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Rule Classes and Syntactic Change*

1. Introduction

It is sometimes argued that the theory of grammar should make available for particular grammars only a very restricted range of rule types. So, for example, Postal (1972) argued that "every linguist has a stake in attempting to preserve the homogeneous, conceptually most restricted theory," allowing the smallest number of rule classes:

the full mapping between surface structure and semantic representation is homogeneous, i.e., carried by a sequence of rules of one type, transformations, with no point where some other type of operation plays a role. ...because of its a priori logical and conceptual properties, this theory of grammar...is the basic one which generative linguists should operate from as an investigatory framework, and...it should be abandoned, if at all, only under the strongest pressures of empirical disconfirmation...With everything held constant, one must always pick as the preferable theory that proposal which is most restricted conceptually and most constrained in the theoretical machinery it offers. (pp. 135-136)

In contrast, current work on the Extended Standard Theory of transformational generative grammar (EST) distinguishes a variety of rule classes which may interact in specified ways: phrase structure rules, transformations, lexical redundancy rules, surface filters, and rules of semantic interpretation are relevant to the present domain of inquiry. The form and function of each rule class must be constrained, unless this abundance is to turn into a true embarras de richesse, to the point that the theory permits an excessive range of grammars. It is important to recognize that this is a modular conception of grammar, where the modules interact crucially in a prescribed

* In Lightfoot (1979, § 6.1) I argued that the transformation of NP Preposing was introduced into the grammar of English in late Middle English, being unmotivated before that period. This article discusses a "Passive transformation", which should really be viewed as one instantiation of the more general rule. Here I am not concerned with the generality of NP Preposing, i.e. with the number of constructions which should properly be subsumed under it, but with the distinction between lexical and transformational rules.

This work was done while I was on sabbatical leave at Cambridge University and was supported in part by a Canada Council Leave Fellowship. I am grateful to Noam Chomsky and Roger Lass for comments on an earlier version.
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fashion; it is to be distinguished from a more taxonomic conception of grammar which differentiates among subclasses of transformations, whereby a given transformation must be annotated to specify whether or not it operates on "clause-mates" or "quasi-clause-mates", whether it is bound or unbound, etc. (see Postal (1974) for such a view). Under this approach, there is a larger "space" of potential grammars to be searched by the language learner; the burden for the language learner is greater than under a theory allowing only transformations which may not be so annotated. Recall that under the modular view the definition of available rule classes is given by the theory, and therefore ex hypothesi would not have to be learned in the acquisition process. As frequently observed, enriching the theory of grammar appropriately has the effect of narrowing the class of particular grammars: conversely, if the theory is conceptually impoverished, a larger class of particular grammars will be allowed.

We shall consider here the distinction in the EST between transformations and lexical redundancy rules. The discussion will draw on Wasow (1977), who explicated five criteria distinguishing these rule classes and showed that these criteria lead to surprising and correct predictions.

A. (Root and local) transformations can change structure, unlike lexical redundancy rules, which cannot.
B. Transformations do not change node labels, whereas lexical redundancy rules may relate items of different grammatical categories.
C. Transformations are "nonlocal" in that they map entire phrase markers into other phrase markers and are blind to grammatical relations, whereas lexical rules are "local" in the sense that they may refer only to those elements which condition a word's initial structure environment. For example, if the lexical rule applies to a verb, it may refer only to those NPs which bear a grammatical relation to the verb in question.
D. Transformations may have as their input the output of an earlier transformation, while lexical rules apply before any transformations and cannot be fed in this way.
E. Transformations are more productive than lexical rules and have few or no genuine exceptions; in a given structural configuration, a lexical rule may apply only if certain lexical items are present.

Armed with these criteria, Wasow examined two proposals for dealing with causative:inchoative relations, showing that criteria A–E for distinguishing lexical from transformational rules uniformly favor a lexical treatment of causatives along the lines of Jackendoff (1975), as opposed to Fiengo's (1974) transformational account.

The bulk of the paper is devoted to passive constructions, and Wasow argues that the grammar of Modern English (NE) has two rules dealing with passives, one lexical and one transformational. He shows first that some passive participles are adjectives,
while others are verbs. Arguments that passive participles may be adjectives are based on statements such as (1).

(1) a. Some occur in prenominal adjective position: the broken jar
    b. Some occur as complements to verbs like act, become, look, sound: He seemed annoyed at us.
    c. Some occur with an un- prefix which is not tolerated by the corresponding active verb: Her whereabouts are unknown:*They unknow her whereabouts.
    d. Some may cooccur with very, which is an intensifier applicable to adjectives (i.e. those whose semantics permit such quantification), and not with verbs: very red:*He very reddened.

On the other hand, there are equally good reasons for believing that some passive participles are not adjectives. Wasow constructs arguments based on (2) and (3).

(2) The judgments of (a) (where *(...) indicates ungrammatical if the parenthesized material is not present) follow from (b) only if there is a transformational derivation.
   a. The church was given *(\$5); \$5 was given (to the church).
   b. Someone gave the church *(\$5); Someone gave \$5 (to the church).

(3) Passive participles may be followed by predicative expressions which may not follow adjectives: John is considered a fool:*John is obvious a fool.

On this basis Wasow postulates two rules relating actives and corresponding passives. According to criteria A–E, only a lexical rule can relate adjectival passives to actives because, for example, transformations are not permitted to change grammatical categories. On the other hand, only a transformational rule may operate on nonadjectival passives and on examples like (4) where the derived subject bears no grammatical relation to the passive verb (see criterion C).

(4) a. A monster is believed to live in Loch Ness.
    b. There is believed to be a monster in Loch Ness.

Therefore criteria A–E force Wasow to postulate two rules relating actives and passives. Such a treatment makes various predictions about the clustering of properties:

(a) Passives whose derived subjects are not their underlying direct objects should be unable to exhibit adjectival behavior:
(b) Criterion D predicts that there may be cases in which a transformation feeds the Passive transformation, but that no transformation may feed the lexical Passive rule;
(c) Lexical but not transformational passives may undergo lexical rules (e.g. category-changing rules);
(d) Criterion E suggests that lexical passives may exhibit idiosyncrasies not found in transformational passives.

