

The Syntax of Old English Experiencer Verbs

Abstract

The paper offers a new classification of the syntactic frames OE Experiencer verbs can appear in. The characteristics of individual construction types seen against the background of the variation exhibited by individual verbs found in them allow us to propose that the fifteen attested structures are in fact only variants of three basic types. The discussion reveals that OE clausal arguments are Case-marked in the same way as NP arguments. A further observation is that OE lexicon is relatively insensitive to category distinctions but sensitive to Case.

1. Introduction

This paper presents an analysis of the syntax of Old English Experiencer verbs based on an extensive data study. Section 1 offers a presentation of the possible range of structures in which Experiencer verbs were found in Old English. Section 2 is devoted to the examination of the morphosyntactic properties of these constructions and the presentation of the distributional patterns typical of selected Experiencer verbs. Section 3 contains a brief summary of the findings of the paper.

2. The syntactic frames of OE Experiencer verbs

Experiencer verbs express a physical or mental experience which involves a human experiencer and optionally the cause of the experience. The argument representing the human affected by the experience is assigned the Θ -role of Experiencer, while the argument representing the cause of the experience is assigned the Θ -role of Theme. Consequently, the lexical entry of any Experiencer verb contains the information that the verb assigns the Θ -role of Experiencer and possibly also that of Theme to its argument(s). While the inventory of the possible Θ -roles is common to all Experiencer verbs, the syntactic structures in which these arguments appear differ from verb to verb. The Experiencer is always expressed by an NP;

yet the Theme can either be realised as an NP, PP, CP, or it can be left out. These structures will be referred to in this paper as 2NPs frame, NP+PP frame, PROP frame, and 1NP frame respectively. In what follows we will discuss these frames in detail. For clarity of exposition, in all examples in this paper we underline Experiencers, italicise the *Themes*, and use bold type for **verbs**.

Let us begin with 2NPs frame, i.e. the one in which both arguments are realised as NPs. This frame may appear in four basic syntactic shapes presented under (1a-d) below.

- (1) a. ðam wife þa word wel **licodon**,
 the-dat wife-dat the-nom words-nom well pleased-pl
 gilpcwide Geates;
 boastful-speech-nom of-the-Gaut
 'well did those words please the woman, the boastful speech of the Gaut'
 Beowulf 21 (*HCET*)¹
- b. Ne **wilnege** ic ðæs synfulla deaðes, (...).
 not desire-1sg I-nom the-gen sinful death-gen
 'I do not desire the death of the sinful'
 The Benedictine Rule 4 (*HCET*)
- c. Him ofhreow ðæs mannes
 he-dat pitied-3sg the-gen man-gen
 'He was sorry for the man'
 Homl. Th. i. 192, 16 (*B&T*)
- d. for ðæm þinge men lyst ælces þara gooda
 for tha thingmen-acc desires-3sg each the goods-gen
 þe hi lyst.
 that them-acc desires-3sg
 'For that reason men desire all the goods they desire'
 Alfred's Boethius 88 (*HCET*)

In (1a) the Experiencer *ðam wife* bears DAT Case, the Theme *þa word* is marked NOM and it controls verbal concord, as evidenced by the plural form of the verb *licodon*. This type is referred to in the literature as Type I. In (1b), known as Type II, the Experiencer *ic* is NOM, the Theme *ðæs synfullan deaðes* is GEN and the verb agrees with the NOM Experiencer.

¹ All examples from *HCET* are quoted by the title and page number of the original text. In the examples cited after secondary sources we stick to the abbreviating conventions used there.

(1c) and (1d) represent two subtypes of the so-called Type N.² In both examples the verb is in the default 3SG form indicating lack of concord and the Theme argument bears genitive Case: *dæs mannes* in (1c) and *ælces þara gooda* in (1d). By contrast, the Experiencer is DAT in (1c): *him*, but ACC in (1d): *men*.³

The next frame to be discussed is characterised by lack of an expressed Theme, i.e. INP frame. This frame had three basic syntactic realisations, illustrated by the examples below.

- (2) a. Ne ic ne scamige
 not I-nom not shame-1sg
 'I do not feel shame'
 Ps. Spl. 30, 20 (B&T)
- b. Deah monnum swa ne þince
 yet men-dat so not seemed-3sg
 'Yet it did not seem so to the men'
 Bt. 39, 8; Fox 224, 17 (B&T)
- c. Þa sceamode ealle his widerwinnan.
 then shamed-3sg all his enemies-acc
 'Then all his enemies were ashamed.'
 The Old English Version of the Gospels, Lk. 13, 17

In (2a) the Experiencer *ic* is in NOM Case and it controls verbal concord, as evidenced by the 1SG form of the verb. (2b) and (2c) are subsumed together as Type O by Allen (1995) as they share some features, namely both exhibit lack of a NOM NP and the verb is invariably 3SG though the only argument present both in (2b) and in (2c) is plural. The Experiencer is DAT in (2b): *monnum* and ACC in (2c): *ealle his widerwinnan*.

² The terms we use to denote the types are due to Elmer (1981). Fischer and van der Leek (1983) call types I, II, and N: Cause-subject, Experiencer-subject, and subjectless respectively. Our choice of the labelling has been influenced by the fact that Elmer's terms, being older than Fischer and van der Leek's, are more widely used and, as pointed out by Allen (1995: 69), Elmer's terms 'have the advantage of not prejudging the grammatical relations involved'.

³ According to Fischer and van der Leek (1983: 355 table 19), the NP arguments in Type N can appear in two more structures, namely as ACC ACC and DAT ACC. It is worth noting that the existence of the ACC ACC type is not recognised either by van der Gaaf (1904), Visser (1963-73), or Mitchell (1985). This is so because there is only one genuine example of this kind. For a discussion concerning the type see Allen (1995: 74ff). The DAT ACC type, on the other hand, has been argued for in the literature. However, as demonstrated by Allen (1995: 79) on the basis of her own examination of all the attested examples of this kind, 'there is no necessity to assume that any of them is DAT ACC'. Therefore, we follow Allen in not recognising the existence of this type.

In NP+PP frame the Theme is expressed by a PP. Again, as above, it appears in three basic structures. Consider the examples below.

- (3) a. We witon þæt ... þu ne **recest** *be ænezum menn*
 we know that you-nom not care about any man
 ‘We know that you do not care for anybody’
 Ags. Gosp. Mark xiii. 14 (*OED*)
- b. Ac ic wolde witan hweðer **ðe þuhte** *be ðam*
 but I wanted to-know whether you-dat⁴ thought-3sg about that
ðe ðu hæfst hweðer hy were ðe
 pt you have-2sg whether it was-subj.sg whether
 læne ðe æce
 transitory or eternal
 ‘But I would know whether you thought of what you have, that it was
 temporary or eternal’
 Shr. 176, 29 (*B&T*)
- c. Hie sculon, ðonne **hie** *ymb hwæt tweoð*, cyrran to hiera agnum
 they should then them-acc⁵ about what doubt-3sg to-turn to their own
 inngedðonce
 intellect
 ‘They ought to - when they have doubts about something - turn to their own
 intellect’
 Past. 16: Wst 102, 4-8 (*B&T*)

In (3a) the Experiencer is NOM: *þu* and it controls verbal concord. As in (2) above, the examples quoted under (b) and (c) share some features: lack of a NOM NP and lack of verbal concord. In (3b) the Experiencer is expressed by a DAT NP: *þe*, in (3c) the Experiencer bears ACC Case: *hie*. The Theme is expressed by a PP in all three examples: *be ænezum menn* in (3a), *be ðam ðe ðu hæfst* in (3b), and *ymb hwæt* in (3c).

