Proceedings
of the
Fourteenth International Congress
of Linguists

Berlin/GDR, August 10—August 15, 1987

Editors:
Werner Bahner
Joachim Schildt
Dieter Viehweger

II

гола, и такого аффиксального тонуса языка, который исключает возможность образования префиксов и т.д.).

Однако следует различать типологические свойства в тюркских языках, унаследованные от праязыка единой генетической семьи языков, и типологические свойства, приобретенные на более поздних хронологических этапах. Ср. различный удельный вес в отдельных тюркских языках придаточных предложений европейского типа. Необходим учет и внешней типологии. Так, например, понять как образовалось в азербайджанском, турецком, узбексом языках придаточное предложение, вводимое союзом *ки*, можно только в результате изучения роли усилительной частицы *ки*, на базе которой позднее развился союз *ки* (наряду с *ки*, заимствованным из персидского языка). А путь развития союзов на базе частиц известен языкам различной типологической структуры.

Таким образом, только совокупное использование различных приемов лингвистического анализа может дать основания для создания исторической грамматики отдельного тюркского языка — установить приемы относительной хронологии, способы расположения реконструируемых архетипов в определенной хронологической плоскости. Наметить критерии определения древности форм, конструкций, определить исконные черты и отграничить их от особенностей, возникших под влиянием других языков может только сравнительно-исторический метод, опирающийся на приемы ареальных и типологических исследований.

Changing Conditions of VNP-Order
in Middle Dutch Infinitive Constructions

Marinel Gerritsen

Amsterdam

The change from DV to VO took place in all Germanic languages except German, Dutch, and Frisian. Although VO-order occurred in these three languages in the Middle Ages, they developed into OV-languages (Gerritsen 1984). We shall consider two changes in these languages:

(1) The shift from Proto-Germanic OV in the direction of VO
(2) The shift from more or less VO back to OV

We lack a detailed analysis of the occurrence of VO-structures in medieval Dutch, Frisian and German, and so we do not know the route these changes took. Consequently, the explanations of both changes are largely theoretical. It is the purpose of this paper to give more insight into the route of the changes and at the same time to test several theories about its causes.

I have carried out a quantitative study of non-literary prose texts written in the last quarters (sic) of the 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th centuries in the dialect of Bruges, a city in the southwest of the Dutch speaking language area (Gerritsen, 1987). I studied among other things the order relative to the V of NPs (which did not have the function of subject), APs, PPs and adverbs in infinitive constructions. These sentences are printed bold in (4) and (5).

They can be characterized as in (6).

    (4) De cause was dat hy int land van Vlaender ghebracht hadde
         The reason was that he in the country of Flanders brought had
         valsche munte *om tvolc mede te bedrieghene*
         forged coins in order the people with to deceive (15th C, Chronicle: 58)

    (5) De voors Jhane ontkende de worden ende hiesch *den heesch over te*
         The named Jhane denied the words and demanded the sentence again to
         hebbene in gheschriften
         have in writing (15th C, Public trial: 1026)

    (6) a. they lack tense
         b. they do not have a subject in surface structure
         c. the comp-position is not always filled

I chose to investigate those sentences for practical reasons. There is, however, no difference between infinitive constructions and other dependent clauses in the position of constituents relative to the V. There is a statistically significant decrease between the 13th and the 16th centuries in the use of VAP, VPP and VNP structures. In this paper I shall only deal with the position of NPs to the V, since the change in the order of those constituents is the most important one from both a typological and a generative point of view.

Table I shows the occurrence of VNP structures in the different centuries. We see a clear decrease in the use of VNP order. This confirms the idea that the change from Proto-Germanic DV in the direction of VO also occurred in Dutch and that this language subsequently developed once more to an OV-language. There is not only a decline in the use of VNP structures between the 13th and the 17th centuries, there is also a change in the factors that govern VNP order during this period. I will deal in succession with the following factors: length of the NP, case-marking, lexical representation of the V.[1]

Table I   The position of NPs relative to the V with the percentage that occurs after the V

13th C.			14th C.			15th C.			16th C.		
NPV	VNP		NPV	VNP		NPV	VNP		NPV	VNP	
29	17	37%	32	13	27%	62	26	29%	127	43	23%

The length of the NP determines its position relative to the V in the 15th and 16th centuries: NPs in VNP structures contain statistically significantly more words than those in NPV structures, but that is not the case for the 13th and the 14th centuries (Table II). The influence of the length of the NP on its position relative to the V increases significantly between the 13th and the 16th centuries (ANOVA, $p < .0002$**).[2] My study shows that the occurrence of VNP structures becomes more and more restricted by the length of the NP between the 17th and the 16th centuries.

