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1. Introduction

In this paper I will discuss the derivation of the passive constructions in Old English (OE).

In Lightfoot (1979 a, b), the differences in the inventory of passive constructions in OE and Present-day English (PE) has been accounted for in terms of Wasow's distinction between lexical and transformational rules. He claims that OE has only lexical passives, whereas PE has both lexical and transformational passives. The introduction of the rule of NP Movement, the source of transformational passives, into the grammar of English took place between 1450 and 1550. From then on, a series of new kinds of passive constructions appear, and they all have to be classified as transformational passives by Wasow's criteria. On the other hand, Lieber (1979) argues against Lightfoot by claiming that both lexical passive rule and the rule of NP Movement were already contained in the grammar of OE. Lightfoot's (1980; 1981) opinion is directly opposite to his earlier one. He argues that the rule of NP Movement has always been a part of English grammar and that a lexical rule which relates actives and passives never played a role. This position has been adopted by Kemenade (1987).

In this paper I will show that the transformational analysis proposed by Lightfoot (1980; 1981) and Kemenade (1987) is superior to the lexical analysis proposed by Lightfoot (1979 a; b). In section 2, the existence of the rule of NP Movement in OE is motivated. Section 3 will give a brief overview of the OE passive construction. In section 4, Kemenade's (1987) transformational approach will be investigated.

2. NP Movement in OE

Lightfoot (1979 a; § 6.1) argues that the rule of NP Movement has been introduced into the grammar of English in the 16th century. He claims that there is no motivation for the rule of NP Movement in the grammar of English before late ME, and that the introduction of this rule accounts for the simultaneity of the development of the following constructions: non-lexical passives, passive nominalizations, split constructions, and subject-to-subject raising constructions.
(1) a. John was given a book. (Indirect passive)  
b. John was expected to win. (Nonlocal passive)  
c. 1. John was found fault with. (Complex verb passives)  
   2. Fault was found with John.  
d. John was helped. (Benefactive passive)  
e. The bed was slept in. (Prepositional passive)  
f. Rome's destruction (Passive nominalization)  
g. the king's son of England (Split construction)  
h. John seems to be happy. (Subject-to-subject raising construction)  
   (Lightfoot (1979: 258-278, 296-304))

However, it has been noticed by Fischer and Leek (1981) that the latter three constructions occur freely in OE, as we will see below.

2. 1. Passive Nominalizations

Lightfoot (1979 a: 302) states that the (logical) object of NP has been generated postnominally even in the SOV period. If this statement is correct, NP Preposing must be applied to derive passive nominalizations.1) In spite of Lightfoot's claim that passive nominalization does not occur in OE, the following examples are cited by Fischer and Leek.

(2) Passive nominalizations:
   to Cristes sleige 'to the slaying of Christ' (from /Æfric: late 10th, early 11th century);  
   Miercna ege 'out of fear for the Mercians', wælstowe gewald 'control over the battle field' for Godes lufan 'out of love for God', (from the earlier part of the Parker Chronicle: late 9th, early 10th century); on fæmna lof 'in praise of women' (from Bede: early 10th century); peæ fifte wæs hyra nytena cwealm 'the fifth was the killing of their animals' (from Orosius: 10th century)  
   (Fischer and Leek (1981: 327))

2. 2. Split Constructions

Lightfoot (1979: § 4.3) argues that in a split construction like (1g), the king is generated in the postnominal position and subsequently moved to the prenominal position by the rule of NP Movement. The following examples cited in Fischer and Leek (1981: 330) show that split constructions exist in OE.

(3) Split constructions:
   /Æfredes godsunu cyninges 'King Alfred's godson'; pæs kyninges peaw Bosiripis 'King Bosiripis' custom' (from Orosius: 10th century); /Æfredes sweostor cyninges 'King Alfred's sister'  
   (from the Parker Chronicle: 10th century)

2. 3. Subject-to-subject Raising

Lightfoot (1979: 300) points out that, although sentences like (4) could be analyzed as involving subject raising or as having subject complement (=sentential subject), the number agreement in parallel structures like (5) requires the latter analysis; pas tida, being plural, cannot
be the subject of puhte which is singular.

