言語研究（*Gengo Kenkyu*）**164**: 93–109（2023） doi: 10.11435/gengo.164.0_93

On the Development of Passive Expletive Constructions in the History of English

Shoko Honda
Aichi University

Tomoyuki Tanaka
Nagoya University

Abstract: This paper aims to account for the development of passive expletive constructions (PECs) in the history of English, especially the changing distribution of their associates, in terms of the rise of a functional category Pred(ication), as well as the change of the underlying word order within VP. By extending Tanaka and Yokogoshi's (2010) analysis of small clauses, it is argued that there was a structural change of the small clause complement to *be* in PECs: from the structure lacking a functional category to the structure headed by Pred, which appeared in the fourteenth century and was established in the eighteenth century. The rise and establishment of the PredP structure are shown to be responsible for the fact that the order in which the associate precedes the passive participle became predominant after Late Middle English, finally replacing in the eighteenth century the order in which the associate immediately follows the passive participle, because the latter order can be derived only from the structure without Pred.*

Key words: associate, passive expletive construction (PEC), Pred(ication), small clause, underlying word order

1. Introduction[1]

PDE has a type of *there*-construction with a passive participle which is called *passive expletive construction* (henceforth, PEC). It is well-known that there is a restriction on the position of the associates in PECs (cf. Vikner 1995, Lasnik 1999, Chomsky 2001, Holmberg 2001 among others), as illustrated by the follow-

* Parts of this paper were presented at the symposium of the 89th General Meeting of the English Literary Society of Japan held on May 21, 2017 and the 6th workshop hosted by Language Change and Language Variation Research Unit held on August 16, 2020. We thank the participants for helpful discussion and anonymous reviewers of *Gengo Kenkyu* for their careful reading and constructive comments. Needless to say, any remaining errors are our own.

[1] Here are the historical periods of English generally assumed: Old English (OE: 700–1100), Middle English (ME: 1100–1500), Modern English (ModE: 1500–1900) (Early Modern English (EModE: 1500–1700), Late Modern English (LModE: 1700–1900)), and Present-day English (PDE: 1900–).

ing examples with PP in postverbal position.[2]

(1) a. There were several large packages placed on the table. (NP-V-PP)
b. *There were placed several large packages on the table. (V-NP-PP)
c. There were placed on the table several large packages. (V-PP-NP)
(cf. Chomsky 2001: 20)

They show that the associates in PECs must appear in a position before the passive participle or after the postverbal PP; if they are located between the passive participle and the postverbal PP, that is, they remain in their base positions, it will result in an unacceptable sentence.[3]

On the other hand, it has been observed by some previous studies that there was more freedom in the position of the associates in PECs in early English: V-NP-PP order as in (1b) was possible in ME and EModE.

(2) a. So than there was made grete ordynaunce in thys ire
so then there was made great ordinance in this year
(Malory 17:11 / Breivik 1990: 221)
b. Ther was taken a playnt ayenst hem … for
there was taken a complaint against him … for
taking of the forseyd plowarre at Drayton
taking of the aforesaid ploughware at Drayton
(Mag. Paston in P. Lett. II. 184 / Jonas 1996: 157)

To the best of our knowledge, however, there have been few diachronic studies on PECs in English; especially, no descriptive investigations have been made on the distribution of the associates in PECs that cover all the historical periods of English. Once the historical facts concerning PECs have been revealed, the next task will be to provide a theoretical explanation for their development in the history of English.

The organization of this paper is as follows. After briefly discussing the historical data on PECs given in previous studies, section 2 investigates the development of PECs by employing four historical corpora, paying attention to how the distribution of their associates has changed in the history of English. Section 3 discusses the structural change of small clauses along the lines of Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010), providing a basis for analyzing the development of PECs. Section 4 proposes to account for the changing distribution of the associates in PECs in terms of the rise of a functional category Pred(ication), together with the change of the underlying word order within VP. Section 5 offers concluding remarks.

---

[2] Since Chomsky (1991), it has been standard practice in generative grammar to refer to the logical subject of *there*-constructions as the associate of *there*, because it is associated with *there* and appears in a local relation to it.

[3] Chomsky (2001) argues that English bars surface structures of the form [V-DO] in passive/unaccusative sentences, formulating the ban as a PF filter. However, his analysis of PECs based on this idea is problematic, as we will see in subsection 4.1.

2. Historical data on PECs

Before presenting the result of the investigation based on historical corpora, let us begin by reviewing the information on PECs in early English reported in two previous studies.

2.1. Previous studies

First, Breivik (1990) conducts a descriptive survey on the distribution of existential constructions in the selected texts from OE to EModE, dividing the relevant periods into four: Period I (–1070), Period II (1070–1225), Period III (1225–1425), and Period IV (1425–1550). As for PECs, he has found eleven examples in Period I, two examples in Period II, twenty-seven examples in Period III, and eighty-four examples in Period IV. He does not pay any attention to the position of the associates in PECs, giving only some samples from each period. From this limited source of data, it can be observed that V-NP-PP order was possible in Periods II–IV (see (2a)), and all the orders in (1) were attested in Periods III–IV, when the frequency of PECs increased by making their ways into subordinate clauses.

