

DIVERGENCE OF SYNTACTIC FRAMES AND DIACHRONIC CHANGE

HYEREE KIM

1. Introduction

This study aims to examine particular syntactic frames governed by the so-called impersonal verb in Old English (OE) and Middle English (ME). The study will show that the syntactic frames of those verbs are so heterogeneous that they cannot be reduced to a single frame. This synchronic diversity in the syntactic frames of different verbs will thus lead to different diachronic outcomes from OE to ME.

The traditional term “impersonal verbs” refers to those verbs that are able to occur in the “impersonal construction”. Following Denison (1993:62), we define an impersonal construction as a nominativeless construction in which the verb has 3 Sg. form and there is no nominative NP controlling verb concord. An impersonal verb is thus distinguished from an impersonal construction because impersonal verbs not only occur in impersonal constructions but also have the potential to occur in other types of constructions.

In an impersonal construction in OE, the impersonal verb can occur with a finite or nonfinite S' (1b), or with a genitive noun phrase (1c):¹

- (1) a. me ofhriwþ
 I(Dat/Acc) ruc(3-Sg)
 ' I rue'

(Visser 22: *ÆGram* 33)²

¹Since the impersonal construction lacks an explicit subject in surface, it is hard to translate the examples literally according to Modern English (NE) syntax which requires the presence of subject NPs. It is not difficult though to give a paraphrase. For example, (*of-hreowan* in (1) is glossed as 'rue' according to its NE descendent but it can be rendered as either 'be depressed; regret; be sorry' etc. making the human oblique experiencers subjects or 'depress, oppress' etc. making the genitive causes subjects.

²In this example and the following, the citation from another article is marked by the author of the article, the page number and the source of the text as represented in the article with the separation of colon. The

- b. me on minum hyge hreoweþ þæt hie heofonrice agan
 I(Dat) in my mind rue(3-Sg) that they heaven possess
 'I regret in my mind that they should possess heaven' (Gen i 426)
- c. him ofhreow þæs mannes³
 he(Dat) rue(1/3-Sg) the man(Gen)
 'he was sorry for the man' (BT)

In ME, impersonal constructions are still found. The following example shows that *reuen* "to rue", descendant of OE *hreowan*, occurs in impersonal constructions:

- (2) him reoweþþ þatt he nafeþþ nohht ...
 he(Dat) rues that he not-has not
 'he was sorry that he does not have ...' (Orm 5570)

The impersonal construction of (1) above is not the only type occurring with the impersonal verb even in OE. Along with the type (1c), reintroduced in (3a) below, the verb can take the nominative cause (=agent) (3b) or the nominative experiencer (=recipient) (3c). We will call (3a) impersonal, (3b) causative and (3c) personal:

- (3) a. him ofhreow þæs mannes
 he(Dat) rued the man(Gen)
 'he pitied the man' (ÆCHom i. 192.16)
- b. þa ofhreow ðam munece þæs hreoflian mægenleast
 then rued the monk(Dat) the leper's feebleness(Nom)
 'then the monk pitied the leper's feebleness' (ÆCHom i. 336.10)
- c. Se mæssepreost ðæs monnes ofhreow
 the priest(Nom) the man(Gen) rued
 'the priest pitied the man' (ÆLS ii. 26.262)

In the following section we will see how these different syntactic frames have been dealt with in previous studies and what their problems are.

2. Previous studies and their problems

Based on the data (3), Fischer and van der Leek (1983:337) note that, rather than assuming that impersonal verbs had one meaning in OE and another meaning in NE,⁴ both meanings existed side by side in OE, systematically associable with different syntactic constructions as follows:

source of the text is marked "C" if the text is from the Concordance, and BT and BTs if from the Bosworth-Toller dictionary and the supplement respectively.

³In (1e) an accusative noun phrase or a prepositional phrase may occur instead of a genitive one:

- i. him gelicade here þeawas
 he (Dat) liked their virtues (Nom/Acc)
 'he liked their virtues; their virtues please him' (F. & L. 347: Chron 201)
- ii. menn ... scamap nu for goddædan
 man (Dat) cause/feel-shame now for good-deeds
 'man is now ashamed of good deeds' (Elmer 60: W.Sermo 62.153)

It is not certain that they share exactly the same distributional attributes and the same semantics and that those occurrences are confined to only a specific subset of impersonal verbs. Further studies are needed.

⁴This kind of claim was actually made in Jespersen (1927) and Lightfoot (1979). Jespersen states that in most cases the verb began by meaning 'give an impression' and came to mean 'receive an impression'.

- (4) i. $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{NP} \quad \text{NP} - (\text{S}') \\ \quad \quad \text{NP: DATIVE; } \theta\text{-role: experiencer} \\ \quad \quad / \quad \text{NP: GENITIVE} \setminus \theta\text{-role: cause} \\ \quad \quad \setminus \text{S}' \quad \quad / \end{array} \right] \text{ 'neutral meaning'}$
- ii. $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{NP} - (\text{S}') \\ \quad \quad \text{NP: DATIVE; } \theta\text{-role: experiencer} \\ \quad \quad / \quad \text{subject NP} \setminus \theta\text{-role: cause} \\ \quad \quad \setminus \text{S}' \quad \quad / \end{array} \right] \text{ 'causative meaning'}$
- iii. $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{NP} - (\text{S}') \\ \quad \quad / \quad \text{NP: GENITIVE} \setminus \theta\text{-role: cause} \\ \quad \quad \setminus \text{S}' \quad \quad / \\ \quad \quad \text{subject NP; } \theta\text{-role: experiencer} \end{array} \right] \text{ 'receptive meaning'}$

Among these three possible entries, Fischer and van der Leek argue, the entry type (i) is to be in the lexicon because it specifies the lexical Cases peculiar to the verb. And the constructions represented by the other two may be derived by move- α . The members in (i) OPTIONALLY assign the lexical Cases specified in their entries, whereas non-impersonal verbs OBLIGATORILY assign the lexical Cases for which their entries are marked. In order to derive (ii), the cause NP does not receive lexical Case from the verb and thus the NP undergoes NP movement into subject position and nominative Case is assigned at surface level. Similarly for (iii), the experiencer NP does not receive lexical Case and thus undergoes NP movement to subject position.

To handle the same data, Lightfoot(1991) introduces the analysis of Belletti and Rizzi (1988) on Italian psych-verbs into the account of OE. With the lexical entry (5bii), the theme does not have an inherent case at D-structure nor could it receive the objective structural case because Vs assign structural case only if they have external arguments. Thus the theme could receive nominative case at S-structure:

- (5) a. $\text{S}[\text{NP INFL vp}[\text{experiencer V}'[\text{theme verb}]]]$
 b. Lexical entries
 i. hreowan: experiencer-dative; (theme-genitive)
 ii. lician: experiencer-dative; theme

As most synchronic generative syntax idealizes variation away, Fischer and van der Leek's approach implicates that all the verbs categorized as impersonal could occur in three syntactic types (i), (ii) and (iii). This is reflected in their use of the data: they make a random use of verbs for examples representing each type. Lightfoot (1991:134), following Anderson (1986), assumes that *hreowan*, in showing all three possibilities, represents the typical case, and that many verbs manifesting only one or two of these possibilities in fact are revealing only accidental gaps in the texts. However, syntactic divergence among these verbs does not seem to be just the result of accidental gaps because some syntactic frames and constructions are never found with a certain verb not only in OE but throughout later periods. In this case, we cannot be sure that it is just an accidental gap, and then there is a possibility of overgeneralization.

Also, Fischer and van der Leek's derivation of (4iii) from (4i) by move- α will predict that the experiencer NP that does not receive lexical Case will move to a subject position but the syntactic features of the cause complement should remain unchanged from (4i). In the

following sections, however, we will see that the cause of impersonal constructions show different category distributions from those of personal constructions.

