

The Historical Syntax Problem: Reanalysis and Directionality
Andrew Garrett

In this chapter I will suggest that our field's interest in reanalysis as a mechanism of change, while rightly focussing attention on syntactic structure, has also contributed to a blinkered view of diachrony. Based on previously unexamined data, I will offer new historical accounts of two of the most widely discussed changes in the history of English: the origin of the *for NP to VP* pattern and the emergence of the *go* future. These accounts illustrate an approach whose goal is not merely to characterize reanalyses but to understand what lies behind them.¹

I begin by making the obvious point that syntactic change is language change and that our understanding of change in syntax could be informed by our understanding of change in other domains. In the area of phonetics, phonology, and morphology, it has long been known that there are two main classes of change: *sound change* emerges from the interaction of the phonological system and the articulatory and perceptual systems; *analogy* is the imposition of regularities from one area of grammar on another. Sound change shows substantive directional asymmetries; general patterns in analogy instead concern which regularities in which areas of grammar tend to be extended to which other areas. I follow Kiparsky (this volume) in understanding grammaticalization and analogy as the major types of syntactic change, and I would emphasize the profile that emerges in Table 1.

Sound change and grammaticalization emerge from the interaction of strictly linguistic systems, phonology and syntax, with their associated external-interface systems: articulation and perception in the case of sound change; semantics and pragmatics in the case of grammaticalization. Both externally oriented types of change show substantive directional asymmetries, familiar to all historical linguists, whereas analogical change typically lacks patterns of the type "X becomes Y but Y does not become X".

What is the role of reanalysis in this context? For example, many linguists have proposed that sound change is caused by the reanalysis of phonetically ambiguous strings. A reasonable question asked in response is why, if reanalysis is the crucial mechanism, directional asymmetries should exist. A possible answer is that perceptual ambiguities may not be symmetric: certain mishearings may be likelier than others for acoustic reasons, for instance, or certain biases may be built into the perceptual system.

¹ This chapter originated as a response to Paul Kiparsky's exemplary contribution to this volume. I am grateful to the editors for permitting the expansion. [The discussion of *for NP to VP* and of the *go* future will be expanded over the coming month or so.]

tem.

(Morpho)phonological change	Basic cause	Directional asymmetries?
Sound change	Interaction of phonology and phonetics	Yes (e.g. <i>kt</i> > <i>tt</i> but not the reverse)
Analogy	Imposition of regularities from one grammatical area on another area	No (generalizations have to do with what regularities from what areas on imposed)
(Morpho)syntactic change	Basic cause	Directional asymmetries?
Grammaticalization	Interaction of syntax and semantics	Yes (e.g. motion V > future auxiliary but not the reverse)
Analogy	Imposition of regularities from one grammatical area on another area	No?

Table 1. (Morpho)phonological and (morpho)syntactic change

To what extent this answer is right is not germane; the question for syntax is what might serve to motivate reanalyses and explain whatever directional asymmetries we find in grammaticalization or other syntactic change. On some level all change must reflect structural reanalysis, at least if synchronic linguistic systems have structures, but as Kiparsky (this volume) notes, reanalysis *per se* has little explanatory force. Any number of reanalyses are imaginable, and many logically possible reanalyses fail to occur; reanalysis is moreover incapable on its own of explaining directional asymmetries. A mature research program should therefore not only characterize structural reanalysis in specific cases but should also seek to understand what triggers it.

In what follows, I will first (in §1) comment on the modern interest in reanalysis. In §2 I will show that radical reanalysis in syntactic change has been overemphasized and that a famous alleged case (the English *for NP to VP* pattern) has another explanation. In §3, finally, I will propose a new account of the emergence of the English *go* future; this case will illustrate how the combinatorial properties of a source pattern give rise to the properties of an emergent one.