(4) ne gepyncð pe swelc gewin noht lustbære (Orosius xciv 30)
not seems (to) you such a battle not agreeable
'such a battle does not seems agreeable to you'

(5) ponc peuhte (singular) eow pas tida (plural) betaran (Orosius cxx 10)
then seemed (to) you those times better
'then those times seemed better to you'

Then he concludes that OE does not have subject-to-subject raising constructions. However, as noted in Fischer and Leek (1981: 337), the number agreement in examples like (6) requires subject raising analysis.

(6) a. Hie ðam were geonge puhton (plural) men
   they (to) the man young seemed men
   'they seemed young men to the man'
   b. Ealle brimu blodige puhton
      all seas bloody seemed
      'all the seas seemed bloody' (Fischer and Leek 1981: 335, 337)

Now, it may be concluded from the above data that the existence of the rule of NP Movement in the grammar of OE is well-motivated. Therefore, it may not be the lack of NP Movement that is responsible for the absence of 'non-lexical' passives.

3. Overview of the Passives in OE

3.1. Indirect Passives

It is true that indirect objects in the dative may not be passivized in OE. Whereas the passive on the direct object in the accusative like (7) is common, the corresponding passive on the indirect object in the dative does not occur in OE.2

(7) Ic sege eow to sopan þæt sib is forgifon godes gelapunge (ÆLS 9.130)
   I say you verily that peace is given God's congregation
   'I say to you verily that peace is given to God's congregation.' (Mitchell 1985: 351)

However, not all indirect passive is absent from OE. Indirect objects in the accusative may be passivized. For example, verbs of teaching assign accusative case to both direct object and indirect object. With these verbs, the indirect object regularly becomes the subject of passive, though there is no example with a retained direct object in the accusative.

(8) a. ond he socol gesette, in þære cneohtas 7 geonge menn tydde 7 lærde
   and he a school established in which boys and young men instructed and taught
   were
   'and he established a school in which boys and young men were instructed and
taught’
b. I was taught

(10) a. pu ... eart cynebeam gecydd
   you are royal-cross proclaimed
   ‘you are proclaimed a kingly cross’
b. pu, cnapa, byst tres hehstan witega genemned
   you, boy, are the highest wiseman called
   ‘you, boy, are called the highest wiseman’

(11) a. I consider [s John a fool].
b. John was considered [s t a fool].

3.2. Non-local Passives
The history of non-local passives is not clear. Lightfoot (1979: 266) states that whereas active verbs of mental perception and saying with infinitival complements are very common in OE and Middle English (ME), passive instances of these verbs with infinitival complements are extremely rare; in OE, only (ge)seom ‘see’ can be passivized.

(9) da wæs heo gesegon mid ... beorhtness leochtscinan
then was she seen with ... brightness light’s shine
‘then she was seen to shine with the brightness of light’

While admitting that the subject of the passive (ge)seom could be construed as corresponding to the subject of the embedded infinitival clause, Lightfoot (p. 267) points out that some verbs which are two place predicates (=expect-type) in PE could be treated as three place (=persuade-type) in OE.3

Predicative passives like (10) occur frequently in OE.

3.3. Complex Verb Passives
It has been noticed in Besten (1981: 83–85 and 101) and Fischer and Leek (1981: 328) that the ‘direct’ object type (1 c 2) can be found in Dutch and German, though the preposition stranding type (1 c 1) is not allowed.

(12) a. German:
   Es wurde von ihm kein Hehl (nom) daraus gemacht, daß er nicht
   there was by him no secret it-out of made that he not
   einverstanden war.
   agreed
   ‘It was not kept secret by him that he did not agree’
   (Besten (1981: 84))
b. Dutch:
Because of the close resemblance between these languages and OE, we would expect to find OE examples of complex verb passive like (12). However, Visser (1963-73: § 1986) records no examples of either type.

3. 4. Benefactive Passives

OE verb *helpan* 'help' is used with the dative, or the genitive, but not with the accusative. The passive is always impersonal.

