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0. Preliminary

The purpose of the study syntactic change in infinitive constructions. A sociolinguistic study of the dialect of Bruges between the 13th and the 17th century is twofold: first, to increase our knowledge of syntactic change in Dutch and second, to test and possibly refine (socio)linguistic theories about the causes of reanalysis and the factors that play a part in the spread of a syntactic change. The study was carried out by the use of a quantitative investigation of infinitive constructions (these are printed bold in 1 and 2) in prose texts from 1277-1600 written in different styles of the Middle Dutch dialect of Bruges.

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

(2) De voors. Jhane ontkende de worden ende hiesch den 
   The named Jhane denied the words and demanded the 
   heesch over te hebbene in rhescriften 
   sentence again to have in writing (15th, Trial:1026)

The infinitive constructions that I examined have the following characteristics (Chapter 4):
- they lack tense
- they have a prosuplubject in deep structure that is controlled by the subject, direct object or indirect object of the matrix clause or that can be interpreted freely.

I call this type of infinitive constructions 'control sentences' (kontrolezinnen). My study deals chiefly with two aspects of these control sentences: change and stability in the basic ordering and movement rules (Chapter 5) and the development of the use of the word 'om' (Chapter 6).

1. Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter I outlines briefly the history of the study of diachronic syntax in the last century. I suggest reasons for the growing interest in syntactic change in general, and in syntactic change in Dutch.
The second part of chapter 2 contains an account of the methods I used to investigate syntactic change (2.2). I start by setting out my expectations, and in chapter 3.1 I present evidence of change. In chapter 3.2 I consider the methods I have used for the investigation of change.

Table 1: The extent of the investigation in broader prose texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probabilistic</td>
<td>Prime 1 to 3000</td>
<td>0.1777-1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrolates</td>
<td>Prime 1 to 3000</td>
<td>0.1777-1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Prime 1 to 3000</td>
<td>0.1777-1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Prime 1 to 3000</td>
<td>0.1777-1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Prime 1 to 3000</td>
<td>0.1777-1.8500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Chapter 3: Problems
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3.2 is concerned with two problems of data gathering. I had serious problems in acquiring data from the last quarter of the 14th century; during that period there were political reasons for writing in French. I was therefore unable to find diaries and trials for the 14th century and because there is hardly any material left for the 13th century, I could only study statutes for that period.

4. Chapter 4: Control sentences in Standard Dutch

Chapter 4 contains a description of Modern Dutch control sentences. It is shown that control sentences have the same base rules as sentences with tense (3) and that Sbars are obligatorily extraposed and FPs optionally.

3 Sbar _Comp S (=V1)
V3 _NP (Adv)* (PP)* (Sbar)* V2
V2 (Adv)* (PP)* (Sbar)* V1
V1 _NP (NP) (PP) (AP) (Sbar) _V0

The use of 'om' in control sentences is obligatory if they have the function of a subject complement (4), a predicative adjunct (5), an adverbial clause of purpose (6), a specifier of NP with the value of a relative clause (7) and a specifier of AP indicating d.

Apart from the cases already mentioned, 'om' is also ungrammatical in control sentences in the function of complement of a preposition (10).

4 De muziek is niet om aan te horen
   The music is not to hear

5 Ik vind haar in die jurk om te stelen
   I think her in that dress for to steal

6 Hij ging naar Amerika om beroemd te worden
   He went to America in order famous to become

7 Een boek om te lezen
   A book <.>. to read

8 Het is te mooi om waar te zijn
   It is too good for true to be

9 Het past je niet (om) dat te doen
   It becomes you not (<.>) that to do

10 Hij probeerde (om) het hek te sluiten
    He tried (<.>) the fence to close

11 Moeber zei vroeeg thuis te zullen zijn
    Mother said early home to will be

12 De drang (om) altijd weer te liegen
   The impulse (<.>) always again to tell lies
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(13) Zijn mededeling niet te willen komen
His communication not to want come
(14) Hij is vrij (om) zich aan te sluiten bij een club
He is free (<>.) himself to join with a club
(15) Zonder de deur te openen
Without the door to open

5. Chapter 5: Change and stability in basic ordering and movement rules

Chapter 5 is concerned with changes and stability in the position of major categories relative to the V. The basic ordering and extraposition rules of Modern Dutch perfectly account for the position of adverbs and Sbars in my corpus, since the first are always preverbal and the latter postverbal. They cannot account for the position of NPs and APs relative to the V. NPs and APs occur frequently after the V. The Modern Dutch rules can account for the position of PPs relative to the V, but it is remarkable that VPP-structures occur far more often in Middle Bruges than in Modern Dutch.