The last frame is characterised by clausal Themes. It is referred to as PROP⁶ and it can appear in five different syntactic structures, presented in (4) below.

- (4) a. Gif **we** *scomiaþ ðæt we to uncuðum monnum suelic sprecen*
 if we-nom shame-pl that we to unknown men so speak-subj.pl

⁴ *De* is the form of both DAT and ACC but it has to be interpreted as DAT since *þyncan* is not attested with unambiguously ACC Experiencers only with unambiguously DAT ones.

⁵ *Hie* could theoretically stand for either for NOM.PL or for ACC.PL but the form of the verb (3SG) implies that we are not dealing with NOM here as NOM Experiencers control verbal concord, which is absent here.

⁶ The term ‘PROP’ and the labels used for individual PROP types are due to Allen (1995).

'If we are ashamed that we speak in this way to strangers'
Past. 10; Swt. 63.6 (*B&T*)

- b. Rofne randwigan restan lyste
stout-acc warrior-acc to-rest desired-3sg
'A stout warrior wanted to rest'
Beo. Th. 3590; B. 1793 (*B&T*)
- c. þa wæron ægðer ge swiftran ge unwealtran, ge eac
then were both quicker and more steady and also
hieran þonne þa oðru. næron nawðer ne on
higher than the other not-were neither not as
Fresisc gescæpene ne on Denisc, but swa him
Frisian shaped nor as Danish but so them-dat
selfum ðuhte þæt hie nytwyrðoste beon meahten.
selves-dat seemed-3sg that they most-useful be might
'They were both quicker and steadier and also higher than the others. They
were shaped neither as the Frisian nor as the Danish. But as it seemed to
them they might be most useful'
Chronicle Ms A Early (O2) 90 (*HCET*)
- d. Lareow, ne ofþingð hit ðe gif ic þus wer geceose?
master not displeases-3sg it you-dat⁷ if I thus man choose
'Master, doesn't it displease you if I thus choose a man?'
Apollonius of Tyre 32 (*HCET*)
- e. þa ofpuhte þæt Mariuse þæm consule. Iuliuses eame,
then regretted-3sg that Marius-dat the consul Julius' uncle
þæt mon ðæt gewin nolde him betæcan.
that one that war not-would him entrust
'Then it offended consul Marius, Julius' uncle, that he was not put in charge
of the war'
Alfred's Orosius 23 (*HCET*)

In (4a) the Experiencer is NOM: *we*, in (4b) it is ACC: *rofne randwigan*. The examples (4c), (4d), and (4e) all contain DAT Experiencers: *him selfum* in (4c), *ðe* in (4d), and *Mariuse þæm consule...* in (4e). Additionally, (4d) and (4e) contain *hit* and *þæt* respectively, while no such element is present in (4c). (4a) is an example of the Personal PROP Type (PERS for short), (4b) and (4c) are classified together as Type S, (4d) is

⁷ *þe* is morphologically ambiguous between DAT and ACC. However, the only Case that *ofþyncan* assigned to the Experiencer was DAT so in this example *þe* has to be interpreted as DAT.

referred to as Type *hit*, and (4e) exemplifies Type DEM (a demonstrative pronoun *þæt* is used). These are the traditionally recognised PROP types (cf. Allen (1995)). There are, however, three additional syntactic structures in which Experiencer verbs with clausal Themes can be found. They are presented below.

- (5) a. gif hi þæs wilniad þæt him heora yfel unwrecen sie
 if they-nom that-gen desire-pl that them their evil unpunished is
 be dæas gyltes andefne
 by the sin's proportion
 'If they ask for it that they should not get their just deserts'
 Alfred's Boethius 123 (HCET)
- b. ac þæs me þincd dæt þæt bio sio soðe & sio fulfremede
 but that-gen me-dat seems-3sg that that is the truth and the perfect
 gesæld de mæg ælcum hire folgera sellan durhwunigendne welan ...
 happiness which may each her followers give continuous wealth
 'But it seems to me that true and perfect happiness is of such kind that it
 continuously gives wealth to each of its followers'
 or: 'For if I mistake not, true and perfect happiness is that which makes a
 man truly satisfied, powerful, venerated, renowned, and happy'⁸
 Alfred's Boethius XXXIII 78 (HCET)
- c. Hine þæs heardost langode hwanne he of ðisse worlde moste.
 him-acc that-gen strongest longed-3sg when he from this world might
 'He strongly desired to be allowed to leave this world'
 Blickl. Homl. 227, 1 (B&T)

All examples in (5) contain a clausal Theme and a demonstrative pronoun bearing GEN Case: *þæs*. The differences between (5a), (5b), and (5c) lie in:

- the Case of the Experiencer: in (5a) it is NOM, in (5b) it is DAT, in (5c) it is ACC;
- the verbal concord: in (5a) it is controlled by the Experiencer and in (5b, c) the verb shows no concord.

All these existing syntactic patterns available for Experiencer verbs in OE have been summarised in Table 1 below for ease of reference.

⁸ Translated by Cooper (1902).

Frame	N ^o	Type ⁹	Experiencer	Theme	Verbal concord	Example
2NPs	i	I	DAT-NP	NOM-NP	+Theme	(1a)
	ii	II	NOM-NP	GEN-NP	+Experiencer	(1b)
	iii	N	DAT/ACC-NP	GEN-NP	3SG	(1c, d)
1NP	iv		NOM-NP	∅	+Experiencer	(2a)
	v	O	DAT/ACC-NP	∅	3SG	(2b, c)
NP+P P	vi		NOM-NP	PP	+Experiencer	(3a)
	vii		DAT-NP	PP	3SG	(3b)
	viii		ACC-NP	PP	3SG	(3c)
PROP	ix	PERS	NOM-NP	CP	+Experiencer	(4a)
	x	S	ACC/DAT-NP	CP	3SG	(4b, c)
	xi	hit	DAT-NP	<i>hit</i> CP	3SG	(4d)
	xii	DEM	DAT-NP	<i>þæt</i> CP	3SG	(4e)
	xiii		NOM-NP	<i>þæs</i> CP	+Experiencer	(5a)
	xiv		DAT-NP	<i>þæs</i> CP	3SG	(5b)
	xv		ACC-NP	<i>þæs</i> CP	3SG	(5c)

Table 1. The attested syntactic patterns available for OE Experiencer verbs

2. Analysis

As can be seen, there exist 15 different types but even a cursory glance at the table reveals that the constructions listed there show significant similarities so, in effect, it may be possible to reduce the number of types they represent. Let us begin by comparing the properties of 2NP types with those of 1NP types.

⁹ Some fields in this column have been left empty as not all constructions presented in Table 1 have their individual names in the literature.