Although part of Breivik's (1990) data will prove to be useful in filling some gap in the investigation to be conducted in the next subsection, he does not clarify the whole path of the development of PECs, especially the distribution of their associates, in the historical periods investigated. Moreover, he does not deal with the development of existential constructions after 1550, so that it remains to be seen when and how V-NP-PP order has become obsolete by PDE.

Second, in her comparative study of clause structure in Scandinavian and English, Jonas (1996) points out that a range of expletive constructions that are unavailable in PDE were attested in ME. According to her observation on PECs, they allowed at least the orders in (1a, b) (see (2b)), and the order in which the associate immediately follows the passive participle was lost at some time in ModE. However, she does not give any statistical data on the distribution of the associates in PECs in ME and ModE, nor is there any explanation for why they ceased to appear in V-NP-PP order during ModE.

2.2. A corpus-based investigation of the development of PECs

In order to reveal the development of PECs, including the changing distribution of their associates in the history of English, this subsection provides an investigation based on the four historical corpora: *The York-Toronto-Helsinki parsed corpus of Old English prose* (YCOE; Taylor, Warner, Pintzuk, and Beths 2003), *The Penn-Helsinki parsed corpus of Middle English*, Second edition (PPCME2; Kroch and Taylor 2000), *The Penn-Helsinki parsed corpus of Early Modern English* (PPCEME; Kroch, Santorini, and Delfs 2004), and *The Penn parsed corpus of Modern British English* (PPCMBE; Kroch, Santorini, and Diertani 2010).

We have collected examples of PECs like (1) with a postverbal PP and classified them into NP-V-PP, V-NP-PP, and V-PP-NP orders. The reason for restricting the target of investigation to PECs with a postverbal PP is that it cannot otherwise be determined whether the associate which follows the passive participle

remains in its base position or undergoes rightward movement. In fact, it has been reported in the literature that PECs without a postverbal PP may have the associate immediately after the passive participle in PDE, especially when the associate is a heavy NP.

(3) a. There were stolen quite a number of very valuable jewels.
(Bolinger 1977: 103)
b. There were killed some 650 infantry from the 2nd Battalion.
(Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1394)

By counting only examples of PECs with a postverbal PP, it is possible to identify the exact position of their associates. In section 4, it is suggested that examples like (3) are derived by rightward movement of the associates (see Chomsky 2001 for a similar view), because PECs do not allow their associates to remain in their base positions, as we saw in (1b).

The result of the investigation is summarized in Table 1, with examples from OE, ME, EModE, and LModE in (4)–(7), respectively.[4]

Table 1 The frequency of PECs with a postverbal PP tokens (per 500,000 words)

	OE	EME	LME	E1	E2	E3	L1	L2	L3
NP-V-PP	7	2	34	53	51	46	29	16	21
	(2.9)	(3.5)	(26.3)	(46.7)	(40.6)	(42.5)	(39.6)	(26.6)	(38.6)
V-NP-PP	9	0	17	8	4	5	0	1	0
	(3.8)		(13.2)	(7)	(2.4)	(4.6)		(1.7)	
V-PP-NP	6	1	15	20	19	7	6	2	9
	(2.5)	(1.7)	(11.6)	(17.6)	(15.1)	(6.5)	(8.2)	(3.3)	(16.5)

(4) OE
a. NP-V-PP
Þær wæs micel wæl geslagen on ægþere healfe,
there was many people killed on both sides
'There were many people killed on both sides,'
(coorosiu,Or_4:7.99.6.2044: O2)
b. V-NP-PP
and þær wearð siþþan aræred swiðe mære cyrce Gode
and there was afterwards reared very famous church God
to wurðmynte þe wunað á on ecnysee
to honor who lives for ever eternity

[4] The texts in YCOE, PPCME2, PPCEME, and PPCMBE are distributed in the following periods: O1 (–850), O2 (850–950), O3 (950–1050), O4 (1050–1150), M1 (1150–1250), M2 (1250–1350), M3 (1350–1420), M4 (1420–1500), E1 (1500–1569), E2 (1570–1639), E3 (1640–1710), L1 (1710–1779), L2 (1780–1849), and L3 (1850–1920). O1–O4 are collapsed into one, and ME is divided into E(arly)ME (M1 and M2) and L(ate)ME (M3 and M4).

