PPs in (ia) and by a fronted full DP object and a PP adjunct in (ib). In both cases, the two preverbal elements would presumably have to be analyzed as occurring above CP1. We have to leave a closer examination of the status of cases like (i) in OE for future research.

[21] Walkden (2017:72) observes that in clauses with fronted full DP objects, subject pronouns do occasionally follow the finite verb albeit at low frequencies (3.8%). In these rare cases, Fam on C1 does not attract the subject pronoun.

familiar ones move to CP1, the contrast with respect to OproSproV order follows. Only the former can move past a subject pronoun.

Turning now to SOV orders involving full DP subjects, the object pronoun will still occupy Spec,CP1 due to the Fam feature on C1, but there are a number of conceivable analyses for the position of the subject. First, just like pronominal subjects, certain full DP subjects could qualify as elements that are attracted by Fam on C1. This option might also play a role in cases of V3 orders of the type XP-S(DP)-V, which have been argued to involve discourse-given subjects (cf. van Kemenade 2012, van Kemenade and Westergaard 2012). A second possibility would be for full DP subjects to be moved to Spec,CP2. This movement would be triggered by discourse-relevant features of the type hosted by C2 in (23) above. Third, C2 could be argued to carry an EPP-feature that is not associated with any other feature. This would then give rise to FM and an unmarked subject-initial declarative clause. We will not pursue the question here as to whether or how frequently the different options listed above occur. This issue would require a detailed analysis of the discourse status of subjects and thus goes beyond the main focus of this paper.

If we compare the above account with that of Frey for a true V2 language like German, we can identify important similarities. Consider the schematic representations for the two languages in (27), with (27)a repeating (23) and (27)b being based on Frey (2006a:254):[22]

(27)   a   OE [$_{CP2(Force/Scene/Contr/Foc...)}$ [$_{CP1(Fam/Fin)}$ V [$_{TP}$ ...]]]
CP-domain: One EPP-feature required (more possible)

   b   German [$_{CP(C/Kontr/Fin)}$ V [$_{TopP}$ ... [$_{TP}$ ...]]]
CP-domain: One EPP-feature required (only one possible)

Leaving aside differences in the labels used, in both languages the clause structure is divided into three main parts with comparable functions: (i) CP2 in OE and CP in German are (a) targets of interpretively-driven movement (Contr/Foc (Walkden); Kontr (Frey)), (b) hosts of adverbials merged in CP (scene setters (Walkden); adverbials licensed in C (Frey)), (c) targets of FM; (ii) CP1 in OE and TopP in German are areas where topical arguments, most typically pronouns, occur;[23] (iii) TP. A further similarity between the two systems is that the CP-domain must contain an EPP-feature and that, if the EPP-feature is not checked by an element merged in CP or an element attracted for interpretive reasons, the highest constituent below C is attracted by default (FM).

The main difference between the systems consists in the placement of the finite verb and the way it delimits the CP-domain. Whereas topical positions are included in the CP-

---

[22] To be precise, Frey does not conflate C, Kontr and Fin in the tree he provides. Instead, three different projections are represented. However, Frey proposes that only one of these projections can be active at a time in German and that structure is generated only if necessary. So the basic structure in each V2 clause is as shown in (27)b: There is only one CP-projection per main clause and it hosts the verb in its head and some XP in its specifier. But the function of that CP-projection may vary.

[23] In Frey's analysis, TopP is assumed to host aboutness topics, whereas in Walkden's account the term familiar topic is used for this second domain. This contrast may be related to different interpretations of the notion of aboutness topic by the two authors (cf. fn. 2 above for Frey, and the discussion preceding our example (12) for the definition given by F&H, on which Walkden's use of the notion of familiar topic seems to be based). Another difference between the two approaches is that Frey assumes that the Spec,TopP positions are A-positions. Although Walkden does not explicitly discuss the nature of the Spec,CP1 position, it would most likely have to be an A'-position, being a criterial position in the CP-system. We leave it open whether these differences are substantial ones or whether the two labels can be unified. For our purposes, it is sufficient to observe that the two domains are very similar.

domain in OE, they are not part of it in Frey's account of German. The difference in the size of the CP-domain could then be argued to be the source of the difference in the occurrence of EPP-features. With only one projection that is active in German, only one EPP-feature is available whereas the division of the CP-domain into two parts allows the occurrence of more than one EPP-feature in OE.