2.1. 2NP types vs. 1NP types

Comparing the properties of particular types representing 2NPs frame with those of 1NP frame, we immediately notice that one of the variants of the latter, namely the one with the NOM Experiencer controlling verbal concord (cf. N° iv) is strikingly similar to Type II (cf. N° ii). The only difference between the two types consists in the fact that in 2NPs frame the Theme is expressed by a GEN-NP, while in 1NP frame it is left unexpressed. In effect, if the expression of the Theme were treated as optional, we could regard the two constructions as variants of Type II, thus avoiding the need to list them separately in the lexicon. Instead, we could propose a common lexical entry for the two constructions. The lexical entry would be as follows:

Type II
 Θ-roles: Experiencer
 (Theme)
 syntax: (GEN-NP)

A similar relationship holds in the case of Type N (N° iii) Type O (N° v): again, the difference between them is limited to the Theme, while the remaining features are shared by the two types: the Experiencer is DAT or ACC, the verb is invariably 3SG, and no NP bears NOM Case. Thus, we will propose after Allen (1995) that Type O, instantiated by examples (2b) and (2c), should in fact be treated as a variant of Type N, in which the Theme has been left unexpressed. The common lexical entry for the two types is as follows:

Type N
 Θ-roles: Experiencer
 (Theme)
 syntax DAT/ACC-NP
 (GEN-NP)

In effect, it is unnecessary to recognise the existence of 1NP frame with its two syntactic realisations as we are dealing here with variants of the relevant 2NP types, namely Type II and Type N.

2.2. 2NPs frame vs. NP+PP frame

Comparing 2NP types with NP+PP types we notice that Type II shares some features with the first type listed in Table 1 under NP+PP frame, i.e. the one in which the Experiencer is expressed by a NOM NP which controls verbal concord (N° vi). The only difference between Type II and N° vi is that in Type II, as we have already established, the Theme may either be realised as an NP or it can be left unexpressed, while here the Theme is expressed by a PP. Thus, it seems that we should in fact classify N° vi as a variant of Type II. This means that Type II has three variants, which are differentiated only by the Theme: it can be expressed by an NP, PP, or it can be left out. The common lexical entry for the modified type would be the following:

Type II
 ⊖-roles: Experiencer
 (Theme)
 syntax: (GEN-NP)/(PP)

An analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of the remaining two NP+PP types listed in Table 1 (cf. N° vii and viii) invites comparison with Type N: in all three constructions the Experiencer is DAT or ACC, the verb is invariably 3SG, and there is no NOM-NP. As in the case of Type II and its variants, the only difference between the structures consists in the Theme. Therefore, it is natural to conclude that here again we are dealing with variants of one basic type, namely Type N. The modified lexical entry for Type N would then be as follows:

Type N
 ⊖-roles: Experiencer
 (Theme)
 syntax: DAT/ACC-NP
 (GEN-NP)/(PP)

The optionality postulated in the lexical entries of the two types, i.e. Type II and Type N, allows us to project all the relevant subtypes: if the Theme is expressed it can be represented either by an NP or a PP, giving 2NPs or NP+PP frame respectively. Alternatively, the Theme can be left out, in which case the resulting syntactic construction will be 1NP frame.

In conclusion, the proposed readjustments allow us to reduce the

number of types that need to be listed in the lexicon under individual entries of Experiencer verbs as the eight various syntactic types discussed so far, i.e. N^os i-viii in fact represent only variants of the three basic types, referred to as Type II, Type N, and Type I. In contrast to Types II and N, which can appear in all three variants, Type I does not have the option of leaving out the Theme or expressing it by means of a prepositional phrase. Its lexical entry is thus the following:

Type I
 Θ-roles: Experiencer
 Theme
 syntax: DAT-NP

Table 2 below presents a summary of the types discussed so far.

Type	Experiencer	Theme	Verbal concord
I	DAT-NP	NOM-NP	+Theme
II	NOM-NP	(GEN-NP)/(PP)	+Experiencer
N	DAT/ACC-NP	(GEN-NP)/(PP)	3SG

Table 2.

2.3. 2NPs frame vs. PROP frame

In sections 2.1 and 2.2 we discussed the constructions which were so strikingly similar that postulating a common lexical entry for the relevant types was only natural. Here our task is to see whether the seven different types representing PROP frame can also be reduced to variants of the basic 2NP types. Due to the considerable structural differences among the attested variants of 2NPs frame and PROP frame, we resorted to a different procedure when comparing individual constructions, namely apart from analysing the morphosyntactic properties characteristic of these structures, we made a textual study of the variation of 15 selected Experiencer verbs (see (6) below) to examine their distributional patterns.

- (6) *gehreowan* to rue, repent, grieve, pity for something
 gelician to please, delight
 hreowan to cause/feel pity regret for something
 langian to cause/feel longing, desire, discontent, or pain
 lician to please

<i>lystan</i>	to cause/feel pleasure or desire for something
<i>mislician</i>	to displease
<i>ofhreowan</i>	to cause/feel grief or pity for something
<i>oflician</i>	to displease, to be displeasing
<i>ofþyncan</i>	to cause/feel regret or sorrow about something
<i>sceamian</i>	to cause/feel shame about something
<i>tweogan</i>	to cause/feel doubt about something
<i>tweonian</i>	to cause/feel doubt about something
<i>þyncan</i>	to seem/think, to appear
<i>wilnian</i>	to desire, to ask for something

This study is based primarily on the Old English part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Additional sources are Bosworth and Toller (*B&T*) together with the supplement (*BTs*), Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*), Visser (1963-73), and Mitchell (1985). Occasionally we resorted to the data quoted by Wahlén (1925), Elmer (1981), Ogura (1986), Allen (1995, 1996) and to *the Old English Version of the Gospels* (ed. R. M. Liuzza), *Gregory's Pastoral Care* (ed. H. Sweet), *The Paris Psalter* (ed. T. Jebson), and *Meters of Boethius* (ed. T. Jebson). Finally, some examples have been kindly provided by Professor Cynthia Allen.

2.3.1. Type PERS

A comparison of the formal properties of 2NP types with the existing PROP types reveals a similarity between Type II and Type PERS. Both types have a NOM Experiencer controlling verbal concord and the difference between the two is limited to the Theme. Type II allows the Theme to be left out or expressed by a GEN-NP or a PP. In Type PERS the Theme is expressed by a clause. This suggests that here again we can talk about a variant of Type II. The question is what readjustment in the lexical entry we need to propose to account for this particular realisation of the Theme. It seems natural to postulate yet another category for the Theme, as in the following:

Type II	
Θ-roles:	Experiencer (Theme)
syntax:	(GEN-NP)/(PP)/(CP)

Let us note that our study of the distributional patterns typical of verbs appearing in Types II and PERS reveals an interesting dependence, namely

only verbs which appear in Type II can also be found in Type PERS, which means that there is no verb which appears in Type PERS but is not found in Type II. This observation has two important consequences. First of all, it offers further support for the claim that Types II and PERS represent variants of one construction. Secondly, this distributional pattern reveals the dependence of Type PERS upon Type II. Therefore, it is incorrect to include a CP by the side of an NP and a PP as a possible category of the Theme in the lexical entry as it fails to capture this dependence. In order to formalise the relationship that obtains between Types PERS and II we propose to ignore the category of the Theme in the lexical entry altogether. We claim that the Case information alone is sufficient to project both an NP Theme which bears genitive Case and a CP Theme. This entails that the Theme is Case-marked regardless of its category, i.e. both the NP and the CP are assigned GEN Case. In other words, our position is that the categorial status of the Theme is irrelevant and as long as the lexical entry includes the information about the available Case it will project the relevant structures as the Case can be absorbed by any Case-absorbing category, i.e. NP or CP. Under this hypothesis the dependence of Type PERS upon Type II follows naturally, as it is only on the basis of 2NPs frame that speakers can acquire the Case available for the Theme. Our objective now is to provide support for the claim that the CP Theme in Type PERS does in fact bear GEN Case. In order to do that we will resort to a familiar feature of OE, namely anticipation.