3. Divergent syntactic frames for OE impersonal verbs

The impersonal verbs we examine are the RUE and PLEASE verbs that survive in later stages. Those verbs are *hreowan*, *sceamian*, *eglian*, *lician*, *lystan*, *langian* in particular. The data are mainly surveyed for OE from the Concordance (C) and Bosworth-Toller dictionary (BT) and its supplement (BTs). The syntactic frames in which an impersonal verb can occur are as follows:⁵

(6) In the syntactic frame of [NP₁ (experiencer or theme) - V - X (cause or agent)],⁶

- I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]
- II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]]
- III. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]
- IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
- V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
- VI. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]]
- VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]
- VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]
- IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]

Here the broad classifications of types (i), (ii), and (iii) in Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and of types N, S, I, and II in Elmer (1981) are subdivided in more detail. The following is a rough correspondence between the features in (6) and classes of Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and Elmer (1981) respectively. (6V) and (6VII) are ambiguous between impersonal and causative constructions depending on whether S is considered as the subject or not. In this case I will call them neutrally as non-nominative constructions (=type i/ii).

(7)	F & L (1983)	Elmer (1981)
I.	type i	type N
II.	type iii	type II
III.	type i	type N
IV.	type iii	transitive
V.	type i	type S
VI.	type iii	type II
VII.	type i	type S
VIII.	type iii	type II
IX.	type ii	type I

⁵A prepositional phrase has been considered as an cause argument alternatively with NP[Gen]:

þu eart sunu min leof, on þe ic wel licade
 you are son my beloved, in you I(Nom) well liked(1/3, Sg)
 'you are my beloved son, whom I liked well' (C: MkGl(Ru) 1.11)

Then, we might need to consider another property: whether X (the cause) can occur as PP in impersonal or non-impersonal constructions. However, as Denison (1990:115) has pointed out, it is questionable that the PP is consistently a cause argument, because in some sentences, the PP is found along with another cause argument:

þas þing ic on þam foresprecanan biscoepe swiþe lufie
 these things I in the aforementioned bishop very-much love
 'these things I love very much in the aforementioned bishop' (C: Bede 206.18)

In this survey, therefore, we will not include PPs. But when we find a notable use of PP with specific verbs, we will put those instances in the footnote.

⁶Note that the format [NP₁ - V - X] does not specify word order of a sentence.

Treating I, III, V and VII, for example, as one category type i, Fischer and van der Leek (1983) fail to capture the variation across the type with regard to a lexical item. Similarly Elmer (1981) also overlooks, for example, the variation across different types of clause, namely finite and nonfinite clauses, treating them as one. Nine classes in (6) are further elaboration of Denison (1990) where five classes were studied. In the following sections, we will see individual verbs with respect to their syntactic frames.

3.1 *hreowan*⁷

This verb occurs with the genitive in both impersonal (I) and personal (II) constructions:

- (8) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]:
 Ne þe hreowan þearf ealles swa micles swa þu me sealdest
 not thee(Dat/Acc) rue need all(Gen) as much as thou me gave
 'you need not regret all you gave me much as it was' (BTs: Seel 150)
- (9) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]]:
 Hie ne magon ealneg ealla on ane tid emnsare hreowan
 they(Nom) not can always all(Gen) at one time equal-sore rue
 'they cannot always repent of all at once with equal contrition' (CP 413.29)

Genuine occurrences of NP[Acc] cause exist but are rare. However, the number will increase by considering numerous sentences which are indeterminate between nominative and accusative. The following is an impersonal construction (III) in which the cause NP should be interpreted as accusative because the predicate does not agree with it:

- (10) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]:
 a. þonne hreoweð hyre swiðe þa yfelan dæda
 then rues(Sg) her(Dat) very-much the(Nom/Acc-Pl) evil deeds
 'then she rues of the evil deeds very much' (C: HomS 4 (FörstVerchHom 9) 80)
 b. hælend þa tosomne cliopade leorneras his cwæp mec hreoweþ
 lord then together called learners his said me rues(Sg)
 þas mengu
 these people(Nom/Acc-Pl)
 'then the Lord called his disciples to him and said, "I feel sorry for these people"'
 (C: MtG1(Ru) 15.32)

The syntactic frame IV is not found in our corpus. Elmer (1981) explicitly states that there is no genuine evidence in OE of transitive use as in a putative **he hreoweþ þa dæd*.

A finite clause is very frequently found in non-nominative constructions (V) as follows:

- (11) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]:
 Hreaw hine swiðe þæt he folcmægþa fruman aweahte
 rued him(Acc) much that he nations first-born aroused
 'he repented much that he had stirred to life the first-born of the nations' (Gen 1276)

Compared to this, the finite clause is not found with a nominative (VI) in our corpus. Elmer also finds no occurrences of these.

⁷The surface forms surveyed are: hreow, hreowan, hreowen, hreoweþ, hreowþ.

The nonfinite clause does not occur with *hreowan* either in non-nominative constructions (VII) or personal constructions (VIII). It is contrasted with the fact that S[Fin] is very commonly found in the same non-nominative constructions. This contrast tells us that to consider both finite and nonfinite clauses as one general class fails to capture an important fact about impersonals.

The non-impersonal causative meaning of the verb *hreowan* 'to cause sorrow, depress' is also found as follows:

(12) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]:

Gif ðu onгите ðæt him his synna hreowan
 if thou understand that him(Dat) his sin(Nom/Acc, Pl) rue(Pl)
 'if you understand that his sins cause him sorrow' (BT: L.de Cf 2)

In sum, *hreowan* is apparently found in all types (i), (ii), and (iii) of Fischer and van der Leek (1983). Further inspection, however, shows that it selects more varieties of categories as a cause argument (i.e. NP[Gen], NP[Acc] and S[Fin], but not S[Nnf]) when the verb occurs in impersonal constructions than when it occurs in personal constructions (i.e. only NP[Gen]). It is also interesting that both personal constructions with the receptive meaning 'to regret, repent' of the verb like (9) and causative constructions with causative meaning 'depress' like (12) are found in the same stage.

3.2 *sceamian*⁸

The genitive NP is very frequently found with *sceamian* both in impersonal (13) and personal constructions (14):

(13) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]

- a. Martiri ne sceamode ðe min ofer eorðan, ne me
 Martyrius, not shamed thee I(Gen) on earth, nor me
 ne sceamað þin on heofonum
 not shames thou(Gen) in heaven
 'Martyrius, you were not ashamed of me on earth, nor will I be ashamed of you in heaven' (ÆCHom i. 336.20)
- b. Oft ðone gebyldegestan scamap ðæs siges
 often the most-patient(Acc) shames the victory(Gen)
 'often the most patient man is ashamed of the victory' (CP 227.19)

(14) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]]

- a. Ic ðæs næfre ne sceamige
 I(Nom) that(Gen) never not shame
 'I am not ashamed of that' (BT: Ps.Th. 24.1)
- b. ðios sæ cwipð ðæt ðu ðin scamige Sidon
 the sea says that thou(Nom) thyself(Gen) be-ashamed Sidon
 'the sea tells you to be ashamed of yourself, Sidon' (CP 409.33)

But no genuine accusative cause is found other than some indeterminate cases in either impersonal or personal constructions.⁹

⁸The surface forms surveyed are: *sceamap*, *sceamian*, *sceamiaþ*, *sceamie*, *sceamien*, *sceamode*, *sceamaþ*, *scamian*, *scamiaþ*, *scamie*, *scamien*, *scamode*, *scamodon*.

⁹The following example might be a candidate for an impersonal construction:

Ʒeal þæt hwæne sceamode scylda on woruide, þæt ...