Secondly, my data indicate a relationship between the position of the NP relative to the V and case-marking. Although case-markings disappeared fairly soon in Dutch compared with, for example, German, many NPs in Middle Bruges have an unambiguous case-marking: it can be seen from the ending of article, adjective and/or substantive whether an NP is in the nominative, accusative, dative or other, case. In order to investigate the relationship

Table II   The significances according to analyses of variance of the differences in length of the NP in words between VNP and NPV structures

	13th century		14th century		15th century		16th century	
	NPV	VNP	NPV	VNP	NPV	VNP	NPV	VNP
Number	29	17	32	13	62	26	127	43
Mean	1.9	1.6	4.1	5.8	2.1	4.8	2.3	5.7
SD	1.0	0.7	6.9	5.0	1.6	5.4	1.9	4.2
p-value	$p = .31$		$p = .43$		$p = .001**$		$p = .000**$	

between case-marking of the NP and its position relative to the V, I distinguished in the first place unambiguous (A) and ambiguous (B + C) case-markings (Table III). In connection with ambiguous case-marking, I made a further distinction between accusative/nominative case-marking (B) and case-marking suggesting two or more other cases (C), because NPs with acc./nom. case-marking have in infinitive constructions an unambiguous case de facto, since these constructions never have a subject. In any case, whether we consider the NPs with nom./acc. case-marking unambiguous or ambiguous, my data show that NPs with an unambiguous case occur statistically significantly more often before the V than after, in the 13th century. These data confirm an old theory that the loss of case-marking in Germanic has affected the change from SOV to SVO (Vennemann, 1974). Throughout the 13th century, we find the NPs with an unambiguous case-marking without exception before the V, but those with an ambiguous one mostly after.

Table III The relation between case-marking and the position of the NP relative to the V with the significances according to Chi-squares

Character of the case-marking								
A Unambiguous		B Ambiguous acc./nom		C Ambiguous		Significance differences		
						A vs. C	A + B vs. C	A vs. B + C
NPV	VNP	NPV	VNP	NPV	VNP			
13th	6 (100%)	0	19 (73%)	7	4 (29%)	10	.0038**	.0018**	.04*
14th	3 (60%)	2	25 (74%)	9	4 (67%)	2	.80	.78	.57
15th	9 (64%)	5	42 (71%)	17	11 (79%)	3	.41	.52	.76
16th	22 (76%)	7	87 (74%)	30	18 (86%)	3	.39	.27	.92

Another factor that affects the position of the NP relative to the V in the 13th century, is the lexical representation of the V. The shift from OV to VO seems to have taken place in a lexically diffuse way: verbs with VNP structures (7) never have NPV structures (8) and vice versa.

(7) VNP: let weave (2×), guard (1×), buy (6×), forfeit (2×)

(8) NPV: pursuit (5×), pay (1×), do (1×), keep (4×), tolerate (1×), shear (1×), (1×), improve (1×), say (1×), set (2×), search (2×).

Most of the verbs occur too infrequently for us to be sure that the NP will always occur on the same side of the V. It is striking, though, that verbs with a high frequency, such as *buy* and *do* always have the NP on the same side. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find differences between the verbs in (7) and (8) that could explain why the first have the NPs to their right and the second to their left. My 14th century data show the same tendency as the 13th century ones: most of the verbs with VNP structures do not have NPV structures, and vice versa. There are two verbs which have relatively short NPs to their left (9) and relatively long NPs to their right (10), in the 14th century.