'and afterwards there was a very famous church reared to the honor of God who lives forever' (coaelive, ÆLS_[Oswald]:40.5410: O3)

c. V-PP-NP
Þær wæron gehælede þurh ða halgan femnan fela
there were healed through the blessed woman many
adlige menn, (…)
sick men
'There were healed through the blessed woman many sick men, (…)'
(coaelive, ÆLS_[ÆAthelthryth]:113.4208: O3)

(5) ME

a. NP-V-PP
And þer byeþ moche uolk y-do to dyæþe and to
and there are many folk done to death and to
zenne.
sin (CMAYENBI,47.814: M2)

b. V-NP-PP
And there was made a grete hale in the palysse,
and there was made a great hall in the palace
(CMGREGOR,96.22: M4)

c. V-PP-NP
For he multiplied so bokes þat þere were founde in
For he multiplied so books that there were found in
his librarie at Alisaundre lxx þousand bokes.
his library at Alexander's 120 thousand books
(CMCAPCHR,43.352: M4)

(6) EModE

a. NP-V-PP
There are two papist offisirs put into theire places.
(ALHATTON2-E3-P1,63.17: E3)

b. V-NP-PP
and muskmellions, there hath been cast fiue or sixe carts load of them in one day to their hogs. (JOTAYLOR-E2-P2,3,97.C2.321: E2)

c. V-PP-NP
And the more, because there is met in your Maiesty a rare Coniunction, aswell of diuine and sacred literature, as of prophane and humane; (…)
(BACON-E2-P1,1,2V.21: E2)

(7) LModE

a. NP-V-PP
There was one taken at the same time much smaller, but marked exactly like the great one. (ALBIN-1736,14.362: L1)

b. V-NP-PP
there has been published a full account of the Attorney General's speech in the Observer, a copy of which I hold in my hand.
(WATSON-1817,1,175.2416: L2)

c. V-PP-NP
and that there shall constantly be kept in the office of the accountant-general for the time being, within the city of London, a book or books, wherein (…) (STATUTES-1805,45,554.95: L2)

As shown in Table 1, the frequency of PECs was low in OE and EME, when impersonal passives without *there* were predominant, as illustrated in (8) (Breivik 1990, Kemenade 1997, Ohkado 1998, Tanaka 2002).

(8) Þeah her wæron gebohte twa hund peningwurð hlafes
although here were bought two hundred pennyworth bread's
'though two hundred pennyworth of bread were bought'
(ÆCHom I, 182. 9-10 / Ohkado 1998: 57)

Although no examples of V-NP-PP order have been found in EME in the investigation of Table 1, it would be accidental due to the low frequency of PECs; in fact, the following example from the same period is cited in Breivik (1990). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that all the three orders were available in OE and EME.

(9) Þer is iboren an luttel child; inne þere leoden
there is born a little child in the land
(Laȝamon 4551 / Breivik 1990: 206)

In LME, the frequency of PECs increased with NP-V-PP order taking the lead. Then, there was a radical change in the transition from LME to EModE: NP-V-PP order became the overwhelming majority at the expense of V-NP-PP order, whose frequency dropped substantially. Finally, V-NP-PP order became almost obsolete by the beginning of LModE, leading to the same situation as PDE that NP-V-PP and V-PP-NP are the possible patterns of PECs.

3. The structural change of small clauses

This section discusses the structural change of small clauses in the history of English, basically along the lines of Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010), to provide a basis for analyzing the development of PECs in the next section.

As a point of departure, Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) argue that small clauses in PDE are headed by a functional category Pred(ication) responsible for establishing a predication relation, and assume the following structure originally proposed by Bowers (1993) and later modified by Svenonius (1996).

(10) They consider [$_{\text{PredP}}$ John$_{\text{i}}$ [$_{\text{Pred'}}$ Pred [$_{\text{AP}}$ t_{i} [$_{\text{A'}}$ suitable for the job]]]]

In (10), the small clause subject is base-generated in the specifier of the predicate and moves to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred. There are two pieces of evidence for the PredP analysis of small clauses in PDE. First, Bowers (1993) claims that *as* in small clauses like (11) is a phonetic realization of Pred, thereby providing direct support for the assumption that the category of small clauses is PredP.

(11) a. We regard John as intelligent.
b. I consider Mary as a good student.

Second, the expletive *it* is obligatory in a small clause whose predicate has a clausal complement as its only argument, as shown in (12) (apart from a number of exceptional cases discussed below). This fact follows from the PredP analysis of small clauses, where *it* is obligatorily inserted into [Spec, PredP] if there are no elements to move to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred.

(12) I consider *(it) impossible that John will win the game.

Next, let us consider the structural change of small clauses by examining when the two pieces of evidence for Pred just mentioned became attested in the history of English. First, Tanaka (2003) utilizes the quotation search function of OED to investigate the first occurrences of *as* in small clause complements to five verbs by focusing on the categories of their predicates after *as*. The result is summarized in Table 2, which shows that *as* first appeared in small clauses with an NP predicate around 1300 and it spread to those with an AP predicate thereafter.

Table 2 The distribution of *as* in small clauses

	hold	rate	reckon	regard	take
NP	1297	1568	1387–1388	1607	1340
AP	1456	1796	1709	1706	1380

(cf. Tanaka 2003: 303)

Based on this observation on the rise of *as*, it is concluded that Pred began to appear with some frequency in the fourteenth century, which is also compatible with the historical data provided in Visser (1963–1973: §§660–662).

