

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Passive and case
- 3 The rise of the recipient passive
- 4 The language contact hypothesis
- 5 Conclusion

Recipient passive (RP)

Definition:

Recipient passive = the indirect passive of ditransitive verbs

(following Allen 1995)

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|
| (1) | Tom gave Mary presents . | active |
| (2) | Presents were given to Mary (by Tom). | direct passive |
| (3) | Mary was given presents (by Tom). | recipient passive |

Motivation

- The passive is affected by the development of the English case system (cf. Allen, 1995)
- 'Dative' is not a homogeneous category:
NP, PP, structural, inherent, etc.
- We expect dative to be more easily affected by language-contact.
 - See also studies of German/Romance bilingual language acquisition (Schmitz, 2006).

Goal of this talk:

Discuss the plausibility of the contact hypothesis.

The frame: BASICS

- English-French contact in medieval times
 - triggered by the Norman Conquest of 1066
 - prevailed for more than three hundred years
- Many studies on loan verbs, but no study of the borrowing of French verbs and the possibility of contact-induced syntactic change.

Borrowing of Argument Structure in Contact Situations

DFG funded project 1.9.2015-31.8.2018

If and in how far was the argument structure of verbs affected by the borrowing of Old French (OF) verbs?

Loss of dative case and its consequences

Diachrony:

- 1 Midlands: mid of 12th century
 - 2 South: end of 13th century
 - 3 Kent: mid of 14th century
- Loss of accusative/dative distinction
⇒ objective case
 - Loss of nominative-dative case distinction
⇒ ambiguity between preverbal nominal indirect object and subject
 - Rise of new types of passives

(cf. Allen, 1995, Denison, 1993)

Passive in Old English

- Periphrastical passive with auxiliaries:
 - *bēon* + past participle (4a)
 - *weorþan* + past participle (4b)

- (4) a. *Æfter þæm þe Rome getimbred wæs.*
 after Rome built was
 'After Rome had been built.'
- b. *þæt hus wearð ða forburnen.*
 the house was then burnt down
 'The house was then burnt down.'
- (Hogg, 2007, 80)

Types of passives

- Types of passives:
 - ① impersonal = objects retain case, verb 3-sg, no nom. subject
 - ② direct = direct object of active > subject of passive
 - ③ indirect = indirect object of active > subject of passive
- In Old English:
 - Monotransitives like *helpan* 'help': impersonal passive
 - Ditransitives like *giefan* 'give': impersonal or direct passive

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| (5) | a. Us (obj-DAT) is helped by God. | impersonal |
| | b. Presents (obj-ACC) was given her (obj-DAT). | impersonal |
| | c. Her (obj-DAT) was given presents (obj-ACC). | impersonal |
| | d. Presents (subj-NOM) were given her (obj-DAT). | direct |
| | e. Her (obj-DAT) were given presents (subj-NOM). | direct |

(see also Denison 1993, 104)

⇒ No indirect passive (Denison, 1993; Mitchell, 1985, 110ff)

Passive in Middle English

- Almost all the OE constructions were lost.
(see also Fischer (2010) on OE quirky subjects)
- Present Day English has the following passives:
 - (6) a. Presents were given to Mary (by Tom).
 - b. %Presents were given her. (dialectal)
 - c. **Mary** was given presents (by Tom).
 - d. Mary was helped (by Tom).
- Indirect passives occur with ditransitives like *give* (6c) and mono-transitives like *help* (6d).

The dative in OF

- Inflection of lexemes is reduced to two OF cases:
 - nominative (< Latin nominative and vocative)
 - accusative (< other Latin cases).

This case distinction gradually disappears towards the end of the OF period (around 1300).

- Pronouns distinguish three cases: nominative, accusative and dative
 - e.g. 'he': nom. *il*, acc. *le*, dat. *li*
 - cf. ModF: (*lui* vs *le/la*).

Case morphology

Case endings are distributed etymologically in OF: Case endings (e.g. -s) can come from Latin NOM or ACC.

⇒ intransparent paradigms.

The dative in OF

- Fomer Latin datives are expressed
 - (rarely) as absolute “dative”, marked by oblique case (< accusative)

(7) il estoit Lancelot
 it was Lancelot.OBL
 ‘it belonged to Lancelot’

- (mostly) as prepositional “dative”: *a* + oblique NP, as in ModF

(8) et dūnet a hume graze et dulce parole
 and gives.3.sg to man.OBL grace and sweet word
 ‘and he gives the man grace and sweet word’ (SRCMF Lapidf p.102)

Allen's study of the recipient passive

Allen: "indirect passive" >

"direct passive"

monotransitive verbs

Us was helped

>

We were helped

OE

13th c.