1. A major weakness of modern historical syntax has been a failure to investigate the causes of reanalysis and a reliance on mere formal ambiguity as an explanation for change.² For example, Harris & Campbell (1995: 53) write that “[l]anguage contact,

² A good example of the failure can be seen in my own analysis of the evolution of ergative case marking systems (Garrett 1990): the crucial reanalysis (instrumental NP > ergative subject NP in previously null-subject transitive clauses) is formally straightforward but was given no motivation. (Why not the reverse

surface ambiguity, and analogues [structurally similar items, constructions, etc.] can all be among causal factors in changes” Since not every syntactic change involves contact or analogy, this means that surface ambiguity — the mere *possibility* of multiple analyses — can sometimes cause an alternative structure to emerge.³

This same weakness can be found in canonical texts of the diachronic generative syntax movement. Thus Lightfoot (1999: 179) has written that “[w]e explain a change only if we can point to prior changes in the distribution of the relevant cues”, adding later (p. 259) that “there is nothing principled to be said about why the cues should shift a little; those shifts often represent chance, contingent factors.” At least for some changes, in other words, explanation is not in our remit.

This is not just criticism of textbook rhetoric; inattention to the cause of reanalysis runs deep. A famous case of reanalysis is the change by which, according to Jespersen and his followers, English psychological verbs such as *like* supposedly shifted from the theme-subject frame in (1a) to the experiencer-subject frame in (1b).

- (1) a *Like* (OE *lician*): Theme subject (nominative) + Experiencer object (dative)
Example: *Ge noldon Gode lician* “Ye would not please God” (Alc. G. 39.161)
- b After reanalysis: Experiencer subject + Theme object
Example: *I like the idea of Miller’s anti-literature*
(OED: 1939 Dylan Thomas *Let.* 11 Sept. (1966) 236)

We now know from the work of Cynthia Allen (1986, 1995) that Jespersen’s story about experiencer verbs is wrong, but it is worth seeing how it has been invoked. Lightfoot (1988: 306) has cited Jespersen as follows:

Jespersen (1928) claimed that [this] change ... ‘was brought about by the greater interest taken in persons than things.’ They did not always presuppose a very sophisticated or even plausible psychology, but it is clear that historians have looked to psychology for their explanations.

As he observes here and elsewhere, an essential element of the Jespersen account is that verbs such as *like* must have been used in OVS sentences often enough to allow

change?) A type of consequence I will not discuss here is that some linguists, seeing how hard the actual problem is in historical syntax, have chosen to foreground syntactic changes due to language or dialect contact; for references see the overview of Kroch (2001).

³ Cf. Harris & Campbell (1995: 72): “the conditions necessary for reanalysis to take place are that a subset of the tokens of a particular constructional type must be open to the possibility of multiple structural analyses, where one potential analysis is the old one (applicable to all tokens) and the other potential analysis is the new one (applicable to a subset).” I agree that some structural ambiguity is necessary for reanalysis, but this cannot be a sufficient condition for reanalysis.

reanalysis.⁴ An example of the relevant type is in (2).

(2) ac gode ne licode na heora geleafleat ...

“But God (DAT) did not like their unbelief (NOM)” (ÆHom 21.68)

By contrast, *kill*, *see*, *love*, and other verbs must relatively rarely have occurred in OVS sentences. This is a key ingredient of the account: after English shifted to basic VO order, surface OVS order with *like* led to reanalysis of the verb’s argument structure.

Why would *like* and other psychological verbs have differed in this respect from all other transitive verbs, including others that originally selected dative objects? This is what Jespersen (1928: 208) sought to answer:

The change in construction was brought about by (1) the greater interest taken in persons than in things, which caused the name of the person to be placed before the verb, (2) the identity in form of the nominative and the oblique case in substantives.

Lightfoot attributes to Jespersen the view that the change itself was caused by our interest in people, but Jespersen actually seems to have been suggesting, in effect, that human referents tend to be more salient or topical in discourse, that such NPs tend to be placed initially, and that this explains the frequency of OVS word order. The reanalysis account requires an explanation of the OVS pattern, and while Jespersen’s explanation is crudely stated it is not incoherent. His account is wrong, to repeat, but he was addressing a crucial question: *Why reanalysis?* Why did the usage patterns of some verbs shift to allow argument-structure inversion? Far from offering a just-so story *à la* Jacob Grimm, Jespersen was trying to answer what a modern theorist has not even recognized as a question.

2. An unfortunate consequence of our lack of interest in what triggers reanalysis has been a willingness to accept accounts based on pure reanalysis. Models like Whitman’s (2000) “relabelling hypothesis” that reject radical reanalysis are welcome, but reanalyses driven solely by syntactic ambiguity remain a staple of the literature. For example, almost as famous as the history of *like* is a reanalysis supposedly underlying the English *for* NP *to* VP pattern. I will suggest that this parade example of reanalysis is also a mirage.

Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) first noted a significant restriction on the *for* NP *to* VP pattern, as follows:

⁴ Similar (in part identical) discussions appear in Lightfoot (1991), Lightfoot (1999), and Anderson & Lightfoot (2002).

Emotive complements are those to which the speaker expresses a subjective, emotional, or evaluative reaction. The class of predicates taking emotive complements ... includes in general all predicates which express the subjective value of a proposition rather than knowledge about it or its truth value. It is this class of predicates to which *for-to* complements are limited.

I will use the term “subjective” for predicates of this sort, like *be a great thing* in (3).⁵

(3) It is a great thing [_{CP} [_C for] [_{TP} struggling youth to have a three-syllabled name with a paroxyton accent]]

(OED: 1887 ‘Q’ (Quiller Couch) *Dead Man’s Rock* 187)

The conventional view of the *for NP to VP* pattern, expressed by many authors and standard handbooks, is that structures like (3) arose from a reanalysis of structures like (4).⁶

(4) It is better [_{pp} for me] [_{TP} to walke ... bare hede and all dysformate]

(OED: 1491 CAXTON *Vitas Patr.* (W. de W. 1495) II. 219 a/2)

As one standard treatment puts it, “a benefactive dative originally governed by the matrix verb ... has come to be interpreted as the subject of the infinitival clause” (Fischer et al. 2000: 217). The reanalysis is schematized in (5).

(5) a Earlier, e.g. (4): Predicate + [_{pp} [_p for] NP] [_{TP} to VP]

b After reanalysis, e.g. (3): Predicate + [_{CP} [_C for] [_{TP} NP to VP]]

In the earlier structure, the NP is a prepositional complement within a higher predicate and the infinitival clause has no overt subject. After reanalysis, *for* is a complementizer and the NP is an infinitival subject.

The modern structure is conventionally dated to the early sixteenth century based on examples like (6); in this example the *for NP to VP* pattern occupies a position where *for* cannot be a preposition.⁷

(6) I doe verily thinke that you being a yong Gentleman, lusty and valiant, no better remedy or deuise can be found, than [_{CP} [_C for] [_{TP} you to aspire & seeke the Kings fauor and seruice]]

(LION: 1567 William Painter *The Palace of Pleasure*, Tome 2)

Yet the standard reanalysis account is wrong; the *for NP to VP* pattern was already clausal before the appearance of examples like (6), in the second half of the fifteenth

⁵ See Mair (1990) for extensive discussion of the pragmatics and usage of the modern pattern.

⁶ See e.g. Fischer (1988), Harris & Campbell (1995: 62), and Fischer et al. (2000: 214-220); for a minority view see Lightfoot (1979: 186-204), followed by Whitman (2000: 223-226).

⁷ According to Fischer (1992: 331) the earliest clear examples are from c. 1507 and from 1534; the next examples known to me are from 1567.

century and probably earlier. I cite my data from Malory (text completed c. 1470, first publication 1485), whose language is representative of the period.

I first cite data consistent with the standard view. Sentences like (6) are absent at this stage; instead, as in (7), we find plain NPs and unambiguously nominative pronouns.

- (7) a ... for she lovyth none of thy felyshyp, and [_{TP} **thou** to love that lovyth nat the] is but grete foly. (Vinaver 1990: 322)
 b ... and thy fadir slew oure fadir, and [_{TP} **thou** to ly by oure modir] is to mucche shame for us to suffir. (Vinaver 1990: 612)

Plain NPs and nominative pronouns are in fact used, as in (8), whenever the NP is not in a position to be licensed by a subjective predicate.

- (8) a ... for hit ys bettir we sle a cowarde than [_{TP} thorow a coward **all we** be slayne]. (Vinaver 1990: 35)
 b ... for hit ys the custom of my contrey [_{TP} **a knyght** allweyes to kepe his wepyn with him]. (Vinaver 1990: 83)

As seen in (4) and (9), the *for* NP *to* VP pattern appears only when the NP is in a position to be licensed by a subjective predicate.