Second, Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) investigate the distribution of the expletive *it* in small clauses from ME to EModE by using PPCME2 and PPCEME. Their result, together with that of the additional investigation based on YCOE and PPCMBE, reveals the distribution of small clauses with/without *it* throughout the history of English, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 The distribution of the expletive *it* in small clauses

	OE	EME	LME	E1	E2	E3	L1	L2	L3
it	0	1	10	50	64	104	44	52	39
ø	2	2	9	17 (7)	22 (11)	33 (8)	12 (1)	9 (1)	2 (0)

Putting aside one exceptional case with *it* in EME,[5] it is observed that *it* began to be attested in small clauses in LME, roughly the same period as the rise of *as*.[6]

[5] This example from *Ancrene Riwle* would be exceptional in that it is a translation of the preceding Latin sentence, where the adverbial clause introduced by *cum* 'when' is translated into the *to*-infinitive.

[6] In addition to collapsing M1–M4 into the two periods, Table 3 has rearranged Tanaka and Yokogoshi's (2010) data in ME according to the manuscript dates of the relevant texts, in

As is obvious from Table 3, small clauses without *it* continued to exist after the appearance of those with *it*, which will suggest that the structures with/without Pred were in competition for some time after LME. Notice that collocations such as (13) allow the omission of *it* even in PDE where the verb and the predicate are analyzed as forming a complex verb and hence do not have the structure of small clauses (cf. Aarts 1992). The numbers in parentheses in ModE indicate those of examples in which the omission of *it* is impossible in PDE, excluding those collocations. Given that such examples became almost extinct after L1, it seems plausible to assume that the insertion of *it* became obligatory in small clauses in the eighteenth century.

(13) find fit, make clear, make ready, make sure, see fit, think best, think fit, think good, think long, think proper, think right, …
(cf. Visser 1963–1973: §§523–526)

Based on these observations, Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) propose the following structural change of small clauses in the history of English.

(14) a. $[_{XP}$ NP X′] (OE-18c)
→ b. $[_{PredP}$ NP_i $[_{Pred'}$ Pred $[_{XP}$ t_i X′]]] (LME-)
(cf. Tanaka and Yokogoshi 2010: 252)

Small clauses from OE to EME lacked functional categories like Pred and were headed by their predicates, thereby accounting for the absence of *as* and the expletive *it*. Then, the structure with Pred emerged in the fourteenth century, entering into competition with the structure without Pred. Finally, as the structure with Pred became the only option in the eighteenth century, the insertion of *it* became obligatory in small clauses, except for collocations like (13).[7]

4. The development of PECs

This section attempts to account for the development of PECs in the history of English, especially the changing distribution of their associates, in terms of the rise of Pred argued for in the previous section, building upon a recent version of the small clause analysis of *there*-constructions.

4.1. The structure of PECs in PDE

Let us begin by overviewing Chomsky's (2001) influential analysis of PECs before

order to be consistent with the method of investigation in Table 1.

[7] Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) propose that the rise of Pred in small clauses was caused by the loss of adjectival inflection in ME: when adjectives were inflected for φ-features and/or case, the matrix V enters into a Multiple Agree relation with a small clause subject and its adjectival predicate, licensing a predication relation between the two (see Chomsky 2008 for the analysis of participle agreement in Icelandic on which their proposal is based). With the loss of adjectival inflection, Multiple Agree could no longer be induced, which led to the rise of Pred as an alternative means of licensing predication.

turning to the analysis adopted in this paper. PECs with PP in postverbal position are exemplified by (1), repeated here as (15).

(15) a. There were several large packages placed on the table. (NP-V-PP)
b. *There were placed several large packages on the table. (V-NP-PP)
c. There were placed on the table several large packages. (V-PP-NP)

Chomsky argues that the internal argument in (15) must undergo leftward or rightward movement at the vP level by an obligatory rule called "thematization/extraction" (Th/Ex), because English bars surface structures of the form [V DO] in passive/unaccusative sentences. According to him, Th/Ex is an operation of the phonological component which strips away the phonological features of XP to which Th/Ex applies and renders it inaccessible to syntactic movement in the next derivational stage, as illustrated by the immobility of the associates in PECs.

(16) *How many packages were there placed on the table? (Chomsky 2001: 20)

However, there have been several problems with Chomsky's (2001) analysis pointed out in the literature (Radford 2000, Rezac 2006, Sobin 2014). First, there does not seem to be a general ban on [V DO] in English passives, as shown in the following example of locative inversion where the internal argument must remain in its base position and cannot move to the preverbal Th/Ex position.

(17) In the lake were <*three fish> caught <three fish>. (Rezac 2006: 685)

As Rezac (2006) argues, to account for the difference in the position of the internal argument between PECs and locative inversion under the Th/Ex analysis, it is necessary to distinguish *[$_{\alpha}$ V DO PP] from [$_{\alpha}$ V DO t_{PP}], which requires the locative PP to move out of α prior to Th/Ex. This will be incompatible with the above assumption that Th/Ex applies at the level of vP before any syntactic movement in the next derivational stage. Rezac accounts for the distribution of the internal argument in (17) by assuming that the locative PP moves through the preverbal Th/Ex position on its way to [Spec, TP], blocking the movement of the internal argument.

Second, Radford (2000) reports that the sentence in (16) is acceptable, citing another example of PEC in which the associate undergoes wh-movement.