2.3.1.1. Anticipation

Mitchell (1985: §1445-6) observes that a pronoun in the appropriate case, gender, and number may anticipate a noun with or without qualifiers. The author quotes the following examples to illustrate the point:

(7)¹⁰ a. And **he** [Malchus] andwyrde
 and he-nom M-nom answered
 'And he, M, answered'
LS 34. 682 (Mitchell 1985: §1445)

b. þa **ða hi** awocon, [se ealdor and his profost] ...
 when they-nom woke the-nom governor-nom and his officer-nom

¹⁰ For ease of exposition the square brackets are used in this section in all examples of anticipation to mark the anticipates, while the anticipators are in bold type.

‘When the governor and his officer woke up’
ÆCHom ii. 172. 17 (*Mitchell* 1985: §1445)

As the sentences are grammatical it is clear that no principles have been violated, i.e. the Θ -Criterion and Case Filter are satisfied. It is therefore obvious that both elements of the pairs *he* – [*Malchus*] and *hi* – [*se ealdor and his profost*] are Case- and Θ -marked. Both elements of the two pairs carry the Θ -role of Agent and both are nominative. Clearly, the only way in which both elements of each pair can receive these properties is through a chain. The two available features, namely the external Θ -role and Case are shared by both members of the chain, i.e. the anticipator and the anticipate are coindexed and share the features via the indices.

Clauses may also be anticipated by a personal pronoun: *hit* or a demonstrative one: *þæt*¹¹ bearing the Case appropriate for the grammatical function of the subordinate clauses. This type of anticipation is illustrated in (8) below.

- (8) a. grette Geata leod, gode þancode wisfæst wordum
 greeted Geat’s man God-dat thanked wise words-dat
þæs [ðe hire se willa gelamp
 that-gen pt her the wish fulfilled
 þæt heo on ænigne eorl gelyfde fyrena frofre].
 that she on some warrior counted-subj.sg wicked-deeds relief
 ‘She greeted the man of the Geats, thanked God with wise words for the fact
 that her wish had been fulfilled, that she could count on some warrior for
 relief from from wicked deeds’
Beowulf 21 (*HCET*)
- b. He him **þæt** ondrede [þæt he sceolde innan atyddrian]
 he him-dat(refl) that-acc fears that he should inside grow-weak
 ‘He fears that he will become weaker inside’
Gr. D. 59, 26 (*BTs*)
- c. And gyf **hit** geweorde, [þæt man mid tyhtlan & mid uncræftum
 and if it-nom happen-subj.sg that man with charge and with ill-practice
 sacerd belecge],...
 priest accuse-subj.sg
 ‘And if it should happen that a man accuses a priest of charge and of ill
 practice’
Laws (Eleventh Century) (*I Cnut*) 284 (*HCET*)

¹¹ *Þis*, which is also used in this function is rare, so we will limit our discussion to the first two.

- d. butan *þæt* geweorðe, [*þæt* he þanon ætberste & swa deope
 unless that-nom happens that he thence escape-subj.sg and so earnestly
 frīdsočne gesece, *þæt* se cyningc him þurh ðæt feores],
 peace-refuge seek-subj.sg hat the king him-dat through that life
 grant
 geunne
 ‘Unless it happens that he may escape and seek a refuge of peace so
 earnestly that the king may grant him his life because of that’
 Laws (Eleventh Century) (I Cnut) 280 (*HCET*)

In (8a) and (8b) the bracketed clauses are anticipated by *þæs* and *þæt* respectively. In (8c) and (8d) the embedded clauses are anticipated by *hit* and *þæt*.¹² In the light of what has been said about the relationship between the relevant elements in (7) above, it would be unreasonable to deny the existence of the same kind of relationship between members of the pairs presented in (8), as the mechanism of anticipation should not be influenced by the categorial status of the elements involved. In effect, we conclude that the anticipators and the anticipates in (8) form a chain and share the Case and Θ -role via indices of the chain, i.e. both the pronominal NPs and the CPs are Case- and Θ -marked.¹³ Let us now compare the properties of the chains in (8) with the properties exhibited by ordinary NPs appearing with the same verbs in the same functions. Consider (9) below.

- (9) a. Apollonius hire *þæs* þancode
 Apollonius her-dat that-gen thanked
 ‘Apollonius thanked her for that’
 Apollonius of Tyre 24 (*HCET*)

¹² For a suggestion concerning the status and structural position of the anticipated clause see Cardinaletti (1990). Working with German data Cardinaletti proposes to treat the embedded clause unaccompanied by a pronoun as an argument, while the clause in construction with *es* is shown to display syntactic properties typical of an adjunct. This account resembles O’Neil’s (1977) treatment of OE relative clauses, which are also analysed as adjuncts.

¹³ The fact that *hit* and *þæt* anticipating clausal arguments are Θ -marked is not uncontroversial. See, for example, Visser (1963-73) and Mitchell (1985), who consider *hit* and *þæt* anticipators of clausal Themes at the same time classifying them as formal subjects devoid of any meaning. Bolinger (1979) and Vikner (1995) argue against assigning the status of expletives to the corresponding MnE pronouns in parallel examples. Similarly, Cardinaletti (1990) argues that German *es* cannot be analysed as an expletive when it co-occurs with an embedded clause and shows that *es* has the status of an argument. Dutch *het*, as analysed by Bennis (1986), corresponds to German *es* in this respect. While these studies do not deal with historical data, an independent examination carried out by Naya (1995) dealing with *hit* and *þæt* anticipating subject clauses in OE corroborates the claim that these pronouns are not expletive. See section 2.3.2 for the details of Naya’s investigation.

- b. Ic ondræde me god
 I fear me-dat(refl) God-acc
 'I fear God'
 Gen. 42, 18 (B&T)
- c. Gewurdon manige wundor on manegum landum
 happened-pl many wonders-nom in many lands
 'Many wonders happened in many lands'
 Ors. 5, 10; Bos. 108, 16 (B&T)

In (9a) the NP object *þæs* bears genitive Case and is assigned the internal Θ -role of Theme by the main verb *þancian*. Note that the chain in (8a) exhibits exactly the same features. As for (9b), the internal argument *god* bears accusative Case and the role of Theme provided by the predicate *ondredan*. The chain in (8b) has the same features. In (9c) the NP subject bears nominative Case and the external Θ -role of Theme. The chains in the parallel examples involving the same verb *geweorþan*, quoted under (8c, d), are supplied with the same properties. In conclusion, the comparison of the properties exhibited by the chains in (8) with the features of the corresponding NP arguments in (9) reveals that the inventory of Cases and Θ -roles in a given verb-argument relationship is not influenced by the category of the argument in OE. Consequently, the unanticipated clausal arguments quoted under (10) below are expected to be Case- and Θ -marked with the same properties as their respective equivalents presented under (8) and (9) above.