- (9) a But M[e]rlyon warned the king covertly that Gwenyver was nat **holsom for hym** to take to wyff. (Vinaver 1990: 97)
 b ‘Truly,’ seyde sir Launcelot, ‘yondir one knyght shall I helpe, for hit were **shame for me** to se three knyghtes on one, and yf [he] be there slayne I am partener of his deth.’ (Vinaver 1990: 271)

The conventional view of this stage is that *for* heads the PP complement of a subjective predicate. This predicts that the *for* phrase will have the distribution of any PP complement, and in particular (1) that a subjective predicate that occurs with the *for* NP *to* VP pattern may also occur with plain *for* NP (plus a nonfinite complement or no complement clause) and (2) that where freer word order is tolerated, *for* NP may be separated from the infinitival phrase.

These predictions are false. As shown for the subjective predicate *be shame* in (10-11), the preposition used in a benefactive phrase with no adjacent infinitival phrase is *to*, not *for*. The data are quite regular.

- (10) a Hit were **shame** [_{PP} **to us**] [_{CP} and he were nat assayed], were he never so good a knyght. (Vinaver 1990: 160)
 b Predicted by the standard view (but unattested): *it were shame **for us** if he were not assayed

(11) a Be there ony bygger knyghtys in the courte of kynge Arthure? Hit is [_{pp} **to you**] **shame** [_{TP} to sey us knyghtes of Cornwayle dishonour], for hit may happyn a Cornysh knyght may macche you. (Vinaver 1990: 399)

b Predicted by the standard view (but unattested): *it is **for you** shame to say

...

The *for* NP pattern is in fact used with subjective predicates only if two conditions are met: the NP immediately precedes and can be construed as the subject of the infinitival clause; and the NP can be interpreted as bearing what we may call the “benefactive” θ -role assigned by the subjective predicate. In (9b), the speaker is the subject of the verb *see* and bears the benefactive role vis-à-vis the subjective predicate *be shame*. We see in (12) that an infinitival subject is not marked by *for* if it lacks this role.

(12) So he rode unto the knyghtys and cryed unto them and bade them sease of that batayle, for they ded **themselves** grete **shame**, [_{TP} so many knyghtes to feyght wyth one].

(Vinaver 1990: 560-561)

The result is something of a paradox: already in the late 15th century stage prior to reanalysis, the *for* NP *to* VP pattern must be a syntactic constituent (presumably a CP), or its two parts would sometimes occur separated; but the NP must bear the θ -role assigned by the subjective predicate, or the pattern would occur in contexts where another argument bears that θ -role.⁸ The construction was syntactically modern, in other words, except that a θ -role was transmitted from the higher subjective predicate to the NP subject, presumably via *for*, which appeared only in such contexts. If so, what change created the modern state of affairs where the NP has no necessary thematic relationship to the subjective predicate? The crucial change was evidently a case of grammaticalization, not reanalysis. In this context *for* earlier had a thematic function but shifted to its modern pure complementizer status. After the shift, *for* could appear in positions where the infinitival subject had no thematic relationship to the subjective predicate.

To summarize: failure to see the explanatory limitations of reanalysis has led to a lack of interest in what actually triggers it and to an easy acceptance of alleged cases of pure reanalysis.

⁸ One may well ask, if *for* in the *for* NP *to* VP pattern was not a preposition in the late fifteenth century, how it got there. Does my account simply push the problem back in time? It does not: what the clausal *for* NP *to* VP pattern itself replaced was a clausal NP *to* VP pattern in which the NP was overtly dative, and the replacement was simply part of the general replacement of dative case-marked NPs by prepositionally marked NPs. In this context the *for* NP sequence was never a PP.

3. The distinction between analogy and grammaticalization in Table 1 naturally directs our attention to their properties as mechanisms of syntactic change. In particular, what causes grammaticalization and why does it show directionality effects? A number of authors within the generative historical syntax tradition have recently addressed this question; I will return to their views later. Meanwhile, I suggest that Meillet (1905-1906 [1921: 239]) was right to suggest that certain meaning changes originate from the compositionally determined semantics of particular syntactic configurations: “Quelques changements ... proviennent de la structure de certaines phrases, où tel mot paraît jouer un rôle special.” Such changes were dubbed “permutation” in the classic study of Gustaf Stern (1931), and they are often the basis of grammaticalization.