Note finally that, given the proposals made above for the analysis of OE, we might end up with a very close parallelism between OE and German with respect to at least some cases of object pronoun fronting. Initially, we concluded on the basis of SOV orders that OE allows fronting of non-contrastive pronominal objects as the result of attraction by Fam on C1. However, we were then also led to postulate FM for reasons that were independent of object fronting. As a consequence, if we assume that OE had scrambling of objects below the CP-level (e.g. through adjunction to head-final TP as proposed by Wallenberg 2009), at least some OVS orders could be derived through scrambling past the subject followed by FM, exactly as Frey proposes for German for clauses in which objects are fronted without being contrastive.[24] Clauses with an initial non-contrastive object pronoun, therefore, could be structurally ambiguous in OE. The question of whether the two options are entirely equivalent remains to be investigated. From a derivational point of view, they are not. The scrambling plus FM option requires one additional derivational step as compared to fronting triggered by Fam on C1, and the former might therefore be disfavoured for reasons of economy. However, this disadvantage could become irrelevant if the interpretive effects of the two options are not entirely identical. In order to answer this question, the discourse properties of scrambling in OE would have to be examined in detail and compared to those of the clause-initial object pronouns we have discussed in this paper. We leave this task for future research.

17.4.2 Diachronic developments after the OE period

As shown in Table 17.1, the frequency of object pronoun fronting among all main clauses containing a pronominal object decreases considerably in the transition from OE to the eME period M1. Given our discussion so far, this decline could be accounted for as follows. If we assume that OE licenses scrambling at the TP-level with head-final TPs, at least a certain number of object-initial clauses could be argued to be the result of scrambling (possibly followed by FM). In eME, head-final TP is lost to a large extent (Kroch and Taylor 2000), and as a consequence, if scrambling is restricted to head-final structure (cf. Wallenberg 2009), scrambling declines as well. The frequencies of OSV and OVS are therefore reduced for the same reason that SOV is reduced, since certain SOV clauses in OE also involve head-final structure.

Despite these developments, OSV and OVS clauses do not entirely disappear in eME; in particular, clearly non-contrastive fronted object pronouns continue to occur (cf. the examples in (13)). In these cases, according to our analysis, the object pronouns are attracted directly by Fam on C1 and thereby check the obligatory EPP-feature in the CP-domain. After 1250, however, fronting of clearly non-contrastive object pronouns is largely lost. As observed in section 17.3.2, there are three further occurrences of such word orders in later ME, and only two additional ones after 1500. This decline in fronting to clause-initial

---

[24] Note, however, that, as pointed out in fn. 4, OVS orders with a weak object pronoun in German are more marked than clauses involving scrambling. A possible reason for this could be given on the basis of the structure in (27)b. According to (27)b a scrambled element occurs in Spec,TopP. But as observed earlier in our discussion of FM and CP2 in OE, positions of this type generally do not allow elements to move on ("criterial freezing", cf. Rizzi 2006). In OVS order with a weak object pronoun in German, the requirements of the EPP-feature triggering FM might therefore exceptionally override criterial freezing but at the cost of yielding a marked result.

position after 1250 coincides with the decline of SOV orders with pronouns (cf. Haeberli 2018, Wallenberg 2009). While SOV orders are still frequent in early ME, there are only sporadic occurrences after 1250.[25] The question that arises then is why fronting of non-contrastive object pronouns is lost after the early ME period.

In terms of the analysis adopted here, the following scenario is possible. Once scrambling is lost, OVS and OSV orders can only be derived if an active C1/Fam is present. However, while in the OE period various phenomena suggest that C1/Fam is active, such evidence declines thereafter. A relevant phenomenon in this respect is the asymmetry between main clauses and subordinate clauses with verb-late order in OE. Whereas verb-late order is relatively rare in main clauses, it is very common in subordinate clauses. This asymmetry suggests that the landing site of the verb is predominantly in the C-domain in main clauses, i.e. C1 in Walkden's (2017) analysis (cf. also Walkden 2014: 74-89), whereas the verb generally occurs in T in subordinate clauses.[26] Once head-final TP is lost after OE, the evidence that is available to the language learner for an asymmetric placement of the finite verb is considerably weakened. This could be argued to strengthen the V-to-T movement option, which, as mentioned in section 17.2, is already available in OE main clauses as well, albeit at considerably lower frequencies than in subordinate clauses. In particular, main clauses with a preverbal subject could start being reanalysed more and more as involving V-to-T rather than V-to-C1 (cf. also Biberauer and Roberts 2010: 280, Haeberli and Ihsane 2016: 509, 532).