- (10) a. Ic ðancige ðe, ðæt ic ne eom na swilce odre mannum
 I thank you-dat that I not am not like other men
 'I thank you that I am not like other men'
 Hml. Th. ii. 428, 19 (B&T)
- b. He him ondrædan sceal ðæt he unmedome sie
 he him-dat(refl) fear shall that he unworthy is
 'He ought to fear that he is unworthy'
 Past. 73, 21 (BTs)
- c. & æfre ne geweorðe, þæt Christen man gewifige
 and ever not happen-subj.sg that Christian man marry-subj.sg
 in VI manna sibfæce on his agenum cynne, ...
 in 6 men's degree-of-relationship in his own kinn
 'And it should never happen that a Christian man marry within six degrees
 of consanguinity'

Laws (Eleventh Century) (VI Æ þelred) 250 (*HCET*)

Working on what has been established above, we conclude that the clausal argument in (10a) is genitive, the one in (10b) is accusative and (10c) contains a sentential subject in nominative.¹⁴

In sum, the discussion concerning anticipation allows us to conclude that argument CPs possess the same features as their NP equivalents thus indicating that the categorial status of the argument does not influence the properties it receives. This in turn corroborates the hypothesis that in Old English the category of the argument need not be included in the lexical entry of a predicate.

Let us now return to Type PERS. As has been remarked at the beginning of this section, anticipation is an optional device. Consequently, we expect that Type PERS should also optionally allow an anticipator¹⁵ and, if we are correct in claiming that the CP in Type PERS bears GEN Case, the pronominal anticipator is also expected to be GEN. This supposition is supported by the existence of examples like the one quoted under (5a) above, repeated here as (11).

- (11) gif hi þæs wilniad [þæt him heora yfel unwrecen sie
 if they-nom that-gen desire-pl that them their evil unpunished is
 be ðæs gyltes andefne]
 by the sin's proportion
 'If they ask for it that they should not get their just deserts'
 Alfred's Boethius 123 (*HCET*)

The existence of GEN anticipators in Type PERS not only supports the claim that the clausal Theme is indeed Case-marked in this construction but

¹⁴ See Charzyńska-Wójcik (2001) for a detailed discussion of Case-marking of clauses in Old English and Rostila (in press) for a discussion of Case-marking of clauses in general based on data from German, English, Finnish and Swedish.

¹⁵ Both anonymous reviewers suggest that anticipators are always present but they are not always phonologically realised. One of the reviewers points out that under this hypothesis we would not need to assume that verbs Case-mark CPs as Case would always be assigned to nominal arguments, i.e. in constructions with clausal arguments Case would be always assigned to the anticipator, either overt or covert. The other reviewer remarks that the Case-marking of subordinate clauses would follow naturally if the clauses were always in apposition with an anticipator because elements in apposition Case-agree with their appositives. The reviewer emphasises that such an assumption accords with the most striking characteristic of Old English, namely its paratactic style.

This hypothesis is a very interesting alternative to the view that anticipators are optional. Note, however, that the Case-marking of clauses will follow under either hypothesis: through a chain with a pronominal anticipator, or via direct Case-marking by the main verb. Therefore, we will not investigate here the differences between the two proposals.

it also allows us to further reduce the number of types that need to be recognised: while (5a) was listed in Table 1 as a separate construction under N^o xiii, it is now clear that it should be interpreted as Type PERS with an anticipator, hence a variant of Type II. It is important to add at this point that textual data support the above conclusion: examples like the one quoted above under (5a/11) exhibit the same dependence upon Type II as Type PERS, i.e. they are never attested with verbs which do not appear in Type II and the dependence works only one way. We can now formulate the revised lexical entry for Type II:

Type II
 Θ-roles: Experiencer
 (Theme)
 syntax: (GEN)/(PP)¹⁶

The major asset of this proposal consists in the fact that it captures the dependence of PROP types upon Type II at the same time revealing an interesting principle that seems to operate in the OE lexicon: the categorial status of the argument need not be included in the lexicon at all; selectional restrictions alone will prohibit the appearance of illegitimate structures (such as the ones with clausal Experiencers).¹⁷

The proposed lexical entry for Type II allows us to project five syntactic structures listed separately in Table 1:

- N^o ii, i.e. a 2NP type if both arguments are realised as NPs;
- N^o iv, i.e. a 1NP type if the Theme argument is not expressed; this is possible as the Θ-role of Theme and GEN/PP are marked as optional;
- N^o vi, i.e. an NP+PP type if the Theme is realised as a PP;
- N^o ix, i.e. Type PERS if the Theme is realised as a clause;
- N^o xiii, i.e. NOM-EXP+*fæs*+CP, if the clausal Theme is anticipated by a

¹⁶ An anonymous reviewer suggests that treating PP as a Case-absorbing category would simplify the representations even more: to Case alone, absorbed by NP, CP, or PP but phonologically realised only on NP. However, as remarked in the review, there are no PP anticipators in OE, which could support this view. Note, moreover, that prepositions are Case-assigners and as such cannot receive Case due to Case Resistance Principle. Finally, observe that the actual choice of the preposition is an idiosyncratic property of individual verbs and therefore has to be specified in the lexicon. Consequently, the proposed reduction in the lexical entry of Experiencer verbs is motivated only for NP and CP.

¹⁷ See Charzyńska-Wójcik (2001) for a more detailed analysis of the variation between NP and CP arguments in various structures (with and without anticipators), supporting the claim that the category of the argument need not be subcategorised for and that the major principle responsible for projecting the structure of clauses in OE is the Case information included in the lexicon.

pronoun.¹⁸

In sum, the comparison of the relevant syntactic structures supported by a detailed study of variation allowed us to conclude that Type II is a basic syntactic pattern for all the variants mentioned above.

2.3.2. Types *hit* and DEM

We will follow Allen (1995) in analysing these two constructions together as they are virtually identical: both exhibit a DAT Experiencer, a clausal Theme, and a pronoun. The only difference between them consists in the fact that one has a personal pronoun: *hit*, while in the other the pronoun is a demonstrative one: *þæt*. The fact that the Experiencer is exclusively DAT invites comparison with Type I. For the convenience of the reader the relevant portion of Table 1 is repeated below.

Frame	N ^o	Type	Experiencer	Theme	Verbal concord	Example
2NPs	i	I	DAT-NP	NOM-NP	+Theme	(1a)
PROP	xi	<i>hit</i>	DAT-NP	<i>hit</i> CP	3SG	(4d)
	xii	DEM	DAT-NP	<i>þæt</i> CP	3SG	(4e)

At first glance, the Case of the Experiencer is the only feature that all three types have in common. However, important information about the correct interpretation of Types *hit* and DEM comes from variation facts. Our study revealed that Types *hit* and DEM appear exclusively with those verbs which appear in Type I but the appearance of a verb in Type I does not automatically involve its occurrence in Type *hit* or DEM. This distributional pattern suggests that Types *hit* and DEM represent variants of Type I in which the Theme is expressed by a clause rather than an NP. What remains to be discussed now are the two features that differentiate the types in question, i.e. the pronominal elements *hit* and *þæt* and the concord parameters.

Let us begin with the status of *hit* and *þæt*. Morphologically these pronouns are ambiguous between NOM and ACC. All existing accounts, see for example Visser (1963-73), Mitchell (1985), Allen (1995), and Naya (1995), interpret these pronouns as nominative. Visser (1963-73) and

¹⁸ Note that the proposed lexical entry actually predicts the existence of this type.