Wasow demonstrates that these predictions are borne out with striking consistency. To illustrate (a) briefly, if the derived subject of a passive verb was the underlying subject of the immediately lower verb (e.g. John was believed to be popular), the phrase must be the result of the transformational Passive, not the lexical rule. Therefore, the passive phrase will not show adjectival properties. This is borne out by the facts that: it cannot occur prenominally (5) or as the complement to verbs like act or seem (6); it cannot occur as an un-passive (7); and it cannot occur with a degree modifier without much (8).

(5) a. *the thought to be a genius scientist...
b. *the found to be not guilty driver...
(6) a. There \{is\} \{seems\} believed to be corruption in high places.
b. Mary \{is\} \{appears\} thought to be a genius.
c. John \{is\} \{sounds\} considered to be a scoundrel.
d. Nixon \{was\} \{acted\} found to be not guilty.
(7) a. John is unknown.
b. John is known to be a communist.
c. *John is unknown to be a communist.
(8) a. We were very *(much) expected to be model citizens.
b. The war was very *(much) believed to be wrong.

To illustrate prediction (d), it can be noted that lexical passives are more exceptional in that, unlike their nonlexical analogues (9), they may require adverbial modifiers (10) and use unpredictable prepositions to mark the NP corresponding to the subject of the corresponding active (annoyed at, bored with, contained in, elated at, frightened at, horrified at, interested in, known to, overjoyed at, pissed off at, relieved at, surprised at, tired of, upset with).

(9) a. An example was constructed by the teacher.
b. These specimens were found by students.
c. Two errors were noticed by every reviewer.
d. This book was read by the entire class.
e. The chicken was killed by the butcher.
(10) a. A ??(carefully) constructed example illustrated the point.
b. These specimens look *(recently) found.
c. Two *(widely) noticed errors have been corrected.
d. This *(rarely) read book is a gem.
e. The chicken smells *(freshly) killed.

Wasow’s analysis predicts that (lexical) passives with prepositions other than by will not occur in environments requiring a transformational derivation (11).

(11) a. John is known \( \{ \text{to by} \} \) everyone.
b. John is known to be a CIA agent.
c. John is known \( \{ \text{??to by} \} \) everyone to be a CIA agent.

This description claims that Fred was infuriated has two surface structure analyses, whereby infuriated is either an adjective (lexical passive) or a verb (transformational passive). This sentence is also ambiguous and may refer to a state or an event. Wasow suggests that the adjectival analysis tends to be associated with the stative reading.

In this way a rich set of implicational statements emerges. The clustering of properties is not something which has to be learned and analyzed on a one-by-one basis, but rather it follows naturally within the framework of a theory distinguishing between lexical and transformational rules in a principled way. In a conceptually restricted theory, allowing only one class of rules, the clustering of properties would presumably have to be stipulated explicitly by a series of unrelated devices.

If Wasow’s analysis is correct, then one wants to know why the grammar of English should contain two rules with such a degree of overlapping in function. Some history may help us come to grips with this question. I shall assume that Wasow’s analysis is fundamentally correct, although revisions will be proposed. Further, I shall argue that the transformational passive is an innovation and was not present in the grammars of earlier English; the earlier grammars contained only the lexical version of passives. This will point to some interesting conclusions about the nature of syntactic change, and I shall adduce support of a novel kind for a theory of grammar prescribing such a distinction between transformational and lexical rules, arguing that such a theory permits an orderly account of an otherwise apparently coincidental cluster of simultaneous historical changes. This presupposes a theory of change developed in Lightfoot (1979). My discussion will draw heavily on Visser’s (1963–1967) lengthy analysis of passive constructions throughout English, and my argument will be based on the simultaneity of various changes.

2. The Argument

On Wasow’s assumptions as outlined above, the following sentences may be used as the bases for arguments that there must be a nonlexical Passive rule in NE. (Such sentences were the basis for the original arguments for a Passive transformation in
Chomsky (1955), where it was noted that selectional restrictions give only a very weak argument.)

(12) a. John was given a book.
b. John was expected to win.
c. Advantage has been taken of John.
d. John was helped.
e. John was considered a fool.
f. John was arrested at 3 P.M. by the police.

On the assumption that the lexical Passive relates the direct object of an active construction to the surface subject of a passive, the subjects of (12) will not be related by such a rule to the object of an active. In (12a), John is an underlying indirect object and, before it can be passivized, i.e. before it can be related to a subject of be given, it must be moved first into postverbal position: Someone gave John a book.\(^1\) Such a sentence, or intermediate structure, cannot be related to (12a) by a lexical rule, because such rules cannot be fed by transformations. On the other hand, a transformational rule will express the necessary relationship, since transformational rules are blind to grammatical (and thematic) relations and any sequence np V NP will meet the requirements of the rule, regardless of the origin or function of the NP (but see Anderson (1977) for interesting discussion of a general principle which renders certain applications semantically uninterpretable; and see note 8). Similarly with (12b), a transformational rule will be able to move John into subject position of be expected, because it is in the postverbal slot and therefore meets the structural description of such a rule; the fact that it is not a direct object is irrelevant to a transformational rule. However, no lexical rule could relate John in I expect John to win to the subject of be expected in (12b), simply because John bears no grammatical or thematic relation to expect. In (12c), Wasow assumes that advantage bears no relation to take, and in (12d), John can be related only to an underlying indirect object, since help does not tolerate a direct object; such a relationship cannot be effected by the lexical Passive rule, which operates only on direct objects. (12e) can be derived only by application of a transformational rule because in general adjectives cannot be followed directly by an NP and therefore the base rules should not generate a structure John was [considered]\(_\text{Adj}\) [a fool]\(_\text{NP}\); the lexical

\(^1\) This analysis is not necessarily correct. Alternatively, Someone gave John a book may be base-generated and related to Someone gave a book to John by a lexical rule. I shall not choose between these alternatives here, but the fact that the putative transformation of Dative Movement is of such limited productivity, along with the occurrence of sentences like The book was given him, suggests that a lexical analysis may be appropriate. If a lexical analysis is adopted, (12a) will not undergo the lexical rule if the definition of "direct object", which is crucial to the formulation of the rule, does not include a postverbal NP which can be lexically related to an indirect object. Such a definition would correspond to the views of the traditional grammars.
Passive operates only on adjetival participles. Finally, on the assumption that adjetival (qua lexical) passives are stative, nonstatives such as (12f) must be derived differently, such as by application of a transformation. We shall argue later that some of these assumptions are incorrect, and some revisions will be made.

In sections 2.1–2.8, I shall examine the history of the constructions in (12) and two others.