An immediate consequence of an increase in V-to-T over V-to-C1 movement is that subjects may also become a potential target of reanalysis. As discussed in section 17.4.1, the fact that OE subject pronouns systematically precede the finite verb in contexts of non-operator fronting suggests that they are attracted by Fam on C1. But once V-movement to C1 starts declining, the evidence for attraction by Fam is weakened as well and XP-S-V orders can be derived with the subject in Spec,TP.

The contrast between the high and low subject positions (spec,CP1 and spec,TP in (27)a; SU1 and SU2, respectively, in (25)) then becomes even further blurred through an independent development. As mentioned above, van Kemenade and Los (2006) treat elements like *þa* and *þonne* 'then' as discourse particles which are frequently used as markers distinguishing the two subject positions in OE: subject pronouns typically occur to the left of these markers and full DP subjects to the right. In the pronominal object fronting data, the role of these markers is clearly illustrated as well; full DP subjects in OSV and OVS orders frequently follow *þa/þonne*, as well as the object pronoun (cf. examples (13)a-d above). The distribution of subjects with respect to discourse markers can again be captured in terms of variation in subject placement: Spec,CP1 when the subject occurs to the left of *þa/þonne*, Spec,TP when it is to the right. Data involving *þa/þonne* thus suggest once again that Spec,CP1 and its Fam feature are active in OE. However, as van Kemenade and Los (2006:244) point out, *þa/þonne* lose their discourse marking properties in ME. As a consequence, another frequent piece of evidence for an active CP1 declines in ME.

---

[25] Individual post-1250 texts occasionally show more substantial rates of SOV order. However, these exceptions can generally be accounted for in terms of idiosyncratic properties of the relevant texts (cf. Haeberli 2018).

[26] This contrast can be explained if we assume (following e.g. Roberts 1996, Walkden 2014, Haeberli and Ihsane 2016) that complementizers are merged low in the CP structure and then move upwards, i.e. in the structure adopted here, from C1 to C2. V-movement to C1 is therefore blocked in subordinate clauses. That the OE V2-like syntax is generally restricted to main clauses (e.g. Fischer et al. 2000:114ff.; van Kemenade 1997) can be argued to follow from this difference as well.

Further consequences on the analysis of subordinate clauses would be worth exploring. However, it would go beyond the scope of this paper to examine the left periphery of OE subordinate clauses in detail, and we will therefore have to leave this issue for future research.

These different developments with respect to verb and subject movement lead to a substantial weakening of the evidence for an active C1/Fam level. Fronting of objects to clause-initial position and to preverbal position in SOV orders declines after the period M1 because C1/Fam is weakened and ultimately becomes entirely inactive.

A further consequence of the ME developments is the effect on FM. On the basis of unmarked subject-initial (and certain oblique-initial) declaratives, we have assumed that OE has an obligatory EPP-feature in the CP-domain and that, if no other trigger for leftward movement to the left periphery is available, an EPP-feature is inserted and attracts the highest element in the clause structure by default. However, once verb movement to C1 declines, evidence for FM declines as well, as FM would be string-vacuous in cases where the verb is in T, leading to the subject being reanalysed as occupying Spec,TP. At this point, rather than being lost completely, we suggest that the obligatory EPP-feature that used to be associated with the CP-level and gave rise to FM might instead become associated with T. This reanalysis then leads to the emergence of a clause structure in which the subject position must be filled (cf. Chomsky's original Extended Projection Principle), a development which is marked by the rise of expletive *it* and *there* during the ME period. However, further exploration of these issues would go beyond the scope of this paper, and we will leave them for future research.

17.5 Conclusion
In this paper, we have examined the status of the V2-like syntax of early English compared to more rigid V2 systems as found, for example, in German. Taking Frey (2006a, 2006b) for German and Light (2012) for early English as starting points, we have focused, in particular, on the question of whether early English has a default fronting process, Formal Movement (FM), which has been postulated for true V2 languages. FM is triggered by an EPP-feature on C and attracts whichever element is highest in the structure below C, if no other element occurs in the CP. Frey (2006a, 2006b) relates the occurrence of clause-initial non-contrastive object pronouns in German to FM under the assumption that an object pronoun can be affected by this process if it has undergone scrambling past the subject. Given that FM seems to have no other function than to assure that the V2 requirement is met, Light (2012) claims that early English cannot have had FM because early English does not have a true V2 system. Under this scenario, clause-initial object pronouns must either be contrastive (TAB) or have undergone scrambling in a clause with the verb in a head-final projection.