Mitchell (1985) claim that *hit* and *þæt* are expletives functioning as formal subjects anticipating the clausal arguments. Allen (1995) also treats these pronouns as formal subjects. On the other hand, Naya (1995) argues that *hit* and *þæt* anticipating subject clauses in OE are not expletive. Naya's study reveals that when used as anticipators, *hit* and *þæt* are not interchangeable (Naya (1995: 34)). The author shows that *hit* and *þæt* differ in the degree of referentiality, namely anticipatory *hit* is slightly less referential than anticipatory *þæt* (which can be shown to carry stress and/or emphasis). Therefore, if the two pronouns can be shown to differ with regard to the degree of referentiality, they cannot reasonably be claimed to be devoid of meaning. This agrees with what we have established in section 2.3.1.1, namely that anticipators share the features of the anticipates so they cannot reasonably be claimed to be devoid of Θ -role. Another important argument against analysing *hit* and *þæt* as formal subjects comes from the comparison of Types *hit* and DEM with Type PERS. As has already been noted, Type PERS optionally contains a very similar element, namely *þæs*, which, in parallel to Types *hit* and DEM, anticipates the postverbal clausal Theme.

Therefore, while it could theoretically be claimed that, viewed from a diachronic perspective, the presence of *hit* and *þæt* in Types *hit* and DEM is due to the growing need in the language to equip every clause with a subject, one can propose no such motivation for the presence of *þæs* in Type PERS, so this line of reasoning is clearly fallacious. Consequently, it can be said that the claim that *hit* and *þæt* are formal subjects in Types *hit* and DEM respectively is circular and theory-internal since it presupposes that OE had formal subjects at the same time substantiating this claim by ascribing the status of formal subjects to the elements in question. Hence, it seems incorrect to treat *hit* and *þæt* as formal subjects.¹⁹ If these pronouns are not formal subjects, what are they? As we have already remarked, Type PERS optionally contains a pronoun (*þæs*) functioning as an anticipator of a clausal Theme. It seems natural to infer that *hit* and *þæt* in Types *hit* and DEM have the same function as *þæs* in Type PERS. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that *hit* and *þæt* bear the Case expected of the anticipator in Types *hit* and DEM, i.e. nominative since, as the data study has revealed, these types are based on Type I, which assigns NOM to the Theme. Establishing the Case and function of *hit* and *þæt* has important consequences for the interpretation of the verbal concord. First of all, the

¹⁹ More arguments against this view have already been presented in fn. 13.

fact that the pronouns are nominative rather than accusative means that the verb agrees with the nominative pronoun rather than exhibiting lack of concord. Furthermore, the fact that *hit* and *þæt* bear the Θ -role of Theme indicates that the verb agrees with the Theme just as in the case of Type I. Let us then summarise the morphosyntactic properties of the three constructions in a table.

Type	Experiencer	Theme		Verbal concord
I	DAT-NP	NOM-NP		+Theme
<i>hit</i>		<i>hit</i> -NOM	NOM-CP	
DEM		<i>þæt</i> -NOM	NOM-CP	

Table 3.

As we can see, the differences between Types I, *hit* and DEM are only superficial: all three types exhibit a DAT Experiencer, NOM Theme (expressed by an NP or a CP anticipated by a pronoun) and a verb which agrees with the Theme. Working on the findings presented in section 2.3.1, namely that there is no need to subcategorise for the actual category of the Theme, we can propose a modified lexical entry for Type I, which will project both Type I and Types *hit* and DEM:

Type I
 Θ -roles: Experiencer
 Theme
 syntax: DAT

The lexical entry does not specify the category of the Theme only the Case available for it, hence it accounts for the distributional dependence of Types *hit* and DEM upon Type I. Note, however, that since anticipation is optional, the lexical entry proposed for Type I predicts the existence of yet another variant of Type I, namely a structure in which the clausal Theme is not anticipated, i.e.: DAT-NP Experiencer + CP Theme: a pattern formally identical with a subtype of Type S (cf. N^o x in Table 1) in which the Experiencer bears DAT rather than ACC Case. This is, at least at first glance, not a desirable effect as it entails a split within Type S for which we would need independent support. We will postpone the discussion of this problem till we have analysed Type S in detail.

2.3.3. Type S

The properties of Type S, i.e. DAT or ACC Experiencer, lack of a NOM NP and of verbal concord invite comparison with Type N, which exhibits the same characteristics. The sole difference between the two constructions lies in the Theme: realised as an NP, PP or \emptyset in Type N, and as a clause in Type S. This structural likeness suggests that here again we are dealing with a variant of the basic Type N. However, in contrast with the PROP types discussed so far, textual data do not corroborate this hypothesis: with the exception of *wilnian* 'to desire' all the verbs listed in (6) above appear in Type S, while only *gehreowan*, *hreowan*, *langian*, *lystan*, *ofhreowan*, *ofþyncan*, *sceamian*, *tweogan*, *tweonian*, *þyncan* are found in Type N. Consequently, the claim that Type N is basic for Type S cannot be sustained. Additionally, a detailed study of the variation exhibited by verbs appearing in Type S (cf. Table 4 below) shows that no other 2NP type can be shown as underlying for Type S.

Verbs in Type S	Verbs in Type N	Verbs in Type I	Verbs in Type II
gehreowan	gehreowan	gehreowan	
gelician		gelician	
hreowan	hreowan	hreowan	
langian	langian		
lician		lician	
lystan	lystan		lystan
mislician		mislician	
ofhreowan	ofhreowan	ofhreowan	ofhreowan
oflician		oflician	
of þyncan	of þyncan	of þyncan	
sceamian	sceamian		sceamian
tweogan	tweogan		tweogan
tweonian	tweonian		tweonian
þyncan	þyncan	þyncan	

Table 4. The occurrence of verbs of Type S in 2NP Types

At first glance the above data do not seem promising: there does not seem to be a key to Type S. A closer inspection, however, reveals that those verbs of Type S which do not appear in Type N appear in Type I, and those verbs of Type S which do not occur with Type I are found with Type N. This leads to the conclusion that the occurrence of Type S in any given case is dependent upon either Type N or Type I (or both). The dependence of Type S upon Type N or Type I brings us back to the prediction following from the lexical entry for Type I stated in section 2.3.2, namely that there should exist a type containing a dative Experiencer and a clausal Theme without an anticipator, that is a type apparently identical with those Type S clauses in which the Experiencer is DAT. The correctness of this prediction can only be established on the basis of the examination of those instances of Type S which co-occur with Type I but never appear in Type N in order to see whether the Experiencers are restrictively dative there in spite of the fact that Type S in principle allows the Experiencer to assume accusative Case. As is clear from Table 4 above, the relevant verbs are *gelician*, *lician*, *mislician*, and *oflician*.

We examined all Type S clauses in our corpus which appear with the verbs listed above, focusing on the Case of the Experiencers and we found that there is not a single instance of an unambiguously ACC Experiencer. Consequently, all examples of Type S with the verbs occurring also in Type I could be treated as variants of Type I derivable from the proposed lexical entry. However, it might be argued that since these verbs do not assign ACC to their Experiencer in non-PROP types anyway, the lack of ACC Experiencers with them in a PROP type does not prove anything. This is not true, however, since without the assumption that a PROP type is **based** on a particular 2NP type, the lack of ACC Experiencers in clauses of Type S, which in principle allows Experiencers to bear ACC Case, will have to be treated as a coincidence. The fact that a verb is capable of assigning a particular Case to its Experiencer in one construction does not automatically mean that the inventory of Cases for the Experiencer is the same in another type. The lack of ACC Experiencers with *gelician*, *lician*, *mislician*, and *oflician* follows automatically only if we classify the occurrences of Type S discussed here as representing variants of Type I.