A finite clause very often occurs in non-nominative constructions as in (15). It is also found in personal constructions as in (16):

(15) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]

- a. hy scamaþ ðæt hy betan heora misdæda
 they(Acc) shames that they compensate for their misdeeds
 'they are ashamed to make up for their misdeeds' (BT)
- b. þæt mænigne mon sceamaþ þæt he wiorðe wyrsa
 that many(Acc) man shames that he become worse
 'that many a man is ashamed that he would become worse' (C: Bo 30.69.11)

(16) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]]

- gif we scomiaþ ðæt we to uncuðum monnum suelc sprecn
 if we shame that we to unknown men such speak
 'if we are ashamed to speak so to strangers' (CP 63.5)

A nonfinite clause is found only in non-nominative constructions in our corpus, but not in personal constructions:

(17) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]

- a. Ac me sceamað nu to gereccenne hu...
 but I(Dat/Acc) shames now to recount how
 'but I am ashamed now to recount how...' (LS (MaryofEgypt) 2.327)
- b. Us sceamað to secgenne ealle ða sceandlican wiglunga
 we(Dat/Acc) shames to say all the disgraceful witchcraft
 'we are ashamed to say all the disgraceful witchcraft' (LS (Auguries) 1.100)

Elmer's list shows no instances of causative meaning of *sceamian*, but we find the following ambiguous example:

(18) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]

- ?And heora æfstu eac ealle sceamien¹⁰
 and their hatreds(Nom/Acc-Pl) also all(Nom/Acc-Pl) shame(Pl)
 'and their hatreds would also cause all to feel shame' (PPs 69.4)

This example is indeterminate between causative construction (IX) and [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] (IV) because both *æfstu* and *ealle* can be nominative and accusative. Since both these two types are not found with genuine examples in our corpus, it seems totally indeterminate. However, the fact that personal usage like (IV) was very limited in OE in

all that one(Acc) shamed(Sg) fault(Nom/Acc/Gen-Pl) in world that
 'all of the guilty acts in the world which one was ashamed that ...' (C: JDay ii. 141)

However, *scylða* is more likely to be a genitive in the context given.

For personal construction, the following indeterminate example is found:

?hi ne scamodon spræca his ofer ele
 they(Nom/Acc) not shamed(Pl) speech(Nom/Acc/Gen-Pl) their over oil
 'they were not ashamed of their words over oil (?)'

<- Molliti sunt sermones eius super oleum (His words became softened more than oil) (PsGII(Oess) 54.22)
 Since the OE glosses do not exactly match those of Latin, it is probably the mistake of the glossator in word-to-word translation and thus this example is problematic because of its probable ungrammaticality as well as indeterminacy.

¹⁰From here on, I use "?" for the sentences indeterminate in grammatical cases or questionable for various reasons.

general while causative usage like (IX) is used in a later stage may lead us to conclude that (18) belongs to a causative construction.

Granted this example, the verb *sceamian* would be said to occur in all three types of constructions of Fischer and van der Leek (1983)— impersonal (type i), personal (type iii) and causative (type ii).

3.3 *eglian* ¹¹

In our corpus, *eglian* is not found with any genuine genitive. Also, no genuine accusative cause is found in impersonal constructions except for some examples indeterminate from the nominative cause.¹² As a candidate for a personal construction, we find a single example as follows:¹³

- (19) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
 ?Se man se ðe unclæne neat þigeð for his þearfum, ne eglað þæt nawiht
 the man who unclean cattle consume for his needs, not ails that nothing
 'the person who consumes unclean meals for his needs, will suffer nothing'
 (C: Conf 1.1(Spindler) 399)

The finite clause occurs with *eglian* only in non-nominative constructions, whereas nonfinite clauses are found neither in non-nominative (VII) nor in personal (VIII) constructions:

- (20) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 Him [Cain] eglde ðæt he [Abel] wæs betra ðonne he
 he(Dat) ailed that he was better than he
 'he was troubled that he was better than he' (CP 235. 8)

The cause nominative NP is very commonly found with *eglian* as in (21):

- (21) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
 a. þæt he us eglan moste
 that he(Nom) us(Dat/Acc) ail might
 'that he might trouble us' (BT: Jud 185)
 b. Him næfre syððan seo adl ne eglode
 him(Dat) never since the illness not ailed
 'the illness never ailed him afterwards' (BT: Guth 60.8)

¹¹The surface forms surveyed are: eglap, eglde, egle, eglede, eglep, eglían, eglige, eglode.

¹²In the following example, *nan ðing* is indeterminate between the nominative and the accusative:
 him nan ðing wið innan ne eglað ænigre brosnunge oððe gewæcednysse
 him(Dat) no thing(Nom/Acc) within not ails any(Dat/Gen) corruption or weakness
 'nothing pains him within [it] of any corruption or weakness' (C: ÆCHom ii, 43 321.95)

However it is more likely that *nan ðing* is a nominative because the genuine nominative cause is found significantly in other instances.

¹³Since this is the only example in which the verb *eglian* is ever used in personal constructions and also the text itself is a translation from Latin, it is not certain whether this represents a genuine usage of the nominative experiencer *se man* with the accusative cause *þæt* or the matrix clause is type (i/iii) with *þæt* referring to the former clause.

Except for (19) which is a translation from Latin, the causative construction is dominant for *eglian* in OE. Even possible impersonal constructions are rarely found only with nonfinite but not with other categories.

3.4 *lician*¹⁴

Although Denison notes that no genuine occurrences of the genitive NP are found, we can see the following example as candidates.¹⁵ The genitive is only found in impersonal constructions:

- (22) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]
 Petrus cwæð, wel me licað þæs þe þu sægst
 Petrus said well I(Dat/Acc) likes that(Gen) that you say
 'Peter said: it pleases me well what you say' (C: GD 1(H) 4.20.4)
 [cf. Petrus cwæð: wel me licað þæt(Acc) þu sægst. (C: GDPref 3(C) 34.246.17)
 Petrus cwæð: me licað þæt þæt(Acc) þu sægst. (C: GD 2(H) 3.108.22)]

The accusative is found only in impersonal constructions (23) and no genuine example is found for personal constructions in our corpus.¹⁶ In (23) *þa* cannot be a nominative because if it were, it would cause the verb to take the plural form to agree with it:

- (23) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]
 ac wel licað wuldres drihtne, þa þe hine him
 but well likes(Sg) glory lord(Dat) those(Acc-Pl) who him them
 ondrædað dædum and wordum
 dread deeds and words
 'but the Lord of glory is well pleased with those who fear him in their deeds and speeches' (PPs 146.12)

A finite clause is found only in non-nominative constructions:

- (24) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 þa licade hire ... þæt heo wolde þa baan up adon
 then liked her (Dat/Acc) that she would the bones up take
 'then she liked to take up the bones' (BT: Ælfred Bede 292.5)

¹⁴The surface forms surveyed are: *lician*, *liciaþ*, *licie*, *licien*, *licodan*, *licode*, *licodon*, *licap*.

¹⁵Denison (1990:114) incorrectly states that the *Concordance* leads to perhaps four example of type (i) (*ge-lician*), all of which have the cause argument apparently in the accusative not in the genitive. Others have a sentential cause, or a nominal cause indeterminately nominative or accusative and are thus ambiguous between types (i) and (ii). Elmer's (1981) survey also shows that this verb is never found in the syntactic frame of [NP[Dat]-NP[Gen]] in later stages, either.

¹⁶Only indeterminate sentences such as the following are found:

?we a worhton, ... georne þæt God licode
 we ever did earnestly what(Nom/Acc) God(Nom/Acc) liked(Sg)
 'we always have done earnestly what God liked (we always have done earnestly what pleased God)'
 (C: WHom 13 77)

Since both *þæt* and *God* are totally indeterminate, this can be analyzed to three possibilities: i) impersonal with the accusative cause *þæt*, ii) causative meaning 'please' treating *þæt* as nominative and *God* as accusative, iii) personal with receptive meaning 'like' (i.e. personal) treating *God* as nominative and *þæt* as accusative (i.e. transitive use). Since except for possibility (iii) genuine usage of (i) and (ii) is found, we may conclude that this example belongs to (i) or (ii), but not to (iii).