(18) How many people were there arrested? (Radford 2000: 41)

This would indicate that the output of Th/Ex is indeed accessible to syntactic movement and hence it cannot be a phonological operation, contrary to Chomsky's (2001) claim.[8] Therefore, this paper assumes that Th/Ex, especially the

[8] Based on the examples of Swedish passive sentences including PECs from Holmberg (2001), Rezac (2006) argues that the movement of an internal argument to the preverbal Th/Ex position feeds further movement to [Spec, TP], which indicates that the output of Th/Ex is accessible to A-movement as well as A′-movement. See the discussion of (20a) below.

movement of the associates in PECs, occurs in the syntactic component, along the lines of many authors including Holmberg (2001), Rezac (2006), and Sobin (2014).

Having rejected Chomsky's (2001) analysis, the remainder of this subsection explores an alternative analysis of PECs in PDE. There have been a large number of studies on *there*-constructions in PDE, some of which discuss the structure of PECs including the distribution of their associates. Most promising would be the small clause analysis originally proposed by Stowell (1978), and many of its recent versions applied to PECs assume that *be* selects a small clause complement headed by some functional category (cf. Lasnik 1999, Holmberg 2001, Rezac 2006, Bruening 2011, Samko 2014).

Toward a unification of small clause complements to verbs including *be*, this paper adopts Samko's (2014) analysis in which all instances of *be* take a PredP complement. As for passive constructions including PECs, he proposes the structure roughly represented as in (19), where the passive *be* is base-generated in v and selects PredP whose head has an EPP feature, arguing that the passive constructions in (20) are derived from the same structure.

(19) $[_{CP}$ C $[_{TP}$ T $[_{vP}$ be $[_{PredP}$ Pred $[_{vP}$ … V-en …]]]]] (cf. Samko 2014: 374)

(20) a. Our nation's chief executive was examined today.
b. Examined today was our nation's chief executive.

In (20a), the internal argument moves first to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred and then to [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP feature of T, deriving a passive sentence with canonical word order. On the other hand, the word order with passive participle preposing in (20b) is derived as follows. The internal argument first moves to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred and stays there; then, the vP complement of Pred moves to [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP feature of T (and further to [Spec, CP] to satisfy the EPP feature of C).[9]

Applying this analysis to PECs, the distribution of their associates observed in (1) is immediately accounted for. This paper assumes with Chomsky (1995) that *there* bears no φ-features and is merged in [Spec, TP].[10]

[9] Thoms and Walkden (2019) argue that present participle preposing involves vP-movement, based on the availability of subject reconstruction into the fronted vP, as illustrated in (i), where the universal quantifier can have scope over the subject. If this is correct, vP-movement is not restricted to passive sentences.

(i) Guarding every station is at least one policeman with the requisite training.
(Thoms and Walkden 2019: 193)

[10] Based on the fact that *there* can undergo movement (e.g., *there is likely to be someone in the room*), Chomsky (2001) assumes that *there* bears an uninterpretable person feature to make it active for Agree, which is a prerequisite for movement in the relevant framework (see also Radford 2009). However, under the recent concept that Merge, including Internal Merge/movement, is freely applied (Chomsky 2015), there is no longer any motivation for postulating some feature on *there* that allows it to move, so that such a feature should be

(21) a. [$_{TP}$ there were [$_{PredP}$ several large packages$_i$ [$_{Pred'}$ Pred$_{\text{~~[EPP]~~}}$ [$_{VP}$ placed t_i on the table]]]]
b. *[$_{TP}$ there were [$_{PredP}$ Pred$_{[EPP]}$ [$_{VP}$ placed several large packages on the table]]]
c. [$_{TP}$ there were [$_{PredP}$ t_i [$_{Pred'}$ Pred$_{\text{~~[EPP]~~}}$ [$_{VP}$ placed t_i on the table]]] several large packages$_i$]

In the derivational stage of (21a) where Pred is introduced, the associate moves from the complement of V to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred. In the TP cycle, T enters into an Agree relation with the associate, deleting the φ-features of T and the Case feature of the associate. In addition, *there* is merged in [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP feature of T. This derivation converges with all the uninterpretable features deleted, yielding NP-V-PP order.[11] On the other hand, with the associate remaining in its base position, the EPP feature of Pred cannot be satisfied in (21b) and hence V-NP-PP order is ungrammatical.[12] V-PP-NP order is derived as in (21c), where the associate first moves to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred and then undergoes rightward movement to the position following PP. If this is correct, sentences like (3) which are acceptable with

---

dispensed with.

[11] In what follows, derivational steps such as Agree, deletion of uninterpretable features, and merger of *there* are omitted, focusing on the position of the associates in PECs.

[12] As mentioned above, this paper assumes that *there* is merged in [Spec, TP], along the lines of Chomsky (1995). However, if *there* could be merged in [Spec, PredP] and then move to [Spec,TP], V-NP-PP order might be wrongly predicted to be grammatical in PDE, contrary to fact.

However, there is empirical evidence that *there* cannot be merged in [Spec, PredP], as Yokogoshi (2003) claims based on the following example.