As a final argument let us remark that all instances of Types *hit* and DEM co-occur with Type S; that is if a verb is found in either of these types, it is also found in Type S (but not the other way round). If the three types were all independent of each other, such co-occurrence could again

only be viewed as coincidental (which makes two coincidences already). We take this point as further confirmation of the proposed reclassification within Type S. Therefore, the examples exhibiting clausal Themes co-occurring with Type I but not with Type N are variants of Type I rather than belonging to Type S. This looks puzzling at first blush since under our account two superficially identical constructions are classified differently, either as Type S or as Type I with a clausal Theme. Consider (12) below.

- (12) a. Gode ofduhte ða dæt he mann geworhte ofer eorðan: ...
 God-dat regretted-3sg then that he man created on earth
 ‘God regretted that he created men on the earth ...’
 The Old Testament, Genesis VI.1 (*HCET*)
- b. him swiðe scomede þat he swa iscend wes.
 he-dat very shamed-3sg that he so disgraced was
 ‘He was ashamed that he had been so disgraced’
 Lazamon 4851 (*Visser* 1963-73: §32)

Both clauses in (12) contain a DAT Experiencer, a clausal Theme, and a 3SG verb. In spite of this formal identity, we propose to classify the example with *offpyncan* (12a) as a variant of Type I, while the sentence with *sceamian* (12b) is to be analysed as an instance of Type S. In support of this rather surprising interpretation of the above data we offer the examples in (13).

- (13) a. Lareow, ne offpingd hit ðe gif ic þus wer geceose?
 master not displeases-3sg it-nom you-dat if I thus man choose
 ‘Master, doesn’t it displease you if I thus choose a man?’
 Apollonius of Tyre 32 (*HCET*)
- b. þa ofpuhte þæt Mariuse þæm consule, Iuliuses eame.
 then regretted that-nom Marius-dat the consul Julius’ uncle
þæt mon dæt gewin nolde him betæcan.
 that one that war not-would him entrust
 ‘Then it offended consul Marius, Julius’ uncle, that he was not put in charge
 of the war’
 Alfred’s Orosius 23 (*HCET*)
- c. And þæs us ne scamað na, ac þæs us scaamad swyþe
 and that-gen us-dat/acc not shames not but that-gen us-dat/acc shames very
þæt we bote aginnan swa swa bec tæcan,
 that we repentance undertake just as book teaches

& þæt is gesyne on þysse earman forsyngodon þeode.
 and that is evident in this poor sinful people
 'And that does not make us at all ashamed but it makes us greatly ashamed
 that we undertake repentance just as the Bible teaches and that is visible in
 this poor sinful people'
 Wulfstan's Homilies (O3) XX 273-4. (HCET)

The clauses in (13) contain the same verbs as those in (12): *offbyncan* and *sceamian*. The verbs are accompanied by DAT Experiencers, clausal Themes, and pronominal anticipators. Note, however, that the anticipators appearing with *offbyncan* bear NOM Case: *hit* (13a) and *þæt* (13b), while the anticipator which features in the clause with *sceamian* is GEN: *þæs* (13c). If the two examples given in (12) represented the same construction, i.e. Type S this should not happen. However, as they represent variants of two different structures it is only to be expected that the anticipators which appear with them should bear different Cases.

In conclusion, there is enough justification for the split within Type S. The proposed reclassification of Type S accounts for:

- a) variation between Type I and Types *hit* and DEM;
- b) the lack of ACC Experiencers with those instances of what is traditionally viewed as Type S which do not co-occur with Type N, a fact which has otherwise gone completely unnoticed;²⁰
- c) the co-occurrence of Type *hit* and DEM with Type S; without the analysis proposed here this co-occurrence is purely coincidental;
- d) the distribution of Type S - by reclassifying some instances of Type S as belonging to Type I, therefore revealing that, like Types PERS, *hit*, and DEM, Type S is based on a 2NP type.

The only disadvantage of the proposed analysis is the structural ambiguity presented in (12) above. The textual study and the data in (13), however, have shown the split within Type S to be well motivated. To avoid confusion between what is regarded as Type S by Allen (1995) and what we treat as Type S here, the latter will be marked with an asterisk (S*). This brings us back to a discussion of Types N and S*.

Considering the structural similarities between Types N and S* and the observed distributional dependence of Type S* upon Type N we conclude that Type S* represents a variant of Type N just as all the PROP types discussed so far were only variants of the relevant 2NP types. Note

²⁰The lexical entry proposed for Type I in fact predicts this distribution of Cases.

that removing the category of the Theme from the lexical entry we proposed for Type N will enable us to project all its variants.

Type N	
Θ-roles:	Experiencer (Theme)
syntax	DAT/ACC (GEN)/(PP)

If both arguments are NPs, the resulting type is a 2NP construction with the Experiencer bearing DAT or ACC Case and the Theme marked GEN (cf. N^o iii). If the Theme argument is unexpressed, the resulting structure is a variant of INP frame (cf. N^o v). If the Theme is expressed by a PP we get an NP+PP construction (cf. N^os vii and viii). Finally, if the Theme is realised by a clause, the lexical entry will produce Type S* (cf. N^o x). However, as was the case with Type I and Type II, we expect the existence of Type S* with an anticipator of the clausal Theme. The expected Case of the anticipator is GEN, as this is the Case assigned by a verb of this type to the Theme argument. This prediction is borne out by the data, as testified by the examples quoted under (5b, c) and listed under N^os xiv and xv in Table 1. The examples are repeated below.

- (14) a. *ac þæs me þincð ðæt þæt bio sio soðe & sio fulfremede*
 but that-gen me-dat seems that that is the truth and the perfect
gesæld ðe mæg ælcum hire folgera sellan ðurhwunigendne welan ..
 happiness which may each her followers give continuous wealth
 ‘But it seems to me that true and perfect happiness is of such kind that it
 continuously gives wealth to each of its followers’
 or: ‘For if I mistake not, true and perfect happiness is that which makes a
 man truly satisfied, powerful, venerated, renowned, and happy’
 Alfred’s Boethius XXXIII 78 (*HCET*)
- b. *Hine þæs heardost langode hwanne he of ðisse worlde moste.*
 him-acc that-gen strongest longed when he from this world might
 ‘He strongly desired to be allowed to leave this world’
 Blickl. Homl. 227, 1 (*B&T*)

In this way the modified lexical entry for Type N not only accounts for the distributional dependence of Type S* upon Type N but it also predicts the existence of its two additional variants. By reclassifying N^os xiv and xv from Table 1 as variants of Type N we have exhausted the range of the

possible structures with which Experiencer verbs can be found in OE.

The importance of the data in (5b/14a, 5c/14b) should not be overlooked as they were not taken into account when postulating the lexical entry for Type N and therefore constitute independent support in favour of the proposed analysis. The presence of the genitive anticipator in Type S* verifies the correctness of the claim that a given Experiencer verb assigns Case to its argument regardless of its categorial status, provided the category is a Case-absorbing one. Let us now itemise the gains following from the revised lexical entry for Type N. It accounts for:

- (i) the variation between Type S* and N;
- (ii) the existence of DAT **and** ACC Experiencers only with Type S*, a fact that escapes notice without the observations following from our study of variation;
- (iii) GEN anticipators in Type S*, as opposed to NOM anticipators in Types *hit* and DEM, based on Type I.