2.1. Indirect Passives

I turn first to examples like (12a), where the subject of the passive is related to an indirect object of an active verb taking both a direct and an indirect object. The history of such constructions is well documented. First, let us note that the corresponding passive on the direct object, A book was given to John, was common from the earliest times: Herodian...had fra Filipp e refedd...wass...& giften till Herode (c1200 Orm. 19827). One also finds He had a book given (to) him: Bot of Ofer wommen tua [he] Had four suns geten him (13.. Cursor M. 3900). However, the “indirect passive” (Visser’s term for a passive whose subject corresponds to the indirect object of an active verb) is a more recent construction. Jespersen (MEG III 15.2) says that this construction is extremely rare before the NE period. This view is echoed by many writers and is consonant with the claim that the transformational Passive represents a fairly recent innovation in the grammar of English. In fact, Jespersen’s statement needs amplification and is disputed by Visser. Early English Ic gēaf him an boc ‘I gave him a book’ had an impersonal as in (13).

(13)   a. Him was given a book.
   b. The king was given a book.

Visser (§1966) notes that in (13a) “the passive sentence opens with the indirect object, clearly recognizable as such because of its form (a dative). In type [(13b)] it is in the zero case, yet was, in the beginning, still apprehended as the indirect object.” This can be demonstrated when the two NPs are of different number and the verb is in a tense which is distinct in the third person singular and plural; in that event the form of the verb indicates which NP is viewed as subject: The king were given books. Visser (§1967) claims that “the origin of [the indirect passive] may be seen as a consequence of the very frequent use—in late Old English and subsequently—of nouns without any outward sign of their indirect object character at the head of the sentence, i.e. in the place proper to the subject”, as in (13b). In this view, which is described in detail by Jespersen (MEG IV 15.2), the development is analogous to that of me thinks > I think, discussed in Lightfoot (1979, §5.1). However, even with the proviso that sentence-initial NPs were often indirect objects, there are a few clear examples from late Middle English (ME) of
NPs which are the subject of a passive verb and correspond to an underlying indirect object.²

(14) a. All my shepe ar gone, I am not left one.  
                c1460 Towneley P1.101 24
  b. He was gyvyn the gre be my lorde kynge Arthure. 
                c1470 Malory, Works (Vinaver) 699
  c. If Sir Thomas thynk that he shuld be alowyd mor, he shall be. 
                1422-1509 Paston Letters (Gairdner) I 252
  d. I was offered iiij marcs to lese my tytle in the said tythes. 
                c1479 Stonor Lett. (Camden) no. 245 p83

Visser provides a long list of examples, but on inspection almost all involve a sentential object and therefore are not instances of indirect passives (15); these are parallel to NE John was persuaded to leave, where John originates in immediately postverbal position, is contained within the same VP as persuade, and hence may fairly be construed as a direct object.

(15) a. And afterward this knyght was bode appere. 
                c1386 Chaucer C.T. C 1030
  b. Ytte am I graunted...to justifie & juge all pe lewes. 
                c1430 York Plays 271 23
  c. He was comaund for to sey. 
                c1450 Generides (EETS) 439

Therefore, it seems to be the case that towards the end of the fifteenth century there are just a few examples of the type He was given a book, where the subject must be construed as corresponding to an underlying indirect object. Some of these examples involve textual difficulties (see note 2), and it is remarkable that many of the attestations are drawn from the Paston Letters. The following verbs occur in an indirect passive construction before 1500: allow (1422), learn (= ‘teach’) (1422), offer (1422), proffer (1422), teach (1434), pay (1440), bring (1450), yield (1449), leave (1460), grant (1460),

² These examples are not without difficulty. Jespersen (MEG III 15.3) found (14a) ‘“rather doubtful”’. He expected have rather than am and speculated that one should be read as an adjective modifying I, rather than as a direct object. If this is correct, I could be a direct object of leave and the example could be handled by the lexical rule.

In (14b), Caxton’s edition reads him for he and treats the expression as an impersonal passive. Such impersonal passives have been subjected to much editorial activity and they have often been emended to personal constructions. This may be another such example. It is surprising that impersonals should have occasioned such editorial disapproval. Clear cases of impersonals were common in OE: Eft &urh ðone witgan wæs geclid hierdum (dative) ‘After by that wise man there was a rebuking to the shepherds’. Parallel constructions occur in Modern German: Dir sei dafür herzlich gedankt ‘To you may there be hearty thanks for it’. Jespersen (op. cit.) observed that almost all the early examples with give involve phrases like I am given to understand. Here I is a direct object and there is no alternating Someone gives to me to understand, where me appears as an indirect object.
give (1470), ask (1490). However, in the sixteenth century the indirect passive begins to occur frequently, and some additional verbs start to tolerate the construction: say, threaten, adjudge, foretell, and show. The construction seems to be well entrenched at this point and steadily extends its domain over subsequent history. In the seventeenth century, it occurs for the first time with allow, demand, advance, licence, enjoin, appoint; in the eighteenth century with interdict, serve, order, make (amends), lead (a dance), lend; in the nineteenth with bid, pardon, secure, owe, allowance, cause, prescribe, deal, leave, assign, play (a trick), allot; in the twentieth with accord, advise, assure, award, charge, deny, do, feed, find, fulfil, get, guarantee, grudge, hand, hit, issue, keep, recommend, send, set, stand, strike, take, tip, vote, wish, write. These lists include some verbs which no longer tolerate indirect passives in NE, but they are nonetheless included here in order to illustrate the extent to which the construction was productive.

Some caution is in order because there is considerable dialectal and stylistic variation. For example, the sentences of (16) are used by established authors of this century, but not all speakers would assent to their grammaticality.