Our evaluation of this prediction on the basis of a detailed analysis of clause-initial object pronouns in the history of English shows that clearly non-contrastive object pronouns can be found clause-initially in early English and that, even though scrambling may be relevant in some cases, they cannot all be analysed in these terms. We also demonstrate, however, that the mere existence of non-contrastive non-scrambled clause-initial object pronouns in early English does not provide conclusive evidence for the existence of FM. This conclusion follows from the fact that object pronouns can also occur preverbally when the subject is fronted (SOV) and, thus, last resort FM of the object pronoun is not necessary. Instead we follow Walkden (2014, 2017) and posit that object fronting in these cases is the result of attraction by a Fam feature in the CP-domain, a process which can derive OVS order as well as SOV order.

While we conclude that FM is not necessary for the derivation of fronted objects in OE, strong support for its existence, nevertheless, is provided by the regular occurrence of neutral subject-initial declaratives. Taking this clause type as an indication of default fronting (i.e., FM), as does Walkden 2017, early English turns out to be very similar to a true V2 language with respect to the part of the V2 constraint that concerns XP-fronting: both types of language require one EPP-feature in the CP-domain, and if the presence of an EPP-feature

is not motivated by an active interpretive feature, an EPP-feature is inserted by default that gives rise to FM. What distinguishes the two types of language is that in true V2 languages, there cannot be more than one EPP-feature, while in early English, there can be more than one. This difference in the number of EPP features can be related to a difference in verb placement within the CP-domain; the early English finite verb (in C1) leaves more structural space above it. Overall, however, the structures of the two types of languages are very similar (cf. (27)). Further research on the discourse properties of the left periphery and scrambling in OE will be needed, however, to make these structural similarities or potential differences more precise, and, in particular, to determine the way in which object pronoun fronting to clause-initial position interacts with scrambling.

Following the OE period, the frequency of object pronoun fronting declines sharply and continues to decline throughout the ME period. After 1250 the fronting of clearly non-contrastive pronominal objects is to a large extent lost. Several factors can be argued to have contributed to these developments. First, object scrambling, which is likely to be involved in a certain number of cases of object pronoun fronting, is lost after the OE period along with the loss of head-final TPs. Second, the loss of fronting of clearly non-contrastive object pronouns after 1250 can be related to a more general decline of a syntactically active Fam feature on C. The loss of the clear word order asymmetry between main and subordinate clauses as well as the loss of the discourse markers *þa/þonne* have the effect of weakening evidence for V-movement to C1/Fam and subject movement to the specifier of C1/Fam. The decline of V-movement to C1/Fam also leads to a weakening of the status of FM to the CP-level. The end result is a grammar in which an obligatorily filled position no longer occurs at the CP level but at the TP level.

References

Allen, Cynthia. 1995. *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Middle English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bech, Kristin. 2001. *Word Order Patterns in Old and Middle English: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Study*. PhD dissertation, Department of English, University of Bergen.

Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Structure of IP and CP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 52-75.

Bhatt, Rakesh Mohan. 1999. *Verb Movement and the Syntax of Kashmiri*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Biberauer, Theresa and Ian Roberts. 2010. Subjects, Tense and verb-movement. In Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, and Michelle Sheehan (eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 263-302.

Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley and Elizabeth J. Pyatt. 2000. VSO order as raising out of IP: Some evidence from Old Irish. In Carnie, Andrew and Eithne Guilfoyle (eds.), *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 39-73.

Fanselow, Gisbert. 2004. Cyclic phonology-syntax-interaction: Movement to first position in German. In Ishihara, Shinichiro, Michaela Schmitz and Anne Schwarz. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, pp. 1-42.

Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman and Wim Van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frascarelli, Mara and Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In Schwabe, Kerstin and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *On information structure, meaning and*

form: Generalizations across languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 87–116.

Frey, Werner. 2006a. Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In Molnár, Valéria and Suzanne Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus* (Studies in Generative Grammar 82). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 235-264.

Frey, Werner. 2006b. How to get an object-es into the German prefield. In Brandt, Patrick and Eric Fuss (eds.), *Form, Structure, and Grammar – A Festschrift Presented to Günther Grewendorf on Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 159-185.

Giorgi, Alessandra and Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haeberli, Eric. 2002a. Inflectional morphology and the loss of V2 in English. In Lightfoot, David (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 88–106.

Haeberli, Eric. 2002b. Observations on the loss of verb second in the history of English. In Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter and Werner Abraham (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 245-272.

Haeberli, Eric. 2005. Clause type asymmetries in Old English and the syntax of verb movement. In Battlori, Montserrat, Maria-Lluïsa Hernanz, Carme Picallo and Francesc Roca (eds.), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 267-283.