Let us revert for a moment to the discussion of the ambiguity illustrated by (12). Establishing that no PROP Type exists with a given verb without the matching 2NP type reduces the number of ambiguous examples to those Type S clauses which contain verbs appearing both in Type N and I, namely, *hreoƿan*, *ofhreoƿan*, *ofþyncan*, *þyncan*. Moreover, examples with clausal Themes anticipated by pronouns will not, of course, be ambiguous.

In conclusion, the data discussed above have allowed us to reduce the 15 types listed in Table 1 to just three basic types, i.e. Type I, Type II, and Type N, which can have various structural realisations differentiated by the Theme. In Type II and Type N the Theme can be realised by an NP, PP, Ø, or a clause with or without an anticipator. In Type I the Theme can be expressed by an NP or a clause, which can optionally be anticipated by a personal pronoun (*hit*) or a demonstrative one (*þæt*). This gives us five variants in the case of Type II:

2NPs	N° ii	(ex.1b)
1NP	N° iv	(ex.2a)
NP+PP	N° vi	(ex.3a)
NP+CP	N° ix	(ex.4a)
NP+anticipator+CP	N° xiii	(ex.5a)

As for Type N, it has seven variants:²¹

2NPs	N° iii	(ex.1c, d)
INP	N° v	(ex.2b, c)
NP-DAT+PP	N° vii	(ex.3b)
NP-ACC+PP	N° viii	(ex.3c)
NP+CP	N° x	(ex.4b, 12b)
NP-DAT+anticipator+CP	N° xiv	(ex.5b)
NP-ACC+anticipator+CP	N° xv	(ex.5c)

Type I can be represented by either of the four variants listed below:

2NPs	N° i	(ex.1a)
NP+CP	²²	(ex.12a)
NP+ <i>hit</i> +CP	N° xi	(ex.4d)
NP+ <i>þæt</i> +CP	N° xii	(ex.4e)

As all analysed constructions are only variants of the three underlying types, it seems reasonable that the labels these types bear should reflect this dependence. We propose the following terms to make this dependence transparent, at the same time keeping as much of the original terminology as possible.

Type II ²³	Type N	Type I
Type II/INP	Type N/INP	
Type II/PP	Type N/PP	
Type II/PROP	Type N/PROP	Type I/PROP
Type II/PROP-ant	Type N/PROP-ant	Type I/PROP- <i>hit</i> ; Type I /PROP-DEM

3. Conclusion

The account proposed in this paper introduces a reduction in the lexicon at the same time revealing an interesting property of the Old English lexicon, namely that arguments which can receive Case, i.e. NPs and clauses are not projected on the basis of subcategorisation frames but on the basis of the Case information alone. In effect, it is the Case that is the major factor differentiating all the clause types which were attested with Experiencer

²¹ In fact the seven variants can be represented by ten various constructions, as Types N, O and S* can appear both with a DAT and an ACC Experiencer, as indicated in Table 1.

²² This variant was not recognised in Table 1.

²³ As the 2NP types are underlying in all instances, they have no additional specification.

verbs in Old English. This result is very much in line with Belletti and Rizzi's (1988) analysis of psychological verbs in Italian. The lexical representations they propose are based on the principle that the Case-grid is the only lexical parameter differentiating the existing classes of psychological verbs.

Apart from being economical, our analysis captures the similarities and dependencies that obtain between individual constructions in which Experiencer verbs could feature in Old English.²⁴ Note that the symmetrical account arrived at here is a direct consequence of the reclassification we introduced into Type S (in the sense of Allen (1995)). Without the observation that some clauses of Type S are based on Type I, while others are dependent upon Type N we would miss an important generalisation namely that **all** PROP types represent variants of 2NP types. The only 'generalisations' that could be made would concern the dependence of Type PERS upon Type II and the dependence of Types *hit* and DEM upon Type I. However, without showing that the remaining PROP types also depend on the existence of a matching 2NP type, these dependencies entail no general consequences for the overall analysis of the syntax of Old English Experiencer verbs and thereby are merely observational.

In sum, Old English Experiencer verbs could appear in three basic types, i.e. Type I, Type II, and Type N, which could then be realised by four, five, and seven different constructions respectively.

Acknowledgement

I wish to thank Professor Cynthia Allen for helping me to collect the data. I am also grateful to Professor Adam Pasicki and two anonymous reviewers for useful comments.

Abbreviations

ANT	anticipator	PL	plural
ACC	accusative	PT	particle
DAT	dative	REFL	reflexive
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
NOM	nominative	SUBJ	subjunctive

²⁴ Interestingly, the dependence of PROP types upon the relevant 2NP types obtained up to the 16thc when PROP types began to appear independently of the matching 2NP types (see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2001) for details).

References:

- Allen, Cynthia L. (1995) *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Allen, Cynthia L. (1996) A Change in Structural Case-Marking in Early Middle English. In Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein and Steve Peter (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, pp. 3-20. Dordrecht, Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi (1988) PSYCH-Verbs and Θ -Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
- Bennis, H. (1986) Gaps and Dummies. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1979) *Meaning and Form*. London and New York: Longman.
- B&T = Bosworth, Joseph & Toller, T. Northcote (1898) *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*. Edited and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller. London: Oxford University Press.
- BTs = *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth, Supplement*. By T. Northcote Toller. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1990) Es, pro and Sentential Arguments in German. *Linguistische Berichte* 126: 135-164.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena (2001) The Evolution of Impersonal Constructions and the Status of the Subject in the History of English. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. Catholic University of Lublin.
- Cooper, W. V. (1902) *The Consolation of Philosophy. Boethius (The Temple Classics)*. In Israel Golancz (ed.), London: J. M. Dent and Company. [Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library, <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/boethius/boetrans.html>]
- Elmer, Willy (1981) *Diachronic Grammar: The History of Old and Middle English Subjectless Constructions*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Fischer, Olga & Leek, Frederike van der (1983) The Demise of the Old English Impersonal Construction. *Journal of Linguistics* 19: 337-368.
- Gaaf, Willem van der (1904) *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English (Anglistische Forschungen 14)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsbuchhandlung, Reprinted 1967. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- HCET = *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal*. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Jebson, Tony (ed.) *The Meters of Boethius*. The Corpus of OE Poetry, <http://www.georgetown.edu/labyrinth/library/oe/alpha/html>.
- Jebson, Tony (ed.) *The Paris Psalter*. The Corpus of OE Poetry, <http://www.georgetown.edu/labyrinth/library/oe/texts/a5.105.html>.
- Kytö, Merja (1996) *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Liuzza, R. M. ed. (1994) *The Old English Version of the Gospels*. Oxford University

Press.

- Mitchell, Bruce (1985) *Old English Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Naya, Belén Méndez. (1995) *Hit* and *Dæt* Anticipating Subject Clauses in OE. True Syntactic Equivalents? *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96: 23-37.
- OED* = *Oxford English Dictionary*. First edn. edited by James Murray et al. 1933, Second edn. prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner 1989. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ogura, Michiko (1986) *Old English 'Impersonal' Verbs and Expressions*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.
- O'Neil, Wayne (1977) Clause Adjunction in Old English. *General Linguistics* 17: 199-211.
- Rostila, Jouni (in press) Kasusentdeckungen? *Finnische Beiträge zur Germanistik*. Frankfurt a. M: Lang.
- Sweet, Henry ed. (1871-2) *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. EETS os 45, 50. London: Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, Sten (1995) *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, F. Th. (1963-73) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, In 3 parts (4 vols.). Leiden: Brill.
- Wahlén, Nils (1925) *The Old English Impersonalia*, Part I. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.