(16) a. She would have been ordered air and sunlight and activity. (G. K. Chesterton)
b. She was not grudged that humble place. (Compton Mackenzie)
c. He had been stood a drink. (G. Warwick Deeping)
d. I was recommended another doctor. (W. S. Allen)
e. The purchaser is guaranteed better terms. (The Times 1954)
f. I must be forgiven these memories of the past. (Graham Greene)

Jespersen (MEG III, 309) claimed that “it would probably be difficult to find examples like these: he was written a letter, sent a note, telegraphed the number, or she was got a glass of wine or done any injustice,” although most speakers would now accept all (with the substitution of radioed for telegraphed). Many grammarians, particularly authors of school grammars, have condemned the construction. Sweet (1900 II, 118) says “we still hesitate over and try to evade such passive constructions as she was given a watch...because we still feel that she...[is] in the dative, not the accusative relation.” Compare Onions (1904, 41), and Stokoe (1937, 78), who comments that “it is strictly speaking wrong to make the Indirect Object of the Active idiom the Subject in the Passive idiom.” Grammarians before Sweet usually do not even mention the indirect passive. Kirschner (1957, 119) provides an extensive list of verbs occurring in the indirect passive and calls several of them Americanisms: accredit, adjudge, administer, appoint, apportion, assure, attribute, bequeath, cable, concede, envy, furnish,

3 Again, for the reasons given above, it is necessary to abstract away from the longer lists provided by Visser. Nonetheless, it is instructive to compare these dates with the earliest examples of indirect passives cited by Jespersen (MEG III 15.3): offer (1593), teach (1731), pay (1713), give (1600).
land, loan, mail, phone, provide, restore, sell, stand, supply, tender, vote, wire, wish, write. Some of these occur in Visser’s lists, under British authors as early as Shakespeare and Goldsmith. Other grammarians claim that nowadays the indirect passive is the preferred form. Allen (1947, 276) says “when the verb in the active voice takes two objects, it is more usual in English to make the personal object the subject of the passive voice.” Strang (1970, 151) comments that the development of the indirect passive “is one aspect of a yet wider tendency, namely to prefer human, especially first person subjects where possible.” Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1972, 346) echo this and claim that the indirect passive is more common than the direct form with verbs taking two objects. Given the attitude of earlier grammarians, one might infer that the lists of permitted indirect passives might err on the side of conservatism; literary texts may have avoided a construction which occurred more freely in popular usage.

However, while there is much dialectal and stylistic variation, from the data presented it is clear that the indirect passive represents an innovative construction; it was not present in ME and began to occur from the late fifteenth century onwards. This is consistent with the claim that the transformational Passive was introduced into the grammar of English in the early modern period and that ME had only the lexical Passive rule.

The historical facts tally with such a theoretical claim on the assumption that the lexical Passive rule relates the direct object of an active verb to the subject of a corresponding passive, where “direct object” is taken to mean one of two things: either an NP in immediate postverbal position in the initial phrase marker and dominated directly by the VP (if I gave John the book is derived by a transformation of Dative Movement) or a postverbal NP which cannot be lexically related to an indirect object (if I gave John the book is base-generated and related by a lexical rule to I gave a book to John). So the definition of “direct object” depends on whether such objects can be transformationally derived. Given the characterization of lexical rules adopted here, there is probably no transformational rule of Dative Movement in the grammar of NE; if there is such a rule, it has many lexical exceptions, as has often been noted (e.g. Oehrle (1975)), and involves numerous meaning differences. Notice that both definitions include under the rubric of direct object those base-generated postverbal NPs which appear in the dative case in earlier English. Therefore, the italicized NPs in (17) will count as direct objects, despite the dative case forms, and will be relatable to the subject of a passive (see (18)). In these examples, no other NP counts as a direct object, regardless of whether it is an accusative ((18f) his), genitive ((18d) synna), dative ((18e) heafde); therefore, no other NP can be related to a passive subject. Interestingly, there is an alternative impersonal passive for (17a,b,c), where the direct object is “retained” in the dative case and there is no subject NP (19) (for examples see (13) above; Visser (§1959, §1964, §1965); and Jespersen (MEG III 15.2)).

4 See Jespersen (MEG III) for many more examples.
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(17) a. Mon him, ofteah þare clæpa. ‘someone took-away from-him his clothes’
b. Mon strake *him (hine) off his leg.
c. They banished *him the realm.
d. Mon geclænsaþ hine eallra synna. ‘someone cleanses him of all his sins’
e. Mon *hine heafde becearf. ‘someone cut him his head = beheaded him’
f. Silvestere lærde *hine þis. ‘Silvestere taught him this’

(18) a. He was oftogen þara clæpa.
b. He was stricken off his leg.
c. He was banished the realm.
d. He wyrþ eallra synna geclænsod.
e. He wæs heafde becorfen.
f. He wæs læred þis fram Silvestre.

Visser (§1980) lists verbs which he calls ‘‘the antonyms of give, such as æþrobeðan, bidælan, forbeodan, ofteon, forniman, beniman, deprive, excuse, save, spare, defend, bereave, deny, reave, rob, spoil, prohibit, etc.’’, and notes that they allow personal passives from early times, unlike give. This follows from the definitions of direct object given above. Passives like (20) corresponded to the actives of (21), and there are no (contemporary) alternatives such as (22). Therefore, the passive subject corresponds to the direct object of a corresponding active, as defined, and hence the relationship can be effected by a lexical rule.

(20) a. Why should than our ley men be forbiden the gospel? 1533 St. Thomas More, Works (1557) F14
b. Is wretchedness depriv’d that benefit? 1605 Shakespeare, Lear IV, vi 61
c. Death shall be deceiv’d his glut. 1667 Milton P. L. 10,989
d. Mrs Privett was spared the washing-up. 1959 Norman Collins, Bond Street Story

(21) a. They forbade our laymen the gospel.
b. They deprived him (of) that benefit.
c. They deceived Death (of) his glut.
d. They spared Mrs Privett the washing-up.

(22) a. *They forbade the gospel to our laymen.
b. *They deprived that benefit to him.
c. *They deceived the glut to Death.
d. *They spared the washing-up to Mrs Privett.
2.2. Nonlocal Passives

Constructions such as (12b) *John was expected to win* cannot be related to an active form by a lexical rule because *John*, the subject of the passive verb, bears no grammatical or thematic relation to it. Therefore, if OE and ME had only a lexical and not a transformational Passive, such sentences should not occur in these periods. This is predicted on the assumption that the alternative initial phrase marker is of the form: *np expected [John to win]*. On the other hand, one would expect to find sentences like *John was persuaded to win*, relatable to *someone persuaded John [PRO to win]*, where *John* is the direct object of *persuade* and therefore in a position to be related by a lexical rule to the subject of a passive *persuade*.

The historical facts are unclear. The handbooks usually fail to distinguish between the two types. Visser, for example, under the heading of the type *His Majesty was thought to be out of danger*, *He was seldom seen to smile* (§2137), claims that "the number of [such passives] in Old, Middle and Modern English is immense," but immediately adds "in almost all cases the subject of the passive represents the direct object [Visser's emphasis] in the active parallel". Indeed, almost all of his subjoined examples seem to be of this type (23); he also conflates sentences with a *that* complementizer like (24), where the passive subject clearly corresponds to a direct object of the related active.