Haeberli, Eric and Tabea Ihsane. 2016. Revisiting the loss of verb movement in the history of English: Evidence from adverb placement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34: 497-542.

Haeberli, Eric. 2018. Syntactic effects of contact in translations: Evidence from object pronoun placement in Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics* 22: 301-321.

Holmberg, Anders. 2015. Verb-second. In Kiss, Tibor and Artemis Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax — Theory and Analysis: An International Handbook*, vol. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 342–382.

Hsu, Brian. 2017. Verb second and its deviations: An argument for feature scattering in the left periphery. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 2(1): 35. 1-33.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1997. V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English. In Kemenade, Ans van and Nigel Vincent (eds.), Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemenade, Ans van. 2012. Rethinking the loss of V2. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Terttu Nevalainen (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kemenade, Ans van and Aafke Hulk. 1995. Verb second, pro-drop, functional projections and language change. In Battye, Adrian and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 227-256.

Kemenade, Ans van and Bettelou Los. 2006. Discourse adverbs and clausal syntax in Old and Middle English. In Kemenade, Ans van and Bettelou Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 224-248.

Kemenade, Ans van and Marit Westergaard. 2012. Syntax and information structure: Verb second variation in Middle English. In Los, Bettelou, María José López-Couso and Anneli Meurman-Solin (eds.), *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in the History of English*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 87-118.

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, and Lauren Delfs. 2004. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)*. Department of Linguistics, University of

Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, first edition, release 3 (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/ppche/ppche-release-2016/PPCEME-RELEASE-3).

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, and Ariel Diertani. 2016. *The Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English(PPCMBE2)*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, second edition, release 1 (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/ppche/ppche-release-2016/PPCMBE2-RELEASE-1).

Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor. 1997. Verb movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect variation and language contact. In Kemenade, Ans van and Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 297–325.

Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor. 2000. Verb-object order in Early Middle English. In Pintzuk, Susan, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner (eds.), *Diachronic Syntax. Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 132–163.

Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor. 2000. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2)*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, second edition, release 4 (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/ppche/ppche-release-2016/PPCME2-RELEASE-4).

Light, Caitlin. 2012. The Syntax and Pragmatics of Fronting in Germanic. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

McCloskey, Jim. to appear. Ellipsis, polarity, and the cartography of verb-initial orders in Irish. In Aboh, Enoch, Eric Haeberli, Genoveva Puskás, and Manuela Schönenberger (eds.), *Elements of Comparative Syntax: Theory and Description*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2005. Two derivations of VSO: A comparative study of Niuean and Tongan. In Carnie, Andrew, Sheila Dooley-Collberg and Heidi Harley (eds.), *Verb First: On the Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.65-90.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1993. Verb seconding in Old English: verb movement to Infl. *The Linguistic Review* 10: 5-35.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1999. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. New York: Garland.

Pintzuk, Susan. 2005. Arguments against a universal base: evidence from Old English. *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 115-138.

Pintzuk, Susan and Eric Haeberli. 2008. Structural variation in Old English root clauses. *Language Variation and Change* 20: 367–407.

Richards, Norvin. 1997. *What Moves Where in Which Language*? Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual Verb-Second and the Wh-Criterion. In Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi (eds.), *Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 63-90.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In Cheng, Lisa and Norbert Corver (eds.), *Wh-Movement: Moving On*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 97-133.

Roberts, Ian. 1996. Remarks on the Old English C-system and the diachrony of V2. In Brandner, Ellen and Gisella Ferraresi (eds.), *Language Change and Generative Grammar*. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 7. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 154–164.

Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures: The Structure of CP and IP*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 297–328.

Roberts, Ian. 2005. *Principles and parameters in a VSO language: A case study in Welsh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Speyer, Augustin. 2010. *Topicalization and Stress Clash Avoidance in the History of English*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Taylor, Ann, Arja Nurmi, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Terttu Nevalainen. 2006. *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC)*. Compiled by the CEEC Project Team. York: University of York and Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Distributed through the Oxford Text Archive.

Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk & Frank Beths. 2003. *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE)*. University of York. Distributed through the Oxford Text Archive.

Trips, Carola and Eric Fuß. 2009. The syntax and semantics of the temporal anaphor "then" in Old and Middle English. In Alexiadou, Artemis, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nuger, and Florian Schäfer (eds.), *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax* (Linguistik Aktuell 141). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 171–195.

Walkden, George. 2014. *Syntactic Reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walkden, George. 2017. Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics:* 20: 49-81.

Wallenberg, Joel. 2009. *Antisymmetry and the Conservation of C-command: Scrambling and Phrase Structure in Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.