(i) *I consider there a man in the room. (Lasnik 1992: 384)

On the other hand, she cites (ii), arguing that it is possible for *there* to be merged in [Spec, TP] of a raising infinitive embedded within PredP and then move to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred.

(ii) I consider there likely to be a man in the room. (ibid.)

Moreover, the contrast in (iii) also supports the same conclusion.

(iii) a. I regard there as being a lot of people.
b.*I regard there as a lot of people. (Yokogoshi 2003: 528)

According to Yokogoshi (2003), *as* (=Pred) takes a gerundive TP complement in examples like (iiia), where *there* is merged in the embedded [Spec, TP] and then moves to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred. In contrast, PredP does not have TP embedded within it in (iiib) whose specifier provides a position for the merger of *there*, so that there is no choice but to merge *there* in [Spec, PredP], which leads to an ungrammatical result. This lends empirical support for the assumption that the position for the merger of *there* is [Spec, TP], but not [Spec, PredP]. See Yokogoshi (2003) for the possibility of deriving the ban on merging *there* in [Spec, PredP] by relating it to the phasehood of PredP.

their associates in postverbal position are derived in the same manner as (21c), though the movement operations involved have no effects on surface word order in the absence of a postverbal PP.

4.2. The changing distribution of the associates in PECs

We are now in a position to account for the distribution of the associates in PECs in the history of English, by extending the structural change of small clauses presented in the previous section to small clause complements to *be*. Recall that small clauses lacked Pred and were headed by their predicates from OE to EME. Assuming Pintzuk's (1999) double base hypothesis that the underlying word order in VP was either OV or VO in these periods, the structures of PECs will be as in (22).

(22) OE-EME
a. there be $[_{VP}$ NP V PP]
b. there be $[_{VP}$ V NP PP]
c. there be $[_{VP}$ (t_i) V (t_i) PP] NP_i

(22a) has underlying OV order, where the associate stays in its base position, yielding NP-V-PP order. In (22b), V-NP-PP order is derived, with the associate in its base position in underlying VO order. Rightward movement of the associate in either underlying OV or VO order leads to V-PP-NP order, as shown in (22c). Thus, although the frequency of PECs was low, it follows from the present analysis that all the three orders were possible in PECs from OE to EME.[13]

Then, small clauses came to have the structure with Pred in LME, with the result that the structures with and without Pred had been in competition until the eighteenth century. In addition, there seems to have been a change of the underlying word order within VP in LME. According to Pintzuk and Taylor's (2006) investigation based on PPCME2, the ratio of surface OV order became less than 1% in LME. Assuming with Pintzuk (1999) that the threshold of grammaticality is 1% and patterns with frequency less than 1% are judged to be ungrammatical, there was no longer enough evidence to postulate underlying OV order, so that underlying VO order became the only option after LME.

If this is correct, the structures of PECs from LME to the eighteenth century

[13] As mentioned in subsection 2.2, the rarity of PECs would be related to the fact that impersonal constructions without *there* were predominant in these periods. Although a detailed discussion of impersonal constructions is beyond the scope of this paper, it might be worthwhile to touch upon two possible analyses in relation to PECs. First, Kemenade (1997) attributes the possibility of impersonal constructions to the presence of the null expletive, arguing that it occupies the subject position and hence the internal argument may remain in its base position. Second, by extending the analysis of word order in Greek and Spanish proposed by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), Tanaka (2002) proposes an analysis of impersonal constructions, where verb movement satisfies the EPP feature of T without filling [Spec, TP]. Then, the rarity of PECs in OE and EME would be due to the robustness of the null expletive or verb movement to T, which serves to dispense with the insertion of *there* into the subject position.

will be as follows.

(23) LME-18c
a. there be $[_{PredP}$ NP_i $[_{Pred'}$ Pred $[_{VP}$ V t_i PP]]]
b. there be $[_{VP}$ V NP PP]
c. there be $[_{PredP}$ t_i $[_{Pred'}$ Pred $[_{VP}$ V t_i PP]]] NP_i / $[_{VP}$ V t_i PP] NP_i

In (23a), the associate moves to [Spec, PredP] to satisfy the EPP feature of Pred, yielding NP-V-PP order based on the structure with Pred. V-NP-PP order is only derived from the structure without Pred as in (23b), where the associate remains in its base position. As shown in (23c), the structures with and without Pred provide two ways to derive V-PP-NP order via rightward movement of the associate. Finally, once the structure with Pred became the only option in the eighteenth century, PECs came to have the structures in (21), which only yield NP-V-PP and V-PP-NP orders, leading to the loss of V-NP-PP order.

This subsection has attempted to account for the changing distribution of the associates in PECs by positing the same structural change as independently proposed for small clause complements to other verbs than *be*. Importantly, the present analysis also captures an otherwise mysterious similarity between the developments of PECs and small clauses. As we saw in Table 1, NP-V-PP order became the overwhelming majority in the transition from LME to EModE at the expense of V-NP-PP order, which was finally lost in the eighteenth century. Interestingly, a similar change in frequency can be observed for small clauses, especially the distribution of the expletive *it* in Table 3: there was a radical increase of small clauses with *it* in the transition from LME to EModE, while those without *it* decreased and were finally lost in the eighteenth century. This parallel receives a natural explanation under the present analysis: the structure with Pred became predominant in the transition from LME to EModE in the course of competing with the structure without Pred, with the former finally winning over the latter in the eighteenth century.