(23) a. You were not bid to speak.
   
   1603 Shakespeare, Measure V, i 77
   
   b. So longe he wooed the matter that Coueyes owne capitaynes were inveagled to betraie theire lorde.
   
   1571 Edm. Campion, History of Ireland (ed. Vosser.) 82,35

(24) a. The beggar was comanded... That he first chese.
   
   c1390 Gower, C.A.V. 2414
   
   b. Ich was preid and e-charged...pat y schuld preche to 3e.
   
   c1389–1400 Three ME Sermons (ed. Grisdale) 79,937

For OE, Callaway (1913, 59) notes that the uninflected infinitive occurs only with the passive of *aliefan ‘allow’, (ge)fremman ‘make’, (ge)seon ‘see’, and hatan ‘command’, and that the inflected infinitive occurs only with the passive of *deman ‘condemn’*, *forbeodan ‘forbid’, and (ge)myngian ‘remind’*.

(25) ða wæs heo gesegen mid...beorhtnesse leohtes scinan.
   ‘she was seen to shine...’
   
   Bede 256.6

Of these verbs, only the subject of passive *(ge)seon* could be construed as corresponding

---

5 For discussion of this difference in the strict subcategorization of NE *persuade* and *expect*, see Chomsky (1965). There are various reasons to make such a distinction; see note 6.
to something other than a direct object. Similarly, Jespersen (MEG V 19.3) discusses expect-types like *He is seen to nod, He was believed to have a bedroom at the back alongside persuade-types such as *They were permitted to land, *A Christian is commanded to be just in all his dealings.

Despite the confusion of the handbooks, we may conclude that passives of persuade-type verbs occur frequently at all stages of English. Similarly, active verbs with infinitival complements are very common and Visser (§2079 and §2081) provides copious examples of active verbs of mental perception and saying in OE and ME. However, passive instances of these verbs with infinitival complements are extremely rare. By Callaway’s account, in OE only ‘see’ can be passive, and Visser and Jespersen’s lengthy lists include very few ME examples of the relevant type. The passive ‘see’ may be by analogy with Latin videor, which is passive in form but often glossed as ‘seem’. The occurrence in ME of these few examples is troublesome for the notion that there was no transformational passive at this time, on the assumption that the relevant verbs were two-place predicates, as they are in NE. However, there is evidence that some verbs which are two-place predicates in NE could be treated as three-place in ME. The OE custom of using a *that-clause after a passive verb (Visser §2137) survived into ME and ENE, so that one finds sentences of the form of (26). In addition, it is common to find forms like (27), perhaps under the influence of Greek.

(26) John was expected that he would win.
(27) You know the lilies of the field how they neither toil nor spin.

Expect and know must be treated as two-place predicates in NE, but such examples show that they could occur as three-place predicates in ME. Given such a possibility, one is free to claim that rare passives like *John was expected to win are related by lexical rule to *np expected John that he would win, which is an independently required structure on the evidence of (26) and (27).  

2.3. Complex Verbs

The usual definitions of “direct object” are thrown into disarray by so-called idiomatic expressions such as find fault with John. Traditional grammarians equivocate over

---

6 I cannot go further with this claim, for want of crucial data. Three reasons for assigning NE persuade and expect different structures are (a) that expect but not persuade is “voice transparent”, (b) that NP + infinitive behaves like a constituent following expect, but not when following persuade, and (c) that one finds persuade NP that S and expect that S, but not expect NP that S. For ME, I assume but cannot establish that (i) is not semantically equivalent to (ii), if indeed (ii) was a possible structure. I do not know whether (iii) was possible; compare NE (iv).

(i) John was expected that he would examine Bill.
(ii) Bill was expected that John would examine him.
(iii) I expected John with all confidence that he would win.
(iv) I persuaded John with good arguments to visit his mother.
whether fault is the direct object of find or John of the complex verb find fault with. Generative grammars often analyze these as [[[find]$_{v}$ [fault]$_{np}$ [with]$_{p}$]$_{v}$ [John]$_{np}$]$_{vp}$ (e.g. Bresnan (1972, 147)). Wasow claims that John is a direct object of the complex verb and can therefore be related to a subject of a passive be found fault with. His discussion implies, although it does not state explicitly, that fault is not a direct object of find and therefore cannot be related lexically to a subject of be found with John in fault was found with John; such a relationship can be effected only by a transformational rule. His evidence lies in the contrast between (28) and (29), which suggests that taken advantage of can occur as an adjective, while taken of John cannot.

   b. *An example seemed (unfairly) made of John.

(29) a. John sounds easily taken advantage of.
   b. John seemed unfairly made an example of.

This evidence is not very persuasive. Notice first that deleting the adverbs renders (29a) of doubtful grammaticality and (29b) positively ungrammatical. Visser (§1986) lists 119 examples of such complex verbs, but almost none can occur in the passive after verbs like seem and sound, which are lexically subcategorized for a following adjectival phrase. For example, Visser cites passives of dance attendance on, find fault with, fall in love with, lay eyes on, make fun of, set fire to, pay attention to, etc., but these cannot occur in the relevant construction.

(30) a. *Martha seems danced attendance on.
   b. *Martha seems found fault with.
   c. *Martha seems fallen in love with.
   d. *Martha seems laid eyes on.
   e. *Martha seems made fun of.
   f. *The house seems set fire to.
   g. *Martha seems paid attention to.

Of the 119, only those in (31) are permitted after seem, etc., in my speech, although none of them is much better than marginal.

(31) a. ?Martha seems got rid of.
   b. The problem seems lost sight of.
   c. Martha seems made a fool of.
   d. The proposal seems made nonsense of.
   e. This seems taken heed of.
   f. This seems taken note of.

Furthermore, the remaining properties of adjectival passives lend no support to the invocation of a lexical rule. Neither passive of these idioms tolerates the un-form (32); this follows from the fact that the internal verbs do not permit the prefix (*unmade,
*untaken, *unfound, *unlaid, etc.) and therefore neither supports nor imperils the lexical analysis. Degree adverbs seem impossible in either their adjectival or verbal form (33), and neither form of the passive occurs prenominally (34).  