Similarly a nonfinite clause is also found only in non-nominative constructions in our corpus:

- (25) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 þe licode mid him to beonne
 you(Dat/Acc) liked(Sg) with them to be
 'you liked to be with them' (C: Ps 43.5)

Nominative NPs with causative meaning are found in numerous instances as in (26):

- (26) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
 a. Æghwylc man ... þurh gode dæda Gode lician sceal
 every person(Nom) through good deeds God(Dat) like shall
 'Everyone shall please God through good deeds' (BIHom 129.33)
 b. forþam hy þe þa licodon
 because they(Nom-Pl) you(Dat/Acc) then liked(Pl)
 'because they then pleased you' (C: Ps 43.5)

In sum, *Lician* is used in various syntactic frames when it is used without a nominative. For personal usage, a single instance is found in our corpus, also cited by Fischer and van der Leek (1983:352) as a crucial example for personal usage of impersonal verbs in general, along with a prepositional phrase:

- (27) ?þu eart sunu min leof, on þe ic wel licade
 you are one my dear in whom/thee I well liked
 'you are my dear son in whom I was well pleased' (Mark; Skeat 1871-87: 11)
 <- Tu es filius meus dilectus, in te complacui.

However, since this reflects word-to-word (literal) translation from Latin, we cannot be so sure if this is a normal OE expression. Thus, it is notable that causative usage with the meaning of 'to please' is much more commonly found than personal usage with the meaning of 'to like; to be pleased'.

3.5 *langian*¹⁷

In general, the occurrences are very limited and the non-impersonal usage is hardly found. The genitive NP is found in impersonal constructions as follows:

- (28) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]
 a. Hine þæs heardost langode hwanne he ...
 him(Acc) that(Gen) eagerly longed when he
 'he eagerly longed for the time when he...' (BT: BIHom 227.1)
 b. Me a langað þæs þe ic þe on byssum hyndum wat
 me(Dat/Acc) ever longs that(Gen) that I you in this affliction know
 'I am always distressed by the fact that I know you being afflicted' (BTs: Seel 154)

But in our corpus no genuine accusative cause is found.¹⁸ Nor are the finite and nonfinite clauses. The causative construction (IX) is not found either.

¹⁷The surface forms surveyed are: *longaþ*, *langian*, *langiaþ*, *langode*, *langaþ*. *Langian* is found to occur with prepositional phrases having *on*, *for*, *æfter*.

¹⁸Only some indeterminate examples between nominative and accusative are found. The following is a possible candidate:

The following is ambiguous between personal and impersonal constructions because *hæleð* can be either a nominative or accusative:

- (29) ?hæleð langode, wægliðende, swilce wif heora, hwonne hie ...
 hero(Nom/Acc) longed seafarers likewise wives their when they
 'the hero, the seafarers and their wives also, yearned for when...' (C: GenA,B 1431)

Since genuine impersonal constructions are found while personal constructions are not, it is safer to presume (29) is impersonal. Then we can conclude that a personal construction was not used with this verb in OE. It is notable that *langian* is not found with a causative meaning while the other verbs above are.

3.6 *lystan*¹⁹

A genitive cause is commonly found with *lystan* in both impersonal and personal constructions as follows:

- (30) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]]
 a. ðises me lyst nu get bet
 this(Gen) me(Dat/Acc) pleases/is pleased now yet better
 'I am still better pleased with this' (BT: Bt 35.4)
 b. hine nanes þinges ne lyste
 him(Acc) none(Gen) thing(Gen) not pleased/was pleased in this world
 'he cared for nothing in this world' (BT: Bt 35.6)

- (31) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]]
 seo sawl þyrsteð and lysteð Godes reces
 the soul(Nom) thirsts and desires God's kingdom(Gen)
 'the soul thirsts and desires the kingdom of God' (BTs: Gr.D 244.27)

We find the following examples with accusative cause in impersonal constructions only:

- (32) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]
 a. þu lufast þone wisdom swa swiðe and þe lyst hine swa wel
 you love the wisdom so much and you(Dat/Acc) desires it(Acc) so well
 'you love the wisdom so much and you want it so much' (C: Solil 1 42.17)
 b. Hu ðone cealdan magan ungeliclice mettas lyste
 how the cold stomach(Acc) different food(Acc-Pl) desired(Sg)
 'how the cold stomach wanted different meals' (BTs:Lch.ii.160,8)

?Langað þe awuht, Adam, up to gode?
 Longs you anything(Nom/Acc) Adam up from God
 'Do you long for anything, Adam, from God above?' (C: GenA,B 495)

However, since *awuht* above can be also regarded as an adverb, this kind of example is really questionable. A transitive use (i.e. with the nominative subject and accusative object) is found with *langian* but with a slightly different meaning (i.e. 'to summon'). BT glosses this as a separate item:

Him com to Godes ængel and cwæð þæt he sceolde þe him to langian
 him came to God's angel and said that he should you(Dat/Acc) him to call
 and þine lare gehyran
 and your teaching hear
 'God's angel came to him and said that he should summon you to him and hear your teaching'
 (C: ÆLS (Peter's Chair) 121)

¹⁹The surface forms surveyed are: list, listan, listen, lyst, lyste, lysteþ, lyston, lystþ.

A finite clause is found in the impersonal construction only as follows:

- (33) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 a. me lyste bet þ þu me sædest
 me(Dat/Acc) desired better that you me said
 'I was pleased better that you told me...' (BT: Bt 34.6)
 b. me lysteþ, Petrus, þæt ic nu gyt sæcge fela
 me(Dat/Acc) desires Peter that I now get say much
 'Peter, I am pleased that I still now say a lot...' (C: GD 2(C) 36.174.27)

A nonfinite clause is found both impersonal and personal constructions as follows:

- (34) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]
 a. Hine ne lyst his willan wyrcean
 him(Acc) not desires his will to work
 'he does not want to do his will' (BT: BIHom 51.16)
 b. him lyst gehyran þa halgan lare
 him(Dat) desires hear the holy teaching
 'he wishes to hear the holy doctrine' (C: ÆLet 2(Wulfstan 1) 5)

- (35) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]
 fela manna of manegum scirum geornlice lyston hine geseon
 many men from many provinces eagerly desired him see
 'many people from many provinces eagerly wished to see him' (C: GD 1(H) 16.45.19)

For type IX, no genuine example of a nominative cause is found in our corpus. In sum, *lystan* occurs in two types of constructions — impersonal, personal although in each type the categories that the verb selects are different.

3.7 Discussion

The following is the list of the different syntactic frames selected by each impersonal verb (I do not list the frames that are totally indeterminate because of case syncretism and "?" is used for the data which has or can be suspected because it is rarely found and only in Latinate syntax):

- (36) 1. Hreowan
 I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]] : type (i)
 II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]] : type (iii)
 III. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Acc]] : type (i)
 V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
 IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Nom]] : type (ii)
 2. Sceamian
 I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]] : type (i)
 II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]] : type (iii)
 V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
 VI. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]] : type (iii)
 VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (i/ii)
 IX. (?) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Nom]] : type (ii)
 3. Eglan
 IV. (?) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Acc]] : type (iii)
 V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| IX. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] | : | type (ii) |
| 4. Lician | | |
| I. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]] | : | type (i) |
| III. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]] | : | type (i) |
| V. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] | : | type (i/ii) |
| VII. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] | : | type (i/ii) |
| IX. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] | : | type (ii) |
| (?) (personal) | : | type (iii) |
| 5. Langian | | |
| I. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]] | : | type (i) |
| 6. Lystan | | |
| I. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP [Gen]] | : | type (i) |
| II. [NP ₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Gen]] | : | type (iii) |
| III. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]] | : | type (i) |
| V. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] | : | type (i/ii) |
| VII. [NP ₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] | : | type (i/ii) |
| VIII. [NP ₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] | : | type (iii) |

We see in the above that not all the verbs take all three types of constructions. This is opposed to the generalizations or assumptions by Anderson (1986), Fischer and van der Leek (1983) and Lightfoot (1991). And there is no single verb that exactly exhibits Fischer and van der Leek (1983)'s syntactic frame in (4). Even the verb *hreowan* that has been treated as a typical example does not exactly allow for all syntactic frames of each of three types in (4). For example, their category S', which is also treated as type S in Elmer (1981), is too general to capture the difference in the occurrences of finite and nonfinite clauses for each verb. *Hreowan*, for example, varies in the cooccurrence with finite and nonfinite clauses: It occurs with finite, but not with nonfinite clauses. And even the finite clause occurs only in the non-nominative (type i/ii) construction, but not in the personal constructions. In this respect, Fischer and van der Leek (1983)'s formalization in (4ii) and (4iii) is an overgeneralization (i.e. S' must not occur in those frames for *hreowan*).