Before closing this subsection, some comments are in order with regard to the rise of Pred in PECs. As briefly mentioned in note 7, Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) argue that the loss of adjectival inflection was responsible for the rise of Pred in small clauses: it was introduced as a means of licensing predication alternative to Multiple Agree. One might then envisage a similar scenario for the rise of Pred in PECs, where it was introduced due to some morphological erosion which occurred on a passive participle. As is well-known, an OE passive participle came originally from an adjectival participle inflected for the number and gender of its subject (Traugott 1992). According to Ono and Nakao (1980), adjectival inflection sometimes appeared on a passive participle with a plural subject, but its distribution was already irregular in OE. Therefore, it is inconceivable that adjectival inflection on a passive participle had something to do with the rise of Pred in PECs in LME.

It will be more promising to invoke the role of the prefix *ge-*, which could be attached to a passive/perfect participle and was productive in OE and EME

(see (4a, c), (5a), (8), and (9)). McFadden (2015) argues that *ge-* is associated with resultativity and a target state, which means that it encodes the resultant state of a subject when it appears on a passive participle. This would lead us to assume that the presence of *ge-* serves to establish a predication relation between a subject and a passive participle. Assuming with Tanaka and Yokogoshi (2010) that licensing of predication via Multiple Agree goes in tandem with Case assignment, one of the possible implementations of this idea would be that T enters into a Multiple Agree relation with a subject and a passive participle, licensing a predication relation between the two.[14]

If this is correct, predication could be licensed via Multiple Agree in PECs in the periods of English when passive participles with *ge-* were productive, even in the absence of Pred as in the structures of (22). According to McFadden's (2015) investigation based on PPCME2, the percentage of passive participles with *ge-* is 44.18% (M1), 24.31% (M2), 12.75% (M3), and 2.64% (M4), which shows that there was a radical decrease in LME, especially in the transition from M3 to M4. Thus, it would be plausible to assume that the decline of passive participles with *ge-* caused the rise of Pred in PECs in LME, as an alternative means of licensing predication. As for the status of *ge-* after LME, OED says that it continued to be used by many writers from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, though it became an archaic feature in EModE. This would indicate that the structure without Pred was retained alongside of the structure with Pred until the eighteenth century, as shown in the structures of (23), with Multiple Agree licensing predication in the former structure.

5. Concluding remarks

This paper has attempted to account for the development of PECs in the history of English, especially the changing distribution of their associates, in terms of the rise of Pred, as well as the change of the underlying word order within VP. By extending Tanaka and Yokogoshi's (2010) analysis of small clauses, it was argued that there was a structural change of the small clause complement to *be* in PECs: from the structure lacking a functional category to the structure headed by Pred, which appeared in the fourteenth century and became the only option in the eighteenth century. According to the present analysis, V-NP-PP order is derived only from the structure without Pred, so that the loss of this structure caused that of V-NP-PP order in the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the rise and establishment of the PredP structure were shown to be responsible for the fact that NP-V-PP order became predominant after LME, finally winning over V-NP-PP order in the eighteenth century.

[14] Given that its presence makes a passive participle active for Agree, *ge-* is plausibly taken to be the locus of φ-features, besides encoding the resultant state of a subject.

References

Aarts, Bas (1992) *Small clauses in English: The nonverbal types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Alexiadou, Artemis and Elena Anagnostopoulou (1998) Parameterizing AGR: Word order, V-movement, and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491–539. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/ A:1006090432389 [accessed September 2022]

Bolinger, Dwight (1977) *Meaning and form*. London: Longman.

Bowers, John (1993) The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591–656. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178835 [accessed September 2022]

Breivik, Leiv E. (1990) *Existential* there: *A synchronic and diachronic study*. Oslo: Novus Press.

Bruening, Benjamin (2011) Pseudopassives, expletive passives, and locative inversion. Ms., University of Delaware. https://udel.edu/~bruening/Downloads/PseudopassArticle1.pdf [accessed September 2022]

Chomsky, Noam (1991) Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In: Robert Freidin (ed.) *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, 417–454. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0272263197241070 [accessed September 2022]

Chomsky, Noam (2001) Derivation by phase. In: Kenstowicz, Michael (ed.) *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/4056.003.0004 [accessed September 2022]

Chomsky, Noam (2008) On phases. In: Freiden, Robert, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria L. Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262062787.003.0007 [accessed September 2022]

Chomsky, Noam (2015) Problems of projection: extensions. In: Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann, and Simona Matteini (eds.), *Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, 3–16, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/la.223.01cho [accessed September 2022]

Holmberg, Anders (2001) Expletives and agreement in Scandinavian passives. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4: 85–128. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015882307080 [accessed September 2022]

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530 [accessed September 2022]

Jonas, Dianne (1996) *Clause structure and verb syntax in Scandinavian and English*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.