(32) a. *Advantage was untaken of the offer.
   b. *The offer was untaken advantage of.
(33) a. *Advantage was very (much) taken of us.
   b. *Fault was very (much) found with the idea.
(34) a. *The taken advantage of offer was refused.
   b. *Taken of the offer advantage was disappointing.

Therefore, for these idioms there is no evidence that either form of the passive should be subsumed under a lexical rule; in fact, (32)–(34) provide evidence to the contrary. Perusal of Visser’s list indicates that almost all examples permit a passive like (35a), whereas the (35b) type is more spasmodic and is often possible only when the direct object is preceded by words like any, no, little, hardly any, etc., or when the verb is negated.

(35) a. John was found fault with.
   b. Fault was found with John.

If exceptional behavior is characteristic of lexical and not transformational rules, this might indicate the reverse of Wasow’s claim: that (35a) should be transformationally derived, while a lexical rule should relate (35b) to its corresponding active. However, it is always hard to distinguish what is truly exceptional behavior from what merely appears to be exceptional to one mechanism in the grammar but in fact follows from other factors.

Correct historical consequences follow from the claims that (35a,b) are both derived by a Passive transformation, that neither fault nor John is a direct object (and therefore cannot be related by a lexical rule to a passive subject), and that there was no Passive transformation before the modern period. Both forms of the passive are extremely rare almost to the point of nonexistence in OE and ME, but begin to occur with great frequency in the sixteenth century. Jespersen (MEG III 15.7) says that he has found only two examples before the eighteenth century. In fact, rare examples can be found from as early as the fourteenth century (36) and Visser cites many instances from the sixteenth century.

---

7 The latter property is not crucial, since in general only “simple” adjectivals can occur prenominally: the obvious plan vs. *the obvious to her plan.

8 For example, the following passives are not possible: *Shame was cried over his folly. *Attendance was danced on Mary. *The better was got of Fritz. The impossibility of such passives may be a function of be cried over NP, be danced on NP, be got of NP being impossible predicates, and therefore may follow from an independent characterization of a “possible predicate”.

---
Given the transformational analysis adopted here, the absence of such passives in OE and ME lends support to the claim that the Passive transformation was introduced only in the sixteenth century.

2.4. Benefactives

Wasow claimed that help and thank (one could add obey) subcategorized only an indirect object, and therefore John was helped was derived transformationally and could not be related lexically to a corresponding active. From this it followed that helped could only be a verbal form and not adjectival, and therefore that it could not occur prenominally, as a complement to a verb like seem, with an un-prefix, or with an adjectival degree modifier.

(37) a. *A (recently) helped person is often good-humored.
   b. *John seems helped by many people.
   c. *John was unhelped.
   d. John was very *(much) helped by her suggestions.

Visser (§1933) notes that “Old English sentences containing a verb + an indirect object... kept in their beon + past participle transforms the indirect object unaltered, i.e. in the dative”: Æem mæg beon...geholpen ‘they may be helped’ (Aelfred, C. P. 28,5). However, most verbs taking a dative also permitted an accusative object with no change of meaning, and therefore one finds personal passives He was geborgen alongside Him was geborgen. This is an area of grammar which has led to much editorial activity and many textual emendations. For instance, G. P. Krapp’s edition of the Junius MS has *swa hie gecyðde waron ‘so they were shown’ (Daniel 431) and then the author notes (p. 227) “Schmidt reconstructs to read swa him gecyðed was.” Therefore, these constructions provide no evidence one way or the other on the question of whether there was a lexical and/or transformational Passive. If the verbs are free to occur with a direct (accusative) object, then a personal subject of a passive can be related lexically to the object NP. However, He was helped, thanked, obeyed also occur in ME, as one would expect if the lexical rule operated on direct objects, where “direct object” is defined independently of case forms and refers to an immediately postverbal NP dominated by VP (see above). We are therefore left with the curious situation that He was helped was lexically related to np helped him in ME, and, if Wasow is right, transformationally related in NE. This might be explainable, but it is a more serious problem
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that *helped, thanked, obeyed* show only one adjectival property in ME. That is, sentences of the form of (37) would also, as far as I know, be ungrammatical in ME, with the exception of (37c); the OED cites *unhelped, unthanked, and unobeyed*. Furthermore, OE *He wæs geholpen* seems to have had only a nonstative interpretation, as in NE. Therefore, *helped* shows no distinctively adjectival characteristics apart from the ability to occur with *un-*, and one is left with no explanation for why it occurs as a passive participle from such an early date, when only adjectival, lexical passives were available. These passives occur from the thirteenth century.

(38) a. Thanked hie be.  
    c1200 Vices and Virtues 97.5
b. He shal ben holpen wel i-nouh to lede a shrewede lijf.  
    c1330 Why Werre (in: T. Wright, Polit. Songs of England) 204

Since lexical passives are characteristically exceptional, one is free to claim that these are adjectival passives, but that they are exceptional in not occurring prenominally, as a complement to verbs like *seem*, with an adjectival degree modifier, and with stative force. But this runs the risk of reducing the enterprise to taxonomy and unfalsifiability.

2.5. Predicatives

Predicative expressions such as *He was ordained deacon, considered a traitor* have occurred frequently from the earliest times (39).

(39) a. Ic Theodor...wæs...sended bispoc Contwara burge cirican.  
    Aelfred, Bede (Miller) 276 15
b. þe king was hoten æþelwold.  
    c1300 Havelok 108
c. Charles þe eldere...was icrowned imperour of pope John.  
    c1387 Trevisa, tr. Higden 6 365

Wasow argues that such constructions must be transformationally derived. If this is correct, one would expect them not to occur in ME, before the introduction of the Passive transformation, which, we argue, took place around the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. A major reason for deriving such passives transformationally is that adjectives in general cannot occur in the frame [NP be ____ NP], and lexical passives involve only adjectival participles. However, it may be necessary to permit deverbative adjectives to occur in such a context or in a frame [NP be ____ P NP] (cf. (40)), where the preposition may be deleted optionally.
(40) a. There weren they dubbed to knyhtes echone.
   c1410 Lovelich, Merlin 25772
b. She shall be condemned for a heretic.
   1681 Dryden, Spanish Friar (Mermaid) I, ii
c. We are held as outlaws.
   1611 Shakespeare, Cymbeline IV, ii, 67

Wasow’s evidence for treating such forms nonadjectivally is not very strong. They do not appear prenominally for independent reasons, namely, that no adjective + complement occurs prenominally, as noted earlier. Complements to verbs like seem, sound, act are liable to well-known transatlantic dialect differences. He seems a hero, He sounds a musician are generally supposed to be acceptable to British speakers and not so to Americans; the OED cites many examples from 1225 onwards. Correspondingly, British speakers usually accept sentences like (41), where a past participle is followed by a predicative NP and occurs as a complement to seem, etc., in an adjectival environment (although I am not sure how freely they occur or whether they should be treated as some kind of analogical formation, more or less like John is speakable to, etc., which one sometimes hears).