(13) a. We ... magon helpan þam forðfarenum
    We ... can help the dead (dat)

b. ... we sceolon earmra manna helpan.

... we must poor men (gen) help

'... we must help the poor men'

(14) a. Swa swa man afandað gold on fyre, swa afandað God þæs mannes mod
    (/ÆChom i. 268.14)
    just as one tests gold (acc) in fire, so tests God the man's mind (acc)
    'just as one tests gold in fire, so God tests the mind of man'

b. Deofol mot ælces mannes afandgian
    (/ÆChom i. 268.11)
    'the Devil may tempt each man'

c. ac hwæðere nan man ne cymð to Godes rice, buton he sy afandod
    (/ÆChom i. 268.8)
    but still no one not comes to God's kingdom unless he be tried
    'but still no one comes to God's kingdom, unless he is tried'

(15) a. Wæs þæs þæm se oðer man ne cymð þæs mannes to Godes rice, and þære manne
    (/ÆChom ii. 407.4)
    'there was that man not come to God's kingdom, and that manne'

3. 5. Prepositional Passives

Preposition stranding by passivization does not occur in OE; sentences like (15) cannot be found in OE.
(15) an biscop wæs ymbœ gefliten
   a bishop was at strived
   'a bishop was strived at'

Impersonal passives like (16) and (17) do not occur in OE, either.

(16) pa wæs wið anne biscop gefliten
then was against a bishop strived

(17) pa wæs anne biscop gefliten

3.6. Summary
Lightfoot has claimed that OE has only lexical passives and hence the passive subject must always be construed as corresponding to the direct object. Contrary to this, the indirect object and the subject of the embedded clause in an active sentence may also become the subject of the corresponding passive sentence, provided that they appear in accusative case in the active.

4. Transformational Analysis of the OE Passives

In this section I will examine how well the transformational analysis of the OE passives proposed by Kemenade (1987: § 3.1.1.4.1 and § 6.4.1) copes with the facts noted above.

According to Kemenade (1987: 86), OE passive constructions are the result of NP Movement. The following is a summary of her analysis.

The D-structure of passive is determined by the following properties.

(18) i. In passive sentences the subject position receives no $\theta$-role.
   ii. A passive participle, $V+en$, has the feature specification $[+V]$.

It follows from (ii) and the Case marking rules (19) that a passive participle may assign oblique Case, but not objective Case.

(19) Case marking rules. The language-specific instantiations of these in OE are:
   a. NP $\rightarrow$ NOM when governed by AGR under $[\text{INFL} + \text{Tense}]$.
   b. NP $\rightarrow$ ACC when governed by a transitive V.
   c. NP $\rightarrow$ OBL when governed by X, X non-distinct from $[+N]$, according to thematic properties of X.

Thematic properties:
$\theta$-role 'content' $\rightarrow$ GEN
$\theta$-role 'goal' $\rightarrow$ DAT
when assigned by $[-V]$ stative $\rightarrow$ DAT
   dynamic $\rightarrow$ ACC (Kemenade (1987: 95))
In the structure (20), the object NP receives \( \theta \)-role from the passive participle \( V+en \).

(20)

\[
\text{S'} \rightarrow \text{COMP} \rightarrow \text{S} \leftarrow \text{INFL} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \{ \text{NP} \} \rightarrow \{ \text{PP} \} \rightarrow [+V] \rightarrow \text{V+en} \rightarrow \text{AGR} \rightarrow -\theta \rightarrow \text{P} \rightarrow \text{NP}
\]

(Kemenade (1987: 88))

If not oblique, the object NP must move to the subject position where it can receive nominative Case, since \( V+en \) cannot assign objective Case. After movement to the subject position, the NP is associated with one \( \theta \)-role (through its trace) and one Case (nominative), yielding well-formed structure. Thus, accusative objects in active sentences become nominative subjects of passive sentences.