I illustrate this with an example from a famous class of grammaticalizations, the shift of motion verbs to future tense markers. Such changes are typologically widespread, and as far as I know the reverse change never occurs. The example is the English *be going to* future. It is universally assumed that this arose from an earlier pattern consisting of the motion verb followed by an infinitival clause of purpose. A couple of relevant examples of this pattern are shown in (13-14). The verb in (13) is nonprogressive, but in (14) the pattern, while in context unambiguously a motion verb followed by a purpose phrase, is of exactly the putative ancestral type.

(13) The king worshipped it, and **went** daily **to adore** it. (OED: 1611 BIBLE *Bel* 4)

(14) Lord: Fellow, whither pressest thou?

Clowne: I presse no bodie sir, **I am going to speake with a friend of mine.**

(LION: 1598 Robert Greene & Thomas Lodge *A looking glasse for London and England*)

The usual view fails to explain not only why the *go* future is progressive in form but also just how purpose clauses gave rise to the prospective aspect expressed by this English grammatical category.

I suggest that the source of the grammaticalized future is not the motion verb *per se* but an offshoot of it, the OED's *go* 34a: “to turn *to*, betake oneself *to* (an employment or occupation); to proceed to some specified course of action; to resort to some specified means of attaining one's object”. This is an extension of the basic motion use, and it occurs with a PP complement headed by *to*. Examples where the object of *to* is a gerund as in (15) are well attested in the late sixteenth century, the critical period immediately before the emergence of the *go* future.

(15) a **I goe to writing or reading**, or suche other businesse as I have.

(OED: 1577 B. GOOGE *Heresbach's Husb.* I. (1586) 3b)

- b O rare, your excellence is full of eloquence, how like a new cart wheele my dame speakes, and she lookes like **an old musty ale-bottle going to scalding**.
(LION: 1600 Thomas Dekker *The shomakers holiday*)

There is indeed a pattern, sometimes hard to distinguish from the *go* future, in which nonfinite *going* is construed with an infinitival but has the same sense as in (15): “turning or preparing to do an action”; the sense is roughly inceptive. This is shown in (16) with progressive forms of *go*, and it is common during the relevant period.

- (16) a For *Zelmane* seeming to strike at his head, and **he going to warde it**, withall stept backe as he was accustomed, she stopt her blow in the aire, and suddenly turning the point, ranne full at his breast

(LION: 1593 Philip Sidney *The Covntesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*)

- b **They going to dance**, each vnhaspes his weapon from his side, and gives em to the torch-bearers. (LION: 1608 Thomas Middleton *Your five gallants*)

This pattern in (16) is surely an extension of the pattern in (15) with a nominal object of *to*. In (17) I cite the first case known to me of its finite variant.

- (17) I hauing shifted no sockes in a sea night, the Gentleman cryed foh; and said my feete were base and cowardly feete, they stuncke for feare. Then hee knock'd my shooe about my pate; and I cryed O, once more. In the meane time comes a shag-hair'd dogge by, and rubbes against his shinnes. The Gentleman tooke the dog in shagge-haire to be some Watch-man in a rugge gowne; and swore hee would hang mee vp at the next doore with my lanthorne in my hand, that passengers might see their way as they went without rubbing against Gentlemens shinnes. So, for want of a Cord, hee tooke his owne garters off; and **as he was going to make a nooze**, I watch'd my time and ranne away.

(LION: 1611 Cyril Tourneur *The atheist's tragedie*)

The gentleman is distracted, but he does not need to go anywhere to take off his garters and make a noose out of them; he just needs to busy himself at it.

The shift from a control verb as in (16-17) to a raising verb expressing prospective aspect, “to be about to or on the verge of”, is semantically minimal, and yields the modern pattern. The examples in (18), from around 1630 and afterwards, show passive infinitives, in several cases with inanimate subjects, where a control analysis is therefore unlikely.

- (18) a He is fumbling with his purse-strings, as a school-boy with his points when **he is going to be whipped**, till the master weary with long stay forgives him.

(1628 Earle *Microcosmography* §19 [mod. spelling ed. Osborne 1933: 32-33], cited by Mossé [1938: 166])

b Bellafront: How now, what ayles your Master? ... Where is his Cloake and Rapier?

Orlando: He has giuen vp his Cloake, and his Rapier is bound to the Peace: If you looke a little higher, you may see that another hath entred into hatband for him too. Sixe and foure haue put him into this sweat.

Bel.: Where's all his money?

Orl.: 'Tis put ouer by exchange: **his doublet was going to be translated**, but for me

(LION: 1630 [performed 1604-1605?] Thomas Dekker *The honest whore, with the humors of the patient man, the impatient wife, Part II*)

c The latter end of this woeful night, poor mourning Hazier the Turk was sent to keep me; and on the morrow the governor entered my room, threatening me still with more tortures, to confess; and so caused he every morning, long before day, his coach to be rumbled at his gate, and about me, where I lay, a great noise of tongues, and opening of doors; and all this they did of purpose to affright and distract me, and to make me believe **I was going to be racked again**, to make me confess an untruth; and still thus they continued every day of five days to Christmas.

(1632 William Lithgow *Travels & voyages*
[mod. spelling ed. Lithgow 1814: 371])

d You see that **My Magazine is going to be taken from Me**.

(OED: 1642 Chas. I *Sp.* Wks. 1662 I. 401)

e You hear that there is money yet left, and **it is going to be layd out in Rattels, Bels, Hobby-Horses, brown paper, or some such like sole commodities**.

(LION: 1647 Nathan Field & John Fletcher, *The honest man's fortune*)

These examples seem to be the earliest true prospective futures.⁹ Note especially Dekker's inanimate *doublet* in (18b) and the utterly non-agentive imprisoned Lithgow in

⁹ Electronic corpora now show that Mossé (1938: 165) was about 20 years off when he wrote that “1650 représente, *grosso modo*, le moment où le nouveau tour est établi en anglais.” Note that an example from Burton's *Diary* is called “relatively early” by Danchev & Kytö (1994: 63), who did not realize that 1567 was a misprint for 1657 in Mossé (1938: 166); their mistake was reproduced by Tabor (1994: 151) and may underlie Traugott & Dasher's (2001: 84) erroneous statement that “[u]nambiguous examples of the temporal do not occur until the later sixteenth century.”

(18c). In neither case is it possible to take the subject as engaging in any activity.

The approximate sequence of events is sketched in (19).

- (19) a OED 34, e.g. (15): go [_{PP} to NP]
(NP may but need not be a gerund.)
b Control I: go [_{TP} PRO to VP]
(Generalization of complement type.)
c Control II, e.g. (16-17): NP_i be going [_{TP} PRO_i to VP]
(= (19b) + progressive aspect.)
d Raising, e.g. (18): NP_i be going [_{TP} t_i to VP]
(Go bleached of lexical/thematic content.)

This account explains the genesis of the English *go* future in terms of syntactic patterns that were frequent enough in the language at the relevant time, and it has the virtue that the source and output patterns are functionally close. Moreover, it explains why the English *go* future is progressive in form. In the source pattern, *go to VP* meant “turn to VP”, the progressive signifies that the action is viewed as ongoing, so that *be going to VP* meant “be turning to VP” or “be starting to do the action.” A nonprogressive would not have yielded a prospective future because plain *go to VP* already encompassed the resulting action. Only from the event-internal perspective of the progressive is the activity of the infinitival phrase prospective, and so only the progressive form of *go* would yield the English prospective future.

What we see here is typical of many important cases of grammaticalization. We cannot understand how one thing has turned into another without locating the pivot context in which the change originated and understanding how the properties of that context invite the change. A central role is often played by the compositional semantics of the pivot context, as with *be going to* and in other cases listed in Table 2. Indeed, I submit that specific pivot context semantics is more helpful than general notions like extravagance (Haspelmath 1999), economy (Roberts & Roussou 2002, 2003), or grammatical simplification (Kiparsky, this volume) in understanding why these particular changes happened *in the particular contexts where they occurred*, or why similar changes are common in languages of the world.

Language & change

English activity verb *do* > habitual
(Garrett 1998)

English deontic *ought* > epistemic
(Nordlinger & Traugott 1997)

English habitual auxiliary *do* > periphrastic
(Garrett 1998)

English inchoative *get* > passive
(Fleisher 2006)

Romance possession verb “have” > future
(Benveniste 1968, Roberts & Roussou 2002)

Romance & English “have” > perfect
(Vincent 1982, Carey 1995)

Pivot context & semantics

do + bare *nomen actionis*; habituality arises from
genericity of bare noun, transferred to *do*

ought + passive infinitival complement; agent
suppression yields generalized obligation sense

do + negation; habituality attenuated in
negative contexts (due to “Neg-Raising”)

get + adjectival passive participle; perfective
aspect facilitates eventive interpretation

“have” + future passive participle; futurity
arises from participle, transferred to “have”

“have” + perception verb participle; result sense
highlighted via pragmatics of perception verbs

Table 2. Syntactic change: Permutations and compositional semantics

References

- LION = Literature Online (<http://lion.chadwyck.com/>)
OED = Oxford English Dictionary, online edition (<http://dictionary.oed.com>)
- Allen, Cynthia L. 1986. Reconsidering the history of *like*. *Journal of Linguistics* 22: 375-409.
- Allen, Cynthia L. 1995. *Case-marking and reanalysis: Grammatical relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Anderson, Stephen R., and David W. Lightfoot. 2002. *The language organ*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1968. Mutations of linguistic categories. *Directions for historical linguistics*, ed. by Yakov Malkiel and Winfred P. Lehmann, pp. 83-94. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Carey, Kathleen. 1995. Subjectification and the development of the English perfect. *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*, ed. by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, pp. 83-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Danchev, Andrei, and Merja Kytö. 1994. The construction *be going to + infinitive* in Early Modern English. *Studies in Early Modern English*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky, pp. 59-77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fischer, Olga. 1988. The rise of the *for NP to V* construction: An explanation. *An historic tongue: Studies in English linguistics in memory of Barbara Strang*, ed. by Graham Nixon and John Honey, pp. 67-88. London: Routledge.
- Fischer, Olga. 1992. Syntax. *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 2, 1066-1476, ed. by N. Blake. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Olga; Ans van Kemenade; Willem Koopman; and Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The syntax of early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fleisher, Nicholas. 2006. The origin of passive *get*. *English Language and Linguistics* 10: 225-252.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. The origin of NP split ergativity. *Language* 66: 261-96.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1998. On the origin of auxiliary *do*. *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 283-330.
- Harris, Alice C., and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics* 37: 1043-1068.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1928. *A modern English grammar on historical principles, Part III*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Kroch, Anthony S. 2001. Syntactic change. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, pp. 699-729. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Lightfoot, David. 1988. Syntactic change. *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*, ed. by Frederick J. Newmeyer, vol. 1, pp. 303-323. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 1991. *How to set parameters: Arguments from language change*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 1999. *The development of language: Acquisition, change, and evolution*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Lithgow, William. 1814. *Travels & voyages through Europe, Asia, and Africa, for nineteen years*. 12th ed. Leith: Archibald Constable [et al.].
- Mair, Christian. 1990. *Infinitival complement clauses in English: A study of syntax in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1905-1906. Comment les mots changent de sens. *L'Année sociologique* 10 [rpt. in Antoine Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* (Paris: É. Champion, 1921), vol. 2, 230-271].

- Mossé, Fernand. 1938. *Histoire de la forme périphrastique être + participe présent en germanique*, Deuxième partie: *Moyen-anglais et anglais moderne*. (Société de Linguistique de Paris, Collection linguistique, 43.) Paris: Klincksieck.
- Nordlinger, Rachel, and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1997. Scope and the development of epistemic modality: Evidence from *ought to*. *English Language and Linguistics* 1: 295-317.
- Osborne, Harold, ed. 1933. *Earle: Microcosmography or a piece of the world discovered in essays and characters*. London: University Tutorial Press.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2002. The history of the future. *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, ed. by David W. Lightfoot, pp. 23-56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: Minimalist approaches to grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, Gustaf. 1931. *Meaning and change of meaning with special reference to the English language*. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 38, 1932: 1.) Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Tabor, Whitney. 1994. *Syntactic innovation: A connectionist model*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Richard Dasher. 2001. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vinaver, Eugène, ed. 1990. *The works of Sir Thomas Malory*. 3 vols. Third ed. revised by P. J. C. Field. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1982. The development of the auxiliaries HABERE and ESSE in Romance. *Studies in the Romance verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent and Martin Harris, pp. 71-96. London: Croom Helm.
- Whitman, John. 2000. Relabelling. *Diachronic syntax: Models and mechanisms*, ed. by Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner, pp. 220-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.