It is notable that when a verb selects a clause in the non-nominative construction, it must be S[Fin] rather than S[Nnf], because the data shows that if S[Nnf] can occur with a verb, S[Fin] can always occur. However the finite clause does not occur with all the impersonal verbs: *langian* is not found with any type of clause. In general, the occurrence of the genuine accusative cause is very rare compared to that of the genitive cause. Thus, different verbs behave differently with respect to the cooccurrence with a particular category. And the distribution of this category even differs according to which type of construction it occurs in. Fischer and van der Leek (1983)'s type ii (i.e. causative meaning) is appropriate for some of the impersonal verbs (e.g. *hreowan*, *eglian*, *lician*, *sceamian* (?)), but not for the others. Similarly Fischer and van der Leek's type iii (i.e. personal) is appropriate for some of the impersonal verbs (e.g. *hreowan*, *sceamian*, *lystan*, *eglian*(?), *lician*(?)), but not for the others (e.g. *langian*).

As seen in (36), impersonal verbs behave so diversely in their syntactic frames that they cannot be collapsed into a single basic frame as done in generative approaches. Only a single common feature is shared that keeps this group of verbs distinct from others: They are all able to occur without the nominative with the Dat/Acc personal experiencer.²⁰

²⁰Therefore, this group of verbs constitutes a syntactic constellation. The idea of morphological constellation has been originally proposed in Janda and Joseph (1990) where the various members are linked

4. Divergent syntactic frames for ME impersonal verbs

One of the notable changes between OE and ME is the collapse of the morphological case system. Due to this syncretism in ME, the NP[Gen] is not found except for the possessive. The NP[Gen] elsewhere in OE gives way to prepositional phrase with *of* (i.e. PP[*of*]). For this reason we can find PP[*of*] in ME in distributions similar to OE NP[Gen]. The ME data in the following are mainly from the Middle English Dictionary (MED).

4.1 *reuen*

The prepositional phrase with *of* occurs in both impersonal and personal constructions as follows:²¹

- (37) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP [*of*]]
- himm reoweþþ off hiss aþhenn woh & off hiss aþhenn sinne
'he repents his own wickedness and his own sin' (c1200 *Orm*. 5566)
 - of auelok rewede him ful sore
'he was sorry very much for Haveloc' (c1300 *Havelok* 503)
 - hir rewed of hir self ful sare, and haued for hir sin slic kare
'she was sorry for her self very sorely and had such a care for her sin'
(a1400(c1300) *NHom. (1) Magd.*p.15)
- (38) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP [*of*]]
- no man shal rewe of thy misfare
'no man shall repent your ill-faring' (a1450 *Yk.Pl.*39/115)
 - my herte rwyth sore of the deth of hir that lyeth yondir
'my heart sorely pities her death who lies yonder' (a 1470 *Malory Wks.* 118/24)

Because of the syncretism between the nominative and the accusative in non-pronominals, a unambiguous accusative is hardly found in the impersonal construction. However, in the personal construction the transitive use are commonly found with alleged accusative NPs on the assumption that no double nominative is possible in English.

- (39) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
- we schold rew þat sore
'we should repent that sorely' (a1325 *Swet ihc hend* p.81)
 - God forbede that al a compaignye sholde rewe a synguler mannes folye
'God forbade that all the company should repent a single man's folly'
(c1395 *Chaucer CT.CY.* G.997)

to one another in some features but kept distinct from one another from other features. Refer to Välimaa-Blum (1988) for syntactic constellation of Finnish word order.

²¹The cause can occur in other PPs such as with *on* (upon), *for*. In an impersonal, the following is found:

þe tiding com wiþ care to blancheflour...for hir me rewep sare
'the time has come with care to whiteflower... for her I rue sorely' (c1330(?a1300) *Tristrem* 216)

In personal construction with the nominative we find the following:

Iesu crist .. thu rew vpon me
'Jesus Christ, have mercy on me' (c1250 *Ar ne kute* 8)

Noyt for his syn he sore rewys
'not for his sin he rues sorely' (c1450(a1425) *MOTest.* 18346)

As in OE, a finite clause occurs with this verb only in non-nominative constructions, not in personal constructions:

- (40) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
a. himm reoweþþ þat he dwelleþþ her swa swiþe lange orin eorþe
'he repents that he detains her so very long on earth' (c1200 *Orm.* 5576)
b. þe wile sare rewen þat tu ðe seluen ne haddest ...
'you will sorely repent that you yourself have not...'
(a1225(c1200) *Vices & V.* (1) 65/3)

Also as in OE, *reuen* is hardly found with nonfinite clause in ME. Just one example of personal construction is found in MED as a possibility:

- (41) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]
lete us plesyn hym tyl þat he rewe in hell to hangyn hye
'let us please him until he repents to be hanging high in hell' (a1450 *Castle Perseu.* 723)

Nominative causes with the causative meaning 'to displease' of this verb are also found in ME as in OE:

- (42) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
a. Alle hie wepeð and wonið ... Hi me reweð swa swiðe þat ic reste ne mai habben
'they all weep and woe... they displease me so much that I cannot take a rest'
(c1225(c1200) *Vices & V.*(1) 155/14)
b. I wott I have done wrang; þat sayng rewys me sore
'I know I have done wrong; to say so displeases me sorely'
(c1450(a1425) *MOTest.* 15154)

In sum, the verb *reuen* can have all three types of constructions — impersonal, personal and causative — in ME.

4.2 *shamen*

The PP[of] cause occurs in both impersonal (43) and personal constructions (44):²²

- (43) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP [of]]
a. him sholde shamen of him
'he will be ashamed of himself' (a1225(?a1200) *Trin.Hom.* 73)

²²The cause can occur as other PPs involving the prepositions *for*, *with* in both impersonal and personal constructions as follows:

- a. (impersonal)
For þaim ne sal þe scam na mar
'you shall be ashamed no more for them' (a1400(a1325) *Cursor* 23498)
Me shames with my lyghame!
'I am ashamed of my body' (a1450 *Yk.Pl.* 25/110)
- b. (personal)
þan schames nane with þair kyn, bot all may þam schame with þair syn, and with þair full pryde.
'then nobody is ashamed of their race, but all may shame themselves with their sin and with their full pride'
(c1450(?a1400) *Quatref.Love* 479-80)
þat schamez for no schrewedschyp, schent mot he worþe
'the one that is not ashamed of any wicked behavior, may he become disgrace'
(c1400(?c1380) *Cleanness* 580)

b. of þine sinnes me mai somen and of þine redes
'I may be ashamed of your sins and your frailty' (c1250 *Body & S* (4) 46)

(44) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP [of]]

- a. and shame thei of alle thingus that thei diden
'and they are ashamed of all things that they did' ((c1384) *WBible (I)* Ezek.43.11)
b. þai salle swa schame ay of þair syn
'they will always be ashamed of thier sin' (a1425(a1400) *PConsc.* 7159)

A transitive use is commonly found in the personal construction:

(45) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]

- a. nyie thou schame the witnessing of oure Lord Jhesu
'you are never to be ashamed of witnessing to our Lord Jesus'
(c1384) *WBible(1)* 2 Tim.1.8)
b. whoso shameþ me and my wordis bifore men, I shal shame him bifore my fadir þat
is in heuene
'whoever is ashamed of me and my words before men, I shall be ashamed of him
before my father that is in heaven. (c1400 *7 Gifts HG* 153)

A finite clause is often found in both non-nominative (46) and personal constructions (47):

(46) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]

- a. vninete[read: vnimete] me scomeð þat hem[read: he] ...
unmeasurably I am ashamed that he ...' (Lay. Brut 12487: a1225(?a1200))
b. Hym schameþ þat hys lynage is so lowe
'he is ashamed that his lineage is so low' (c1450(1410) *Walton Boeth.* p.83)

(47) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]]

- a. ne ssame 3e noȝt þat ...
'you are not ashamed that ...' (a1325(c1300) *Glo. Chron.* A 7441)
b. Alle his bretheren schamyd that so noble a persoun schuld be putt with lewde-men
'all his brothers were ashamed that such a noble person should be put with ignorant
men' (a1500(?c1425) *Spec. Sacer* 48/4:)

A nonfinite clause is often found in both non-nominative (48) and personal constructions (49):

(48) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]

- a. Me shameþ for to begge
'I am ashamed to beg' (a1425 *Wycl.Serm.* 1.22)
b. Me shamed at that tyme to have more ado with you
'I was ashamed at that time to have more trouble with you'
(a1470) *Malory Wks.* 443/25)

(49) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]

- a. I shamed to asken of þe king foote men & horsemen in felashipe of grace
'I am ashamed to ask of the king the footmen and horsemen in the fellowship of
grace' ((a1382) *WBible (I)* (Bod 959) 3 Esd.8.52)
b. Thei shameden for to shewe to hem self her coueitise
'they were ashamed to show their covetness to themselves'
(c1384) *WBible(I)* Dan. 13.11)

The nominative cause with the causative meaning 'to disgrace' of the verb is also found:

- (50) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
 a. He hauede him so shamed
 'He had him(self) so disgraced' (c1300) *Havelok* 2754)
 b. Wolt thou shame thyselff?
 'will you disgrace yourself?' ((a1470) *Malory Wks.* 1122/9)

In sum, the verb *shamen* also occurs in all three types of constructions in ME although the categories that they select vary.

4.3 *eilen*

The cause argument of PP[of] is not found with *eilen* in MED. Like other verbs, no genuine accusative cause is found in impersonal constructions. But in both causative constructions (51a) and personal constructions (51b), the accusative cause is used along with the nominative subject:

- (51) a. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
 Him e3leþ se blodrine
 'the bleeding troubles him' (c1150)?OE) *PDidax* 49/1)
 b. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
 And asked hym what he eyled
 'and asked him what he was troubled with'
 (1485(a1470) *Malory Wks.* (Caxton:Vinaver) 1258/3)

No instances of finite clauses and nonfinite clauses are found in MED with *eilen*.²³ The above example (51a) shows that the nominative *se blodrine* is a cause providing the causative meaning 'to trouble' to the verb. In sum, unlike *reuen* and *shamen*, *eilen* does not show impersonal usage in ME.

4.4 *liken*

PP[of] is (rarely) found with *liken* both in impersonal constructions (52) and personal constructions (53):²⁴

- (52) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP [of]]
 Of that syght lykyd hym full yll
 'that sight pleased him so badly' (a1500 *Tundale*(Adv) 1033)

²³Some infinitive clauses are found with *what*. Without *what*, we can say the following example is impersonal. But with *what*, the infinitive is a result rather than a cause:

Alas, wat eiled vs to slepe þat we ne micht him notht kepe?
 'Alas, what troubled us to sleep so that we could not keep him?' (a1325(?c1300) *NPass.* [911])

²⁴*Liken* occurs with the cause with other prepositions such as *in* and *bi* in impersonal or personal constructions:

a. [impersonal]
 Howe lyke yowe be þys mayde younge?
 'how do you like this young maiden?' (a1500(a1450) *Parson.* (1) (Add) 5452))
 b. [personal]
 þer may no man be saf but if he loue and lyke in þe name of Ihesu
 'there no man may be safe but he loves and like in the name of Jesus'
 (?a1475(a1396) *Hilton *SP* 1.44.28b)

- (53) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP [of]]
 a. Som man mai lyke of that I wryte
 'a certain man may like what I write' (a1393)Gower *CA* prol.21)
 b. Of this message he liked yll
 'he liked this message badly' (a1450 Gener.(1) 3124)

The accusative cause is found in both impersonal (54) and personal constructions (55):

- (54) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]
 a. Sei me, loueli lemman, how likes þe me nowþe?
 'tell me, lovely mistress, how do you like me now?' (a1375 *WPal.* 1740)
 b. So wel vs liketh yow ... that we ne kouden nat ...
 'we like you so well ... that we could not ...' ((c1395) Chaucer *CT.Cl.* E.106)
 c. The more that a man beheld hym, the bettre hym schuld like hym
 'the more a man beheld him, the better he should like him' (c1450 Ponthus 12/9)

- (55) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
 a. Syr Launfal lykede her not ...
 'sir Launfal did not like her ...' (a1500(?1400) Chestre *Launfal* 44)
 b. [The Sultan] lekid hym right wele
 'the Sultan liked him just well' (a1500(a1450) Gener.(2) 661)

A finite clause is found in both non-nominative and personal constructions:

- (56) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 Me likez þat sir Lucius launges aftyre sorowe
 'I was pleased that sir Lucius is preoccupied with sorrow'
 (c1440 (?a1400) *Morte Arth.* (1) 383)
- (57) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]]
 God liketh nat that Raby men vs calle
 'God is not pleased that Raby men call us' ((c1395) Chaucer *CT.Sum.* D.2187)

Along with the finite clause, the nonfinite clause is very often found with *liken* in both non-nominative (58) and personal constructions (59):

- (58) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]
 a. Hym likiþ ... for to lovuen Him
 'he likes ... to love Him' (?a1475(a1396) *Hilton *SP* 1.29.18a)
 b. Me liketh nat to lye
 'I do not like to stay' ((a1420) Lydg. *TB* 4.1815)
- (59) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]
 a. As myn auctour liketh to devise
 'as my author likes to devise' ((?c1421) Lydg. *ST* 1003)
 b. 3e þat louen & lyken to listen
 'you love and like to listen' (a1375 *WPal.* 162)

The nominative cause is also found with the causative meaning 'to please' of the verb:

- (60) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]
 a. Drihtin wel ma33 don All þat himm selfenn likeþþ.
 'Lord may do well all that pleases himself' (?c1200 *Orm.* 9912)

- b. *pis holi mihte, hit te wile likin be nihte oðer be daiȝe.*
 this holy might, it will please you by night or by day'
 (a1225(c1200) *Vices & V. (1) 85/25*)
- c. *To don al that may like unto youre herte*
 'to do all that may please your heart' (a1425(c1385) Chaucer *TC 5.133*)

In sum, the verb *liken* is found in all types of constructions and select all types of categories in question.