(21) a. Active:

\[
\text{pæt he ongann to writenne pa halgan Cristes boc (acc)}
\]

that he began to write the holy gospel  

(AHP, I, 25)

b. Passive:

\[
\ldots \text{swa swa hit (nom) awritten is as it written}
\]

as it is written  

(Kemenade (1987: 86))

If the object NP receives oblique Case and \( \theta \)-role from the passive participle \( V+en \), it need not move to the subject position, since it is already associated with one \( \theta \)-role and one Case. Also, oblique objects cannot move to the subject position. If it moved to the subject position, it would receive nominative case there, yielding Case-clash. Thus, in OE there are no instances of passivization of an oblique object. Oblique Case-marking is retained in passive sentences.

(22) a. And him (dat) \( \text{wæs swa forwyrnad ðæs inganges (gen)} \)  

and him was thus prohibited the entry  

(Hexameron St Basil (ed Norman) 24)

b. \( \text{Swawyrð eac gestiered ðæm gitseres (dat) ðæs reaflaces (gen)} \)  

so is also corrected the miser the extortion  

‘thus the miser is also corrected of extortion’  

(Kemenade (1987: 87))

In impersonal passives like (22), no nominative case is assigned, and there is no verbal contrast: the verb always appears in the third person singular.\(^4\) Thus, the optional fronting of an oblique object in sentences like (22 a) is not analyzed as movement to subject position,
rather it is analyzed as movement to COMP, that is, topicalization.

In general, extraction out of PP is prohibited by the Empty Category Principle (ECP) which states that any trace of movement must be properly governed. Proper government is formulated as in (23), and it is assumed that P is not a lexical head for (23b).

(23) Proper government:
α properly governs β if α governs β and
a. α is coindexed with β
or
b. α is a lexical category X₀

(Kemenade (1987: 160))

However, preposition can become a proper governor under the following conditions:

(24) i. The PP of which the P in question is the head is a thematic dependant of a verb, and it is governed by the verb.
ii. Verbs and prepositions assign θ-roles in the same direction in the language in question.

In OE, preposition cannot become a proper governor, since prepositions assign θ-roles to the right while verbs assign θ-roles to the left. Thus, OE does not have either personal passives analogous to PE examples (25) where a prepositional object is extracted by passivization, or impersonal passives analogous to Modern Icelandic examples (26) where a prepositional object is extracted by topicalization.

(25) a. John was looked at.
   b. John was taken advantage of.

(Kemenade (1987: 214-215))

(26) a. pessa konu (acc) er oftast talað vel um that woman is usually spoken well of
b. pennan ref (acc) hefur aldrei veri skotið á that fox has never been shot at

(Kemenade (1987: 217))

4.2. ‘Non-lexical’ Passives Revisited

Now, let us reconsider the facts noted in section 3 in light of Kemenade’s analysis.

4.2.1. Indirect Passives

As noted in section 3.1, not all indirect passives are absent from OE; when verbs with the double accusative are passivized, the indirect object regularly becomes the nominative subject. In this case, no accusative NP appears as direct object. Suppose that verbs with the double accusative assign two objective Cases. As a result of the neutralization of the value of the feature [N], the corresponding passive participles become unable to assign objective Case, and therefore the objects must move or the Case Filter will be violated. They can only move to the subject position as a consequence of the Projection Principle and the θ-criterion. Since a sentence has only one subject position, only one of the two objects can move there and receive nominative Case, the other object can not receive any Case and therefore must remain un-
realized. This will account for the fact that either the direct object or the indirect object may appear as the nominative subject when a verb with double accusative is passivized, and that there appears no retained accusative object in either case.

4.2.2. Non-local Passives

It is unclear whether OE has exceptional Case-marking infinitivals and small clauses like (27).

(27) a. John considers [s Mary to be a fool].
   b. John considers [s Mary a fool].

Whatever this may be, Kemenade's analysis make correct predictions. The neutralization of the value of the feature [N] means that a passive participle loses its objective Case-assigning ability altogether. That is, it cannot assign objective Case either to its NP complements or exceptionally to the subject of the embedded clause. Thus, whether the NP is the object or the subject of the embedded clause, it must move to the subject position when passivized.