> (9a) *die deken* te daghen ten like (14th C, Statute: 156)
>   the dean to summon, to the corpse
> (9b) *enich werc* te vercopene (14th C, Statutes: 96)
>   some work to sell
> (10a) te daghene *sine zorghers* elken up xij d. (14th C, Statute: 154)
>   to summon his inspectors everyone for xij d.
> (10b) te verkopene binder stede ende scependomme van Brugge *eneghe niewe fort-ciere* to sell in town and region under alderman's jurisdiction of Bruges some new chests (14th C, Statutes 98)

My 15th and 16th century data do not show any relationship between the lexical representation of the V and the position of the NP. The occurrence of VNP structures is only conditioned by the length of the NP in those centuries. It seems that in the period under investigation postposition of NPs depends in the early period on the lexical item that governs it, the V, and later on the length of the NP. A tentative explanation for this change, which is in fact supported by my 14th century data, is the following. The child learning its language had problems to discover which verbs governed to the left and which to the right. Subsequently language production factors have interfered. They caused long NPs to occur after verbs that governed to the left. The language acquiring child then deduced that NPs with a great length may appear after the V.

Summary

My 13th century data indicate that the change from OV in the direction of VO (1) took place in Dutch and that the decline of the case-system played a role in this. Furthermore, it emerges that the lexical representation of the V governing the NP, played a part in the development of VNP structures. Those structures occur only with some verbs. Whether we should assume either a VO or an OV basic ordering in the 13th century, is however hard to decide reasoning strictly according to Government and Binding criteria (11).

> (11) a. The position to the V of NPs that are sister of VO (VO-NPs), defines whether the basic ordering is XV or VX.
>   b. The direction of government is category bound.
>   c. Movement of constituents is only allowed if they have an element in surface structure that expresses their relationship to the V.

It is not possible to determine the base structure on the basis of these criteria. VO-NPs occur before and after the V and they do not always have a marking in either position that shows their relationship to the V. If we want to preserve the criterion of the category bound direction of government, it is most plausible — in spite of the unexplainable VNP

structures — that 13th century Middle Bruges had an OV deep structure for two reasons:

a. VO—NPs mostly occur left of the V and it is most likely that the child learning its language, deduces the structure that occurs most frequently.

b. Pronouns never occur after the V, and movement of pronouns is from a theoretical point of view, highly unacceptable.

Regarding the shift from VO back to OV (2), my data show that this change took place between the 13th and the 17th centuries. We do not find a change in the base and/or extraposition rules between the 13th and the 17th century, but a change in the frequency of the extraposition rules and the factors that condition extraposition. Extraposition of NPs occurs in the earlier periods more frequently than in the later ones; the occurrence of VNP structures becomes more and more restricted to the length of the NP. The occurrence of VNP structures in the 15th and the 16th centuries can be explained by Behaghel's Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder. Since the NPs after the V are longer than those in front, we can assume that their occurrence right of the V results from performance mechanisms: extraposition of long constituents from an DV basic ordering.

My data indicate that the change back to OV might be partly due to the fact that two phenomena which lead to reinterpretation of OV Old English to VO Middle English, did not occur as frequently in Middle Dutch as in Old English: single unit verbs (cf. Gerritsen, 1984) and adverbs after the V (they (N = 134) occur without exception before the V). The fact that stabilization of OV took place after the introduction of the art of printing (c. 1450) in both German and Dutch, indicates that probably a second factor also affected the change back to OV: the increasing use of the written word. Owing to this, people became aware of the variability in the position of NPs to the V. This was experienced as undesirable and a choice was made for a standard variant — the most frequent one: NPV.

Notes

1 The influence of the function of the NP on its position relative to the V is noticeable during the whole period: sisters of VO occur less often in VNP-structures than sisters of V1 and V2. The length of the infinitive construction either counted in words or in constituents did not have any statistical significant influence on the position of NP relative to V.

2 The greater length of the 15th and 16th century NPs after the V does not result from a higher complexity of those NPs. Even if we omit to consider NPs (for example those with relative clauses, appositions) VNP structures have significantly longer NPs than the NPV structures in the 15th and the 16th centuries (ANOVA, $p < .05*$, $p < .03*$).

References

Gerritsen, Marinel, 1984, Divergent word order developments in Germanic languages, A description and a tentative explanation. In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.) Historical Syntax. Mouton Publishers. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam. pp. 107—137.

Gerritsen, Marinel, 1987, Syntaktische verandering in kontrolezinnen. Een sociolinguïstische studie van het Brugs van de 13e tot de 17e eeuw. Foris Publications. Dordrecht.