4.5 *longen*

PP[of] is not found either in impersonal or in personal constructions.²⁵ The accusative cause is rarely found except the following example which is indeterminate whether the usage is impersonal or personal. But it is more likely that *long* is a transitive verb here because the accusative in impersonal constructions are very infrequent in general and no genuine example of this usage is found with *long* throughout its history:

- (61) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]
 ?Say I wylle come when I may And byddith hyr longe no-thinge sare
 'say I will come when I can and bid her to feel sore longing for nothing'
 (a1500 (?a1400) *Morte Arth. (2) 511*)

The cause as a finite clause is found with *longen* in non-nominative constructions, but not in personal constructions:

- (62) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]]
 Somdel hem longed... þt heuene cloue ofte atwo...
 'he somewhat wished that the heaven split often into two'
 (a1350(?c1280) *SLeg.Prol.CV (Ashm) 45*)

Compared to the finite clause, a nonfinite clause is found commonly in both impersonal (63) and personal (64) constructions:

- (63) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]]
 a. *hire longuede with hire broþer to speke*
 'she wanted to speak with her brother' (c1300 *SLeg. (Ld) 198/14*)
 b. *sore has me longed to se þi freli face*
 'I have badly desired to see the noble face' (c1375 *WPal. 4570*)
 c. *sore me longis launcelot to se*
 'sorely I long to see Lancelot' (a1500 (?a1400) *Morte Arth. (2) 543*)

²⁵Other prepositional phrases with *after*, *to* etc. occur in both impersonal and personal constructions:

- a. [impersonal]
swiðe þe longeð after laðe spelle
 'very much thou long for loathful spell' (a1225(?a1200) *Lay. Brut. 15808*)
me longith to youre presense
 'I long for you presence' (a1475 *Ludus C. 357/75*)
- b. [personal]
ich langy so swiðe after Gorloys his wifue
 'I long so much for Gorloy's wife' (c1300 *Lay. Brut (Otho) 18918*)
so longid this lady with lust to the Temple
 'this lady so longed with lust for the temple' (c1450(?a1400) *Destr.Troy 2914*)

(64) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]]

- a. þe cwen...longede for to seon þis meiden
'the queen wanted to see this maiden' (c1225(?c1200) *St.Kath.(1)* 1556)
- b. on a day she gan so sore longe to sen hire sister...
'on a day she began to yearn so sorely to see her sister'
(c1430(c1386) Chaucer *LGW* 2260)

The nominative cause is not genuinely found in MED. In sum, *longen* occurs in potentially impersonal (type *i/ii*) and personal constructions. The occurrence of a nominative cause is not found in our corpus.

4.6 *listen*

Only the NP[Gen] is found in the early period in case of impersonal constructions as follows:²⁶

(65) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP [of]]

- þe hura metes ne lyst
'thou does not want their food' (c1150(?OE) *PDidax* 29/19)

When we assume that *the ladies* is a nominative in the following example, the PP[of] is said to be found in personal constructions:

(66) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP [of]]

- þe leuedis listed noht o [Fr: of] pride
'the ladies did not want the pride' (a1400(a1325) *Cursor* 1791)

Only examples with *what* are found as a possibility as an accusative. Since *what* can be the nominative as well as the accusative, it is indeterminate whether the following example is an impersonal with an accusative cause ([NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]) or a causative construction [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]]:

(67) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]]

- a. tomorwe wol I seye thee what me leste
'tomorrow I will tell thee what I want' ((c1390) Chaucer *CT.ML.* B. 742)
- b. lete hym drynke it with qwat licour þat hym lyst
'let him drink it with what liquer that pleases him' (?a1450 *Agnus Castus .../22*)

However, the fact that a genuine nominative cause is not found in ME nor was it in earlier stages, and that instead an impersonal with an accusative cause existed in earlier stage may lead us to conclude that (67) belongs to the impersonal construction. For personal constructions, we find the following examples:

(68) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]]

- a. If yc list it be lefte, let me wete sone
'if you want it to be left, let me know soon' (c1450(?a1400) *Destr. Troy* 2611)

²⁶The cause can occur as other PPs as in the following impersonal constructions:

schape þy cloute with þi scheres as þe liste affir þe quantite of þe wounde
'make your clothes with you scissors if you wish some amount of wound'
(?a1425 **MS Htrn*, 95 101a/a)

Alls he mare & mare gett, a33 lisse himm afterr mare
'as he has more and more, he always desires more' (c1200 *Orm.* 10220)

b. *qwat þou* [Ashm: þe] list ellys
 'whatelse you desire'

(a1500 *Wars Alex.* (Dub) 1761)

On the assumption that there is no double nominative construction in English, *qwat* must be interpreted as the accusative in (74b). But the fact that *þe* was used interchangeably in another manuscript again raises the issue of the ambiguity of analysis for *qwat*, one possibility as an impersonal, the other as a causative construction.

No finite clause is found as a cause with *listen* in MED. Contrasted to the finite clause, the nonfinite clause is found very often in both non-nominative (69) and personal (70) constructions:

(69) a. He... se33de þatt him listte þa wel etenn off an appell
 'he said that he then wished to eat well from an apple' (?c1200 *Orm.* 8119)

b. For wher as evere him lest to sette, ther is no myht which him may lette
 'For where he ever wishes to remain, there is no power which may let him'
 ((a1393) Gower *CA* 1.37)

(70) a. whan that fortune list to flee, ther may no man the cours of hire withholde
 'when the fortune desires to flee, no man can withstand the course of her'
 ((c1375) Chaucer *CT.Mk.* B. 3185)

b. Who list to have joie and mirth also of love
 'who wishes to have joy and mirth of love' (a1425(?a1400) *RRose* 5028)

As for the nominative cause, no unambiguous data are found. For *listen*, impersonal and personal constructions are found in ME. The fact that OE did not show any unambiguous example of causative constructions and afterward in ME only ambiguous examples involving such as 'what' with indeterminate case are found in ME may lead us to conclude that those ambiguous examples are not really causative constructions.

4.7 Discussion

The following is the list of the different syntactic frames selected by each ME impersonal verb:

(71) 1. Reuen

- I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP[of]] : type (i)
- II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP[of]] : type (iii)
- IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (iii)
- V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
- VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (iii)
- IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] : type (ii)

2. Shamen

- I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP[of]] : type (i)
- II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP[of]] : type (iii)
- IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (iii)
- V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
- VI. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]] : type (iii)
- VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (i/ii)
- VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (iii)
- IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] : type (ii)

3. Eilen

- IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP [Acc]] : type (iii)

- IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] : type (ii)
4. *Liken*
- I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP[of]] : type (i)
 II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP[of]] : type (iii)
 III. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (i)
 IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (iii)
 V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
 VI. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Fin]] : type (iii)
 VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (i/ii)
 VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (iii)
 IX. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Nom]] : type (ii)
5. *Longen*
- IV. (?) [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (iii)
 V. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Fin]] : type (i/ii)
 VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (i/ii)
 VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (iii)
6. *Listen*
- I. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - PP[of]] : type (i)
 II. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - PP[of]] : type (iii)
 III. (?) [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (i)
 IV. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - NP[Acc]] : type (iii)
 VII. [NP₁ [Dat/Acc] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (i/ii)
 VIII. [NP₁ [Nom] - V - S[Nnf]] : type (iii)

In ME too, which particular category a verb can select varies according to whether it occurs in impersonal and personal constructions. For example, *reuen* does not have an accusative in the impersonal but does in the personal construction. *Longen* has a finite clause only in the non-nominative, not in the personal construction. Also, which particular category is selected varies according to different verbs. For example, PP[of] is found with *reuen*, *shamen*, *liken* and *listen*, but not with *eilen* and *longen*. S[Nnf] is found with *reuen*, *shamen*, *liken*, *longen* and *listen*, but not *eilen*.

Moreover, type (ii) of Fischer and van der Leek (1983) is not appropriate for all verbs above: no genuine example of type (ii) is found with *longen* and *listen*. Type (i) is not found for all impersonal verbs, either. For *eilen*, no impersonal construction is found. Type (iii) is now found for all these verbs, of course with some variation depending on what syntactic frames (i.e. which categories) they select.

5. Diachronic account

Based on the corpus we used, the change of the syntactic frames of impersonal verbs between OE and ME is summarized as follows. The following tables show that different verbs historically develop along different lines and at a different pace:

(72)

I. <i>RUE</i>	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	I	III	*
Type ii (causative)	IX	*	*
Type i/ii	V	*	*
Type iii (personal)	II	*	IV, VIII

Not found: VI, VII.