4.2.3. Complex Verb Passives

The transformational analysis correctly predicts that complex verb passives of the preposition stranding type do not occur in OE. Since P and V does not assign θ-roles in the same direction, P cannot be a proper governor for the ECP, and hence extraction from PP is excluded. On the other hand, if we accept Kemenade's analysis, it would be expected that complex verb passives of the 'direct object' type occur in OE. However we cannot find examples of this type, either. Though I have no good account for this fact, it should be noticed that such complex verb expressions are extremely rare in OE; Visser (1963-73: § 703-704) gives only fourteen examples.

4.2.4. Benefactive Passives

According to Kemenade's analysis, a benefactive object, or more generally an oblique object, may not move to the subject position, because it would receive nominative Case there. Since it is already assigned an oblique Case, the movement would yield Case-clash.

As noticed by Mitchell (1985: § 847-848) and Kobayashi (1986), OE verbs which take oblique objects can be classified into the following two groups: (i) verbs which take only the genitive and/or the dative object, and (ii) verbs which take an object that may be in the accusative or in the dative or in the genitive. A plausible assumption may be that verbs which belong to the group (i) assign oblique Case obligatorily, and verbs which belong to the group (ii) assign oblique Case optionally; if oblique Case is assigned at D-structure, the object appears in the dative or genitive, otherwise, objective Case is assigned at S-structure and the object appears in the accusative. Suppose that this is so. Then, Kemenade's analysis predicts that group (i) verbs have only impersonal passives, and that group (ii) verbs have both personal and impersonal passives. According to Mitchell and Kobayashi, group (i) verbs have impersonal passive as a rule, but group (ii) verbs regularly have personal passives. Thus, the first prediction is borne out, but the second prediction is not.

4.2.5. Prepositional passives
According to Kemenade's analysis, in OE movement out of PP is prohibited by the ECP. Thus, the absence of personal passives and impersonal passives like (28) is correctly predicted.

(28) a. an bispoc wæs ymbe geflieten
   a bishop was at strived
   'a bishop was strived at'
   b. pa wæs anne bispoc wið gefliiten
      then was a bishop against strived

However, there is some evidence in OE that can not be handled by the ECP approach. Given that lexicalization of the subject position is not obligatory in OE, the fronting of an oblique object is not obligatory, as (29) shows.

(29) Swa wyrð eac gestiered ðæm gitsere (dat) ðæs reaflaces (gen)  (CP, 341, 11)
   so is also corrected the miser the extortion  (Kemenade (1987: 87))

Then one might expect to find examples like (30), where no movement has taken place, and therefore there is no potential violation of the ECP. However, this is non-attested in OE according to Mitchell (1985: § 855).

(30) pa wæs wið anne bispoc gefliiten
    then was against a bishop strived

Passivization of prepositional verbs, that is, attachment of the passive morphology to a prepositional verb, is allowed in PE and Modern Icelandic. See §4.1 (25) and (26) for examples. These languages are V-O and prepositional, and hence, V and P are string adjacent in the base-generated structure. On the other hand, since OE is O-V and prepositional, the base-generated string must be P-NP-V where V and P are not string adjacent. If we take string-adjacency as a necessary condition for the attachment of the passive morphology to a prepositional verb, the absence of passives like (30) can be accounted for.

5. Summary

In this paper it has been shown that the existence of the rule of NP Movement in OE is well-motivated, and that the transformational analysis proposed by Kemenade (1987) can handle most of the data, with some auxiliary assumptions. The following question has been left open: why verbs which optionally assigns oblique Case does not have impersonal passives?

Notes

* This paper is a revised version of chapter 4 of my MA thesis.

1. Lightfoot (1981: 96) states that the occurrence of examples like Rome's destruction in OE does not constitute evidence for Move NP, because its usual alternant was destruction Rome's, which could be related to Rome's destruction by a stylistic permutation.

2. Lieber (1979: 686) cites some apparent examples of passivization of the dative indirect objects in OE.
However, it has been revealed by Russom (1982) that all of them are in fact examples of passivizations of the direct objects.

3. See Takahashi (1983) for arguments for the position that causative verbs and perception verbs were three place predicates in OE.

4. This shows that the subject position need not be lexicalized in OE.
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