Kemenade, Ans van (1997) V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English. In: Kemenade, Ans van and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*, 326–352. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, and Lauren Delfs (2004) *The Penn-Helsinki parsed corpus of Early Modern English*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, and Ariel Diertani (2010) *The Penn parsed corpus of Modern British English*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor (2000) *The Penn-Helsinki parsed corpus of Middle English*, Second edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Lasnik, Howard (1992) Case and expletives: Notes toward a parametric account. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 381–405. DOI: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178778 [accessed September 2022]

Lasnik, Howard (1999) *Minimalist analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
McFadden, Thomas (2015) Preverbal *ge-* in Old and Middle English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 58: 15–48.
Ohkado, Masayuki (1998) On subject extrapositon constructions in the history of English. *Studies in Modern English* 14: 53–78. DOI: https://doi.org/10.11220/mea1984.1998.53 [accessed September 2022]
Ono, Shigeru and Toshio Nakao (1980) *History of English* I, Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
Pintzuk, Susan (1999) *Phrase structures in competition: Variation and change in Old English word order*. New York: Garland. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315053127 [accessed September 2022]
Pintzuk, Susan and Ann Taylor (2006) The loss of OV order in the history of English. In: Kemenade, Ans van and Bettelou Los (eds.) *The handbook of the history of English*, 249–278. Oxford: Blackwell. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757048.ch11 [accessed September 2022]
Radford, Andrew (2000) On object displacement in English passives. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics* 33: 33–49.
Radford, Andrew (2009) *Analysing English sentences: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801617 [accessed September 2022]
Rezac, Milan (2006) The interaction of Th/Ex and locative inversion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 685–697. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2006.37.4.685 [accessed September 2022]
Samko, Bern (2014) A feature-driven movement analysis of English participle preposing. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)* 31: 371–380. http://www.lingref.com/cpp/wccfl/31/paper3040.pdf [accessed September 2022]
Sobin, Nicholas (2014) Th/Ex, agreement, and case in expletive sentences. *Syntax* 17: 385–416. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12021 [accessed September 2022]
Stowell, Tim (1978) What was there before *there* was there. *Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS)* 14: 458–471.
Svenonius, Peter (1996) Predication and functional heads. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)* 14: 493–507.
Tanaka, Tomoyuki (2002) Synchronic and diachronic aspects of overt subject raising in English. *Lingua* 112: 619–646. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(01)00064-X [accessed September 2022]
Tanaka, Tomoyuki (2003) Expletives, functional categories, and small clauses in the history of English. In: the editorial board of the Modern English Association (ed.) *Studies in Modern English: The twentieth anniversary publication of the Modern English Association*, 295–308. Tokyo: Eichosha.
Tanaka, Tomoyuki and Azusa Yokogoshi (2010) The rise of a functional category in small clauses. *Studia Linguistica* 64: 239–271. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.2010.01173.x [accessed September 2022]
Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Frank Beths (2003) *The York-Toronto-Helsinki parsed corpus of Old English prose*. York: University of York.
Thoms, Gary and George Walkden (2019) vP-fronting with and without remnant movement. *Journal of Linguistics* 55: 161–214. DOI:10.1017/S002222671800004X [accessed September 2022]
Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1992) Syntax. In: Richard M. Hogg (ed.) *The Cambridge history of the English language, Volume 1: The beginnings to 1066*, 168–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vikner, Sten (1995) *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Visser, Frederik Theodoor (1963–1973) *An historical syntax of the English language*, 4 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Yokogoshi, Azusa (2003) On the syntactic status of small clause particles in English. *English Linguistics* 20: 518–534. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj1984.20.518 [accessed September 2022]

Dictionary

The oxford dictionary of the English language (OED), Second edition.

Authors' contact information:
Shoko Honda
Faculty of Regional Policy, Aichi University
e-mail: shonda [at] vega.aichi-u.ac.jp

Tomoyuki Tanaka
Graduate School of Humanities, Nagoya University
e-mail: tanaka.tomoyuki.c6 [at] f.mail.nagoya-u.ac.jp

[Received 2 August 2021;
Accepted 9 October 2022]

【要　旨】

英語史における受動虚辞構文の発達について

本多　尚子　　田中　智之
愛知大学　　名古屋大学

本論文では，英語における受動分詞を伴う there 構文，すなわち受動虚辞構文の歴史的発達の全体像を明らかにするとともに，特に関連要素の分布の変化について，VP 内基底語順の変化と機能範疇 Pred(ication) の出現に関連付けて説明することを目的とする。その説明に際して，Tanaka and Yokogoshi（2010）による小節の統語分析を拡張することにより，受動虚辞構文における be の小節補部が機能範疇を持たない構造から Pred を主要部とする構造へと変化したことを提案する。Pred を主要部とする構造は 14 世紀に出現し 18 世紀に確立されたが，PredP の出現および確立により，後期中英語期に関連要素が受動分詞に先行する語順が優勢になり，関連要素が受動分詞の直後に来る語順が 18 世紀中に消失したという事実が正しく説明されると主張する。