(41) a. Edward already acts ordained (as) a deacon.
b. John seems considered (as) a fool.
c. John sounds elected (as) President.

Such examples are no worse without the as, as Wasow’s analysis would predict, since be ____ NP is supposed not to be an adjectival environment, unlike be ____ P NP. These forms cannot occur with an un- prefix, but this is not a good diagnostic for adjective-hood; many participles can occur prenominally and as a complement to seem, but not with an un- prefix.

(42) a. the murdered President
b. John acts murdered in the next scene.
c. *John was unmurdered.
(43) a. the uprooted plant
b. The plant looks uprooted.
c. *The plant was unuprooted.

Also, these forms cannot occur with the adjectival or verbal degree modifier.

(44) a. *Edward was very (much) ordained deacon.
b. *John is very (much) considered a genius.
c. *The child was very (much) named Harry.

Hence there seems to be no good reason not to treat these forms as adjectival. The fact that they may be interpreted statively, as in (45), argues for the possibility of such an adjectival analysis.
(45)  a. The villain is called Ratman.
    b. John is considered a genius.

This analysis must be preferred to Wasow’s because it introduces less exceptionality into the grammar and because what exceptionality there is is in “the right place”. The exceptionality lies in the fact that the relevant verbs cannot occur with an *un-* prefix and in the fact that they tolerate no degree adverb. Such exceptionality is not surprising for lexical redundancy rules. Wasow’s analysis involves exceptions insofar as the verbal participles can occur in an adjectival environment as a complement to verbs like *seem* and take no degree adverb, but are liable to a stative interpretation. This constitutes more exceptions, and transformational rules are characteristically supposed to be exceptional. If such an adjectival analysis is adopted, we may say that deverbative adjectives (unlike nondeverbatives) may occur in the frame *NP be ___ P NP*, and deverbatives allow an optional deletion of the preposition, as in (41).

An anonymous reader for *Linguistic Inquiry* suggests an alternative analysis, whereby a node *Pred*, dominating *NP*, *PP*, or *AP*, would be generated after the direct object of verbs like *consider, call, paint*, and the copula. The reader also cites an unpublished paper (which I have not seen) by Mariza Pinsenta-Bueno, arguing that these constructions occur in Brazilian Portuguese, despite the fact that, given Wasow’s other criteria, the language has only a lexical Passive.

Whatever the mechanism, there is good evidence for treating participles in constructions like (12e) as adjectives and therefore as relatable to a corresponding active by the lexical rule. In that case, one is not surprised to find that such constructions occurred in ME, before the introduction of the transformational Passive.

2.6. *Stative/Dynamic Readings*

The ambiguity of many passive phrases between a stative and dynamic reading is well known. *The food was eaten* may mean that at a certain moment somebody ate the food or that the food had already been eaten. Wasow seeks to associate the stative reading with the adjectival analysis and the dynamic reading with the transformational derivation, although it is by no means clear that such a correlation can be successfully effected.

One finds dynamic (46) and stative (47) passives from the earliest times.

(46)  Heo þa geascede, þæt þære arwyrðan abbudissan lichoma wæs in cirican broht & geseted.

    Aelfred, Bede (Miller) 288,30

    ‘Then she found out that the body of the venerable abbess had been brought into the church and placed there.’

(47)  Seo Asia on ælca healfe heo is befangen.

    Aelfred, Oros. 12,12

    ‘Asia is surrounded on both sides.’
However, Visser (§1909) gives the usual view that

originally the stative pattern was the normal one, for the simple reason that in Primitive Germanic weōran/beōn... was a notional verb with the sense 'to exist', 'to be (there) while the past participle functioned as a predicative adjunct with adjectival import... This replacement of the static connotation by the dynamic connotation... was naturally a very slow process and not complete until after a period of vacillation and wavering, which may have begun in Old English.

In short, dynamic passives of the form be + past participle are very rare in OE and not common in ME. This is consistent with the tendency of the dynamic reading to be associated with the transformational Passive, and with our historical claim that the transformational Passive was introduced only in the early modern period.

The development of this stative vs. dynamic ambiguity has never been adequately explained, as often noted. It is clearly related to the demise of weorþan + past participle, which was unambiguously dynamic, presumably as a result of the meaning of weorþan 'become'. The availability of weorþan alongside wesan and beon originally kept dynamic and stative passives distinct. The distinction was eliminated even before the loss of weorþan, as is illustrated by two almost adjacent entries in the Parker Chronicle, where there seems to be no semantic distinction: her Oswine kyning wes ofslægen (an. 651) and her Onna cyning weard ofslægen (an. 654). Traugott (1972, 83) notes that Aelfric uses only wesan- and beo- + past participle in his Grammar, but uses weorþ- in his Lives and Homilies very frequently; she speculates that there was a stylistic distinction whereby weorþan was less formal. As the weorþ vs. wes semantic distinction was lost, so new markers were introduced.9

For example, Visser (§1875–1881) demonstrates in detail how forms like The house was (a, an, at, or in) building came to take on (dynamic) passive force, as in (48).