2. SHAME	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	I	*	*
Type ii (causative)	IX	*	*
Type i/ii	V, VII	*	*
Type iii (personal)	II, VI	*	IV, VIII

Not found: III.

3. AIL	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	*	*	*
Type ii (causative)	IX	*	*
Type i/ii	*	V	*
Type iii (personal)	IV	*	*

Not found: I, II, III, VI, VII, VIII.

4. LIKE	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	I, III	*	*
Type ii (causative)	IX	*	*
Type i/ii	V, VII	*	*
Type iii (personal)	with PP(?)	*	II, IV, VI, VIII

5. LONG	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	*	I	*
Type ii (causative)	*	*	*
Type i/ii	*	*	V, VII
Type iii (personal)	*	*	IV(?), VIII

Not found: II, VI, IX.

6. LIST	Cont'd (OE to ME)	Disappear	Appear
Type i (impersonal)	I, III(?)	*	*
Type ii (causative)	*	*	*
Type i/ii	VII	V	*
Type iii (personal)	II, VIII	*	IV

Not found: VI, IX.

One reason for the different line of change is that each verb originally has different syntactic frames in earlier stage. *Ail* has not taken the genitive cause (or its descendent PP[of]) as its complement throughout its history, while the genitive cause (or PP[of]) was very common with the other verbs in both OE and ME. Similarly *ail* has not taken the nonfinite clause at all, while for the personal construction it was newly introduced to *rue*, *shame*, *like* and *long* and continuously used for *list*. Similarly, because *long* and *list* did not have a nominative cause (IX) in OE, it has no way to keep or lose that construction, while the other verbs keep that construction in ME and some of them lose it later.

The three syntactic types (impersonal, personal and causative) do not behave consistently in diachronic change in respect to all impersonal verbs above and all syntactic categories they select. For example, all the categories of type (i) which were used in OE continue to occur with *shame* and *like* in ME, but some categories of type (i) disappear with *rue*, *ail*, *long*

and *list* in ME. So, here we see the gradualness of disappearance of impersonal constructions across different verbs.

One notable phenomenon here is that the accusative cause is on the increasing line along with the increase of the personal construction. We see this from the fact that the accusative is getting lost in impersonal constructions (e.g. *rue*) but newly introduced (e.g. *rue*, *shame*, *like*, *long*(?), *list*) or continuously used (e.g. *ail*) in personal constructions. The finite clause is on the decreasing line in non-nominative constructions (type *i/ii*): it is completely lost in ME for *ail* and *list*.²⁷ In contrast, the nonfinite clause is on the increasing line along with the increase of the personal construction. Here, it seems that a new introduction of the nonfinite clause in the personal construction — with the increase of personal construction in general — is possible when at least a finite clause could occur with the verb at the same time or in an earlier stage.

Examining particular instantiations of impersonal verbs at two historical stages in the above nonetheless shows some trends between OE and ME. We cannot find any verbs and any categories that the verb selects for which a personal construction (type *iii*) disappears through time. A personal construction newly appears or at least continues from OE. As mentioned above, new appearance of personal construction is especially notable with regard to subtype IV (i.e. with the accusative cause) and VIII (i.e. with nonfinite cause). Conversely the impersonal construction (type *i*) in general follows a decreasing line: it disappears or continues from OE—of course with some variation across the syntactic frames.

The causative construction (IX) is intermediate between the two types. It generally continues to exist from OE if it was possible with a certain verb in OE. We find no new introduction or loss of the nominative cause construction in ME. In NE, causative meaning is still available for *ail* (e.g. *what ails him*) and *shame* (e.g. *His son's behavior shamed him very much*). But for the words like *rue*, *like* and *long*, only personal (receptive) meaning is used in NE. In this case, the fact that the nominative cause continuously existed from OE to ME suggests that impersonal constructions began to diminish earlier than causative constructions.²⁸ It seems that the causative outlived the impersonal because the former satisfies a new syntactic constraint of English, that is that the nominative (subjective) case should be obligatory in a sentence and English is not a pro-drop language anymore.

6. Conclusion

This paper focused on how heterogeneous the syntactic distributions of the impersonal verbs are in each synchronic stage of OE and ME. Different impersonal verbs behave differently in terms of their occurrences in particular syntactic frames. Therefore, diachronic change of each verb also varies with regard to particular syntactic frames. The precise details of each syntactic frame may be subject to some revision with more

²⁷An exception is *long* where it is developed. This can be interpreted in two ways: either in OE *long* had a finite clause in non-nominative constructions in OE and just the lack of data did not show it, or ME *long* later developed the finite clause in non-nominative constructions by analogy to other verbs before the other verbs began to lose finite clause in the same construction.

²⁸The causative meaning 'to please' of the verb *like* is found until 19th c. as in the following example from OED:

I rode sullenly upon a certain path that liked me not (Rossetti, Dante & Circ. (1874) I. 41)

The impersonal construction, comparatively, is not found in NE except in the highly fossilized or lexicalized expression such as *me thinks*, for rhetorical reasons.

consideration of new data. Our particularistic approach of this paper, however, proposes the following points:

- i) Contrary to Fischer and van der Leek (1983), Anderson (1986) and Lightfoot (1991), the three syntactic types (i), (ii) and (iii) did not occur to all impersonal verbs. Furthermore Fischer and van der Leek (1983)'s representation of lexical entries is overgeneralized because no single verb exactly matches such lexical entries.
- ii) Fischer and van der Leek (1983)'s account of the relations among three syntactic types by means of move- α is not accurate because the data show that the same verb selects different categories according to whether it occurs in impersonal or personal constructions.
- iii) A data-oriented approach to impersonal verbs shows how the change is gradual and how different verbs change along different lines. Divergent change is in part due to the divergence of the synchronic syntactic frames across the verbs in the previous stage.
- iv) This also gives more dynamic accounts of historical change. We have found that in cases where the impersonal and causative constructions are now both obsolete in NE, the two types had undergone the decay at different time: the impersonal decayed earlier than the causative.

References

- Anderson, J. 1986. A note on Old English impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 22: 167-177.
- Belletti, A., and L. Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and theta-theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6.3: 291-352.
- BT = Bosworth, J., and T. Toller, eds. 1898, 1929, 1954, 1972. *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- BTs = Teller, T., and A. Campbell, eds. 1921, 1955, 1966, 1972. *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*, Supplement. Oxford University Press.
- Denison, D. 1990. The Old English impersonals revived. In *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, ed. S. Adamson, V. Law, N. Vincent and S. Wright. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Denison, D. 1993. *English historical syntax*. London/New York: Longman.
- Elmer, W. 1981. *Diachronic grammar: The history of Old and Middle English subjectless constructions*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Fischer, O., and F. van der Leek. 1983. The demise of the Old English impersonal construction. *Journal of Linguistics* 19: 337-368.
- C = Healey, A., and R. Venezky. 1980. *A microfiche concordance to Old English: the list of texts and index of editions*. University of Toronto.
- Janda, R. D., and B. D. Joseph. (1990 ms.) On constellation in morphology: Crosslinguistic evidence and modern Greek mi(n)(-).
- Jespersen, O. 1909-49. *A modern English grammar on historical principles*, 7 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung/ Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Lightfoot, D. W. 1979. *Principles of diachronic syntax*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, D. W. 1991. *How to set parameters: Arguments from language change*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- MED = Kurath, H. S., S. M. Kuhn, J. Reidy, R. E. Lewis et al., eds. 1952-. *Middle English dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- OED = Murray, J. A. H. et al., eds. 1933. *The Oxford English dictionary*. 12 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Välilmaa-Blum, R. 1988. Finnish word order as a set of syntactic constructions. *ESCOL* '88: 500-511.
- Visser, F. Th. 1963. *An historical syntax of the English language*, vol. I, Leiden: Brill.