5.2.1 deals with the position of the NP relative to the V. There is not only a statistically significant decline in the use of VNP-structures between the 13th and the 16th centuries, there is also a change in the factors that condition VNP order during the period under investigation.
- The length of the NP: the NPs in VNP-structures are significantly longer than those in NPV-structures in the 15th and the 16th century. The influence of the length of the NP on its position increases in a statistically significant way between the 13th and the 16th centuries.
- Casemarking of the NP: NPs with unambiguous case always occur before the V and never after, in the 13th century. This is a confirmation of the theory that the loss of casemarking has affected the change from OV tot VO (Vennemann, 1974).
- Function of the NP: sisters of VO occur less often in VNP-structures than sisters of V1 and V2.

5.2.2 deals with the relative position of APs to V. Although APs hardly occur in my corpus, my data indicate a statistically significant decrease in the use of VAP-structures between the 13th and the 16th centuries.

The subject of 5.2.3 is the position of the PP relative to the V. There is a significant decrease in the use of VPP-structures between the 13th and 16th centuries and there is a change in the factors that condition the occurrence of VPP-structures.
- The length of the PP: PPs after V are significantly longer than those before the V in the 15th and the 16th centuries.
- The function of the PP: there is a tendency for PPs that are
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sisters of V0 and that do not have the function of object of the
preposition, to occur more often in VPP-structures than PPs that
are sister of V1 or V2. The decrease in the use of VPP-structures
takes place chiefly in PPs that are sister of V0 and do not have
the function of object of a preposition.

The majority of the stylistic differences in placement of the NP
and the PP to the V confirm the hypothesis that syntactic change
proceeds faster in informal than in formal styles.

I have examined in 5.3 whether the basic ordering and movement
rules of Standard Dutch (3) should be adapted in order to account
for my Middle Bruges data and whether there are changes in base
and/or movement rules in the period under investigation. I have
therefore traced whether the theoretical arguments that are put
forward for the base and extraposition rules of Standard Dutch
hold true for my data. I assume that the position relative to the
V of NPs that are sister of V0 (V0-NPs), defines whether the V
governs to the right (Modern English) or to the left (Modern
Dutch) and that the direction of government is category bound.
Referring to Stump (1986), I assume furthermore that movement of
constituents is only allowed if they have an element in surface
structure that expresses their relationship to V (a case-marking,
preposition).

It emerges from my study that it is not possible to determine the
base structure of Middle Bruges on the basis of these criteria.
V0-NPs occur at all points of time both before and after V; they
do not always have a marking in either position that shows their
relationship to the V. Consequently, there are no theoretical
arguments for movement of NPs from a right or a left peripheral
V. It is not possible to define the basic ordering strictly
within government and binding terms. I offer two alternatives,
one which retains the notion of category bound direction of
government of the V, and one which exchanges this for a lexically
bound direction of government.

If we preserve the criterion of the category bound direction of
government, the most plausible assumption is that - in spite of
the unexplainable VNP- and VAP-structures - Middle Bruges had a V
governing to the left, as has Standard Dutch.
- V0-NPs occur mostly left of the V and it is most likely that
the child learning its language deduces the structure that occurs
most frequently.
- It is generally assumed that the Germanic languages had a V
governing to the left before the documented period; Modern West-
Flemish also has a left governing V. It is not probable that a
language will change very quickly from left to right governing V
and back again.
- pronouns never occur after V, and movement of pronouns is, from
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a theoretical point of view, highly unacceptable.
We do not find a change in the base and/or the extraposition rules between the 13th and the 17th centuries, but a change in the frequency of the extraposison rules and of the factors that condition extraposition. Extraposition of NPs, APs and PPs occurs in the older periods more frequently than in the younger ones. The conditions on extraposition become more and more restricted in the period under investigation. It looks as if the language develops a tendency to become a language with a left peripheral V in the 13th century, but this tendency clearly diminishes in the period under investigation.

If we abandon the concept of category bound direction of government, the data can be interpreted differently. The change from a V governing to the left, to a V governing to the right, seems to have taken place in a lexically diffuse manner: verbs with VNP-structures never have NPV-structures and vice versa in the 13th century. It seems that in the period under investigation, postposition of NPs depends first on the lexical item that governs it, the V, and later on the length of the NP. My data suggest that the child learning its language had problems to discover which verbs governed to the left and which to the right and that language production factors have subsequently interfered. The latter resulted in long NPs occurring after verbs that governed to the left. The language acquiring child next deduced that NPs with a great length may appear after the V.