(48) a. Great preparations are making to send forces to Guernsey.
   1601–1704 Hatton Correspondence (ed. Thompson) VI, 174
b. no marvel, If I found check in our great work within, When such affairs
   as these were managing.
   1610 Ben Jonson, Alchemist IV, iii, 66

9 Traugott (1972, 83) claims that in OE stativity was marked by adjectival endings. She cites (i) and (ii):

(i) On þære ican tide wurdon twegen æþelingas aþliemde (adjective) of Scythian.
   'At that same time were two princes put-to-flight from Scythia.'
   Aelfred, Orosius 44.24
(ii) hu II æþelingas wurdon aþliemde (no inflection) of Scythian
   'how two princes were put-to-flight from Scythia'
   Aelfred, Orosius 1.25

She assumes that aþliemde is a verbal (participle) form. However, it is by no means clear even that there is a stative vs. dynamic distinction in (i) and (ii), or that it could be generalized. The notion is difficult to test because, as noted by Traugott, the adjectival forms were not manifested in the nominative masculine singular, and nominative and accusative neuter singular; therefore, many examples are ambiguous: an æþeling wurde aþliemde of Scythian ‘one prince was put to flight from Scythia’. Since case markings were dysfunctional at this time, one would want to see further arguments for the claim that aþliemde in (i) is an adjective, as distinct from aþliemde in (ii).
c. Their very names were blotting out.
   1890 Dickens, Tale of Two Cities 2.73

d. The horses are harnessing.
   C. Bronte, Jane Eyre 323

Visser shows that a passive interpretation is certainly permissible by the time of ME and slowly becomes more common in the period 1500–1800 (the prepositional form dropped out in the sixteenth century), even though it is condemned as “a vitious expression” in Johnson’s Dictionary (1755). The construction is unambiguously nonstatic throughout its history. It was still frequently attested in the nineteenth century, but quickly begins to decline as a further innovation develops, is being + past participle, which dates from the second half of the eighteenth century and was in its turn roundly condemned by grammarians until the end of the nineteenth century (see Visser (§2158) and Jespersen (MEG III 13.7) for citations). Another method of disambiguation arises from the development of the get form, which denotes the dynamic reading and is equivalent to the older weorpan: The book got written. Strang (1970, 150–151) notes that the periphrastic expressions developing from the sixteenth century serve to disambiguate passive phrases: the modern is taken, is being taken, has been taken, and gets taken distinguish shades of meaning which could all be expressed by is taken in the sixteenth century. Despite the availability of these various expressions, The food was eaten is still ambiguous and it seems that the language has, in a sense, never fully recovered from the loss of the wearp vs. wæs distinction.

2.7. Agent Phrases

Given our distinguishing criteria for lexical and transformational rules and the diachronic claim that English originally had merely a lexical Passive, developing a transformational Passive only in ENE, one is not surprised to find that agents could be marked in a variety of ways in ME and that the by-phrase became standard later. Until the sixteenth century the agent could be marked by the dative case (OE only), or the prepositions among, at, between, betwixt, by, for, from, mid, of, on (OE), to, through, with. For any given example, it is sometimes not clear whether one is dealing with an “instrumental” NP or one which would serve as a subject in the corresponding active; but evidently there was a far greater variety of expressions before ENE. (49) provides some clear examples; Visser (§1988–2000) offers lengthy lists.

(49) a. Sur, I wulde be shreven at you & at no noder.
   c1450 Alphab. Tales 49,16

10 The construction survives to the present day in isolated expressions like $5 is wanting, owing, missing; these exist alongside the so-called passivals, The clothes are drying, The glass shattered, which are not restricted to progressive aspect. When this construction was productive it was usually ambiguous between an active and passive reading, which was perhaps a reason for its demise: She was shooting.
b. Thanne seide Artheur...that for him discouered scholde hit neuere be, Ne non thyng to hire he wolde disere.

c1410 Lovelich. Merlin (ed. Kock) 12383

c. I...am defoyled with falsehed and treson thorow sir Bors and sir Ector.

c1470 Malory, Works (ed. Vinaver) 528,30

This variety was eliminated and after the sixteenth century by is the standard form, although, predictably, one still finds other prepositions being used with lexical passives like Schubert was interested in Beethoven, known to Wagner, and surprised at Mahler.

2.8. Prepositional Passives

A further argument for our proposition can be based on diachronic changes involving constructions in which the passive subject corresponds to an immediately postverbal PP.

(50) a. The bed was slept in.
b. The book was alluded to.
c. The strategy was decided on.
d. The plan was talked about.
e. The meal was paid for.
f. The target was shot at.
g. The player was hooted at.

In NE such passives occur quite freely and, in general, the verb forms do not show adjectival properties, which suggests a transformational analysis. By and large, these forms do not occur prenominally (51), as a complement to verbs like seem (52) (although here there seems to be dialectal variation and my judgments are often hazy), with un-prefixes (53), or with very (54). Furthermore, they usually carry a dynamic reading and the agent phrase is consistently marked with by.

(51) a. *the slept in bed
b. *the alluded to book
c. *the decided on strategy
d. *the talked about plan

(52) a. The bed looks slept in.
c. ?The strategy seems decided on.
d. *The plan seems talked about.

(53) a. *The bed was unslept in.
b. *The book was unalluded to.
c. *The strategy was undecided on.
d. *The plan was untalked about.

(54) a. The bed was very *(much) slept in.
b. The book was very *(much) alluded to.
c. The strategy was very *(much) undecided on.
d. The plan was very *(much) talked about.

The evidence of (51)-(54) indicates that prepositional passives should be transformationally derived. There are, however, isolated instances of prepositional passives in certain adjectival environments ((55) and (52a,c)). These examples do not show the full range of adjectival properties. Thus, while *lived in can occur after *looks in (55a), it cannot occur prenominally or modified by very. One solution is to list such phrases as exceptional adjectives, occurring in certain of the usual environments but not in others. After all, all other major categories have lexical items with prepositional adjuncts (e.g. verb–particle combinations, nouns like drop-out and lean-to, and prepositions like out of), so it seems natural to posit adjectives with such adjuncts.

(55) a. This house looks lived in.
   b. Your scheme was unheard of.
   c. ?Aspects is the most referred to book.

The history of prepositional passives lends support to this analysis and to the claim that the transformational Passive was introduced in the fifteenth-sixteenth century. The handbooks say that there are no instances before 1300, although Visser (§1950) has found two examples. Van der Gaaf (1930, 19) found eleven examples from the fourteenth century; Visser adds a few more.11 The construction begins to spread rapidly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and Visser (§1952–1953) cites 68 new forms from the fifteenth century and 124 from the sixteenth. For example, be agreed on, be aimed at, be asked for occur for the first time in the sixteenth century. Visser comments that at this point “it was well on its way to become one of the commonest usages in the language. It appears to have been a special favourite in familiar letters and other texts written in a colloquial style.” The construction has continued to be more widely attested and to occur with ever more numerous combinations of verbs and prepositions. Even today there are many combinations which cannot occur in a passive construction (56), but this is often due to other factors.12 See, for example, the discussion of the ambiguous