Allen: "dative fronting"

"recipient passive"

ditransitive verbs

Us was given the book



We were paid the money

We were given the book

OE

>1375



Allen (1995:384): a gap in the development of ditransitives

Dative fronting was not reanalysed as RP: they do **not** co-occur.

→ Dative fronting in archaic texts, e.g. poetry

→ Wycliffe (~1400): no fronting of indirect objects. RP occur, but they are not numerous.

Allen's study of the recipient passive

Allen (1995): The first 'genuine example of a recipient passive' is quoted by Visser in a text from 1375:

- (9) Item as for the Parke **she** is a lowyd Every yere a dere
'Item: as for the park, she is allowed a deer each year'

AwardBlount p.205 (1375), from Allen 1995, 393

Allen's study of the recipient passive

Contact-induced change?

“It is not difficult to find a reason why such passivization should be kept to a minimum. Most prose texts from this time are translations from Latin or French, and even original texts were affected by the **grammatical models of French** and Latin, which did not allow recipient passives. It seems most likely that recipient passives were **first used in speech** and only gradually gained acceptance in writing.”

Allen (1995, 395)

Corpora

Syntactically annotated corpora for ME and OF:

- *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English Prose* (PPCME2, Kroch and Taylor, 2000)
- *Syntactic Reference Corpus of Medieval French* (SRCMF, Prévost and Stein, 2013)

English	time span	French	time span
OE	< 1150		
ME-M1	1150-1250	OF	842–ca.1320
ME-M2	1250-1350		
ME-M3	1350-1420	MF	ca.1320–1500
ME-M4	1420-1500		
Early Mod. English	1500-1710		

English and French periods

Corpora

- **Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence** (PCEEC, Taylor et al. 2006)
 - 1410-1695
 - 84 letter collections
 - ca. 2.2 mio. words, 4970 letters

replica language (RL=ME) — **model language (ML=OF)**
(terminology of Heine and Kuteva 2005)

No recipient passive in Old French

- No RP of ditransitives, e.g. *doner* 'give'.
- Variation of some monotonitives between dative and accusative, e.g. *aider* 'help' (cf. Troberg 2008).
- Frequent: indirect object + clausal complement. Communication verbs like *comander* 'command':
SRCMF: 414 active occurrences (regardless of the verb).

(10) Jo vos cumant qu' en Sarraguze algez
 I you-dat-2-pl command that to S. go-3-pl
 I command you to go to S.

SRCMF,roland,pb:198,lb:2673

No recipient passive in Old French

- Only very few (impersonal) passive constructions:

(11) Ne vos sera mie celé/ Qui nos somes et de quel terre
 neg you-dat-2-pl be-fut-3-sg ever hidden who we are and of which country
 'It will never be hidden to you who you are and where from'

SRCMF, YvainKu, pb:99, lb:5244

(12) Se nus de ces deus la requiert Ja contredite ne lor iert
 If us of these two it requires never refused neg them-dat-3-pl was
 'If this one of two things was asked of us, it was never refused to them'

SRCMF: YvainKu, 03, 1310910138.78

Recipient passive in the PCEEC

- Corpus study based on the *Penn Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (PCEEC, Taylor et al. 2006).
 - Query:
 - passives of ditransitive verbs
 - ... governing a subject *and* a direct object.
- ⇒ the subject is the former dative argument

Unexpected findings: language contact?

Recipient passives are much more frequent with verbs of French origin than with native verbs.

Recipient passive in the PCEEC

French verbs				native verbs			
verb	active	RP	% RP	verb	active	RP	% RP
pay	162	10		send	2502	1	
promise	96	7		give	1545	2	
offer	55	12		tell	446	2	
allow	40	7		show	223	1	
deny	31	7					
serve	2	1					
fine	1	6					
	387	50	11.44		4716	6	0.13

Table 1: Active and recipient passive with ditransitive verbs

Recipient passive: corpus data

- Further examples:

(13) Then when **þe pylgrym** was asket þis, þen he sayde:
 then when the pilgrim was asked this then he said
 'Then when the pilgrim was asked this, he said: ...'

M34-a1415,MIRK,10.274

(14) and that **he** shuld be seruid the same wythinne fewe dayes.
 and that he should be served the same within few days
 'and that he should be served the same within a few days.'

M4-1461,PASTON,II,248.387.10097

(15) And seye þat **ye** will be paijd euerj pene,
 and say that you will be paid every penny
 '... and say that you will be paid every penny.'

M4-1465,PASTON,I,133.035.765

Explanations

- What we have to explain is. . .
 - that RPs appear only in late Middle English (>1375).
 - that RPs are much more frequent with verbs of French origin.
 - that French does not have RPs.
- What we can exclude is. . .
 - that RPs are an instance of grammatical replication.
The model language has no RPs
 - that the absence of RPs in French had an inhibiting influence (Allen)
RPs should not appear with French verbs first
 - that RPs were of native origin, spreading from other verb classes (e.g. object predicatives: *He was named king*).
again: RPs should not appear with French verbs first

Explanations

- The data (correspondence) reflects the active competence of the writers, independent of any direct French influence, e.g. by translations.
 - ⇒ The passive is not calqued, but part of the writer's grammar.
- The indirect object of French verbs was interpreted differently from native indirect objects.
 - Native indirect objects may still have had a notion of 'dativeness', even without case marking.
 - 'French' indirect objects were not perceived as 'datives' or as a different kind of dative.

Theoretical implications

A discussion of the types of datives is needed.

Types of datives

Alexiadou/Anagnostopoulou/Sevdali (2014):

- Following others, they distinguish inherent/lexical and structural case.
- They distinguish two types of mixed languages:
 - 1 with ditransitive-monotransitive asymmetry
⇒ DAT-NOM alternation only with ditransitives
 - 2 with no such asymmetry
⇒ DAT-NOM alternation with both classes
- Datives in ditransitives are “closer to our current understanding of what a structural accusative is” than in monotransitives.
- The authors propose a “suspected” universal:
“[i]f a language has a DAT-NOM alternation in monotransitives, it also has it in ditransitives (but not vice-versa)” (p.27).

Preliminary conclusions

- OE datives are **inherent** datives, and therefore excluded from the DAT-NOM alternation.
- This property is maintained in Middle English, even after the loss of morphological case marking.
- Datives of **French ditransitives** are analysed as **structural** case. They can become the subject of passive clauses.
 - The French case system was not transparent anymore.
 - French impersonal passives with null subjects could have been reanalysed as indirect passives.
- The indirect object of **native ditransitives** was under double pressure:
 - No case marking, reanalysis of the first preverbal object as internal
 - French verbs formed recipient passives

Open questions

- 1 Is the 'suspected universal' confirmed by the development of the indirect passive in English?
No: the DAT-NOM alternation of monotonatives is prior to the DAT-NOM alternation of ditransitives.
- 2 In how far does the recipient passive correlate with the double-object construction?
This needs further research.

Open questions

- 1 Is the 'suspected universal' confirmed by the development of the indirect passive in English?
No: the DAT-NOM alternation of monotonatives is prior to the DAT-NOM alternation of ditransitives.
- 2 In how far does the recipient passive correlate with the double-object construction?
This needs further research.

You_{DAT?} are thanked for your attention!

- Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E. and Sevdali, C. 2014. "Opaque and transparent datives, and how they behave in passives". *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 17 (1): 1–34.
- Allen, C. 1995. *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Denison, D. 1993. *English Historical Syntax*. Longman Linguistics Library. Essex: Pearson Longman.
- Fischer, S. 2010. *Word-order change as a source of grammaticalisation*, volume Vol. 157 of *Linguistik aktuell*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heine, B. and Kuteva, T., (eds). 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge approaches to language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogg, R. 2007. *An Introduction to Old English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, [Edinburgh textbooks on the English language].
- Kroch, A. and Taylor, A., (eds). 2000. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, Second Edition (PPCME2)*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Prévost, S. and Stein, A., (eds). 2013. *Syntactic Reference Corpus of Medieval French (SRCMF)*. Lyon/Stuttgart: ENS de Lyon; Lattice, Paris; Universität Stuttgart.
- Schmitz, K. 2006. "Indirect objects and dative case in monolingual German and bilingual German/Romance language acquisition". In *Datives and Other Cases*, D. Hole, A. Meinunger and W. Abraham (eds), 239–268. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Taylor, A., Nurmi, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S. and Nevalainen, T., (eds). 2006. *Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC)*. York and Helsinki: Universities of York and Helsinki.
- Troberg, M. 2008. *Dynamic Two-place Indirect Verbs in French: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study in Variation and Change of Valence*. PHD Thesis: University of Toronto.