5.4 is concerned with possible explanations for the change from XV in the direction of VX (5.4.1) and the change back to XV (5.4.2). I show that my data indicate that the change from XV to VX has to do with the decline of the case system, but I have not been able to demonstrate that convincingly. Secondly, I enumerate the phenomena that according to Stockwell (1977) led to the reinterpretation of OV Old English to VO, and I show that two of those phenomena did not occur as frequently in Middle Bruges as in Old English: first, the frequent occurrence of single unit verbs (Gerritsen, 1984) and second, the frequent occurrence of adverbs after the V. I argue in 5.4.2 that the lack of those phenomena in Middle Bruges might have caused the change back to XV. Following Vennemann (1984) I suggest further that it is likely that the developing written language has also brought about the stabilization of XV. This assumption is supported by the fact that the change from VX to XV takes place in both German (Ebert, 1980) and Middle Bruges after the 15th century, thus after the invention of the art of printing (c. 1450), which led in both countries to the standardization of the written language. The stylistic differentiation in the use of XV-structures in the 16th century supports this assumption.
6. Chapter 6: The rise of 'om' in control sentences

Chapter 6 is devoted to the rise of the use of the word 'om' in control sentences. 'Om' occurs mainly in control sentences with the function of adverbial clause of purpose, so-called purpose control sentences (1.6). The bulk of this chapter therefore deals with the rise of the use of the word 'om' in purpose control sentences. These show a significant increase in the use of 'om' between the 13th and the 16th centuries. Two traditional explanations for the rise of 'om' in purpose control sentences are tested in 6.2. I show that it might be affected by the fading of the final meaning of 'te', the word that introduces all infinitive constructions. This explanation cannot be tested due to the scarce knowledge we have about the history of 'te' in Dutch. Next, I have traced the hypothesis that the disappearance of the marking of the gerund by the ending -e (see 1.2) caused the rise of the word 'om'. My results indicate that this is not plausible, since 96% of the 11th century purpose control sentences are formed with a gerund with an ending, whereas in this century 48% already was introduced by 'om' (See Diagram I, p.151).

The addition of 'om' to purpose control sentences with a gerund with an ending developed between the 13th and the 15th centuries and is conditioned by the following factors:
- Subcategorization features of the matrix verb: In the 13th century, purpose control sentences with 'om' occur significantly more often with intransitive matrix verbs than with transitive ones.
- Length control sentence: control sentences with 'om' contain significantly more constituents.
- Distance: The distance in words between the purpose control sentence and the NP in the matrix clause that has to be interpreted as its subject, is always greater in sentences with 'om'.

The style differences in the formation of purpose control sentences corroborate fully the hypothesis that syntactic change occurs faster in informal than in formal styles.

6.4 gives a survey of the use of 'om' in control sentences with another function than purpose adverbial. 'Om' occurs in all control sentences in functions in which it is obligatory in Modern Dutch (cf. Chapter 4). Although the data are scarce, it looks as if those control sentences have always been constructed with 'om'. The occurrence of 'om' in control sentences in which it is optional in Standard Dutch, is very slight. There is a small but statistically insignificant, increase from the 13th to the 16th century (see Diagram II, p.187).
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7. Chapter 7: Evaluation method of investigation

My socio-historical approach to syntactic change is different from the one generally found in previous studies of syntactic change in Dutch. That is why in Chapter 7 I evaluate whether this labour-intensive approach renders a sufficient harvest. 7.1. deals with the results of the combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques. I show that the quantitative analysis has indeed led to more adequate observations than would have been possible by means of a qualitative analysis only. Using the quantitative approach I found, for example, that the position of NPs relative to the V was related to the lexical representation of the V in the 13th century: if a verb had the NP to its left it never had it to its right and vice versa. The combination of both approaches made it further possible to trace changes in the conditions of the use of VNP-structures. Secondly, I gained greater insight into the extent to which language learners have to be exposed to ambiguous structures, before reanalysis takes place. My 13th century data show that even if a language with a V governing to the left has a lot of constituents after the V (in this instance 100% PP, 100% AP, 33% NP), reinterpretation to a V governing to the right does not yet take place. It is extraordinary that the 13th century Bruges toddlers did not deduce from the language input that the V governed to the right. My study also provides insight into the structures that are relevant for the birth of reanalysis. It seems that the position of adverbs and V0-NPs to the V is very important here.

7.2 deals with the harvest of the incorporation of external factors. I show that considering four points of time in the period between the 13th and the 17th centuries has produced many results. Table I (p.218) summarizes all the significant changes. My study shows that there are more syntactic differences between the different periods of Middle Dutch than has been generally assumed. In the few cases where the results of my study can be compared with similar regional dialect studies, the results of the comparison are widely varying. It suggests that we have to reckon with regional differences in syntax. I found many striking differences between the styles (Table II, p.223). They support the hypothesis that syntactic change takes place quicker in informal than in formal styles. It also appears from my study that distinctions such as indicator and marker can be implemented on syntactic variants. The style differences in the use of 'om' indicate that it is a marker, as is to be expected from a lexically bound syntactic variant. The style differences in the use of VNP- and VPP-structures show a change from indicator to marker between the 15th and the 16th centuries. My investigation shows that the consideration of style differences can increase our knowledge of the stylistic embedding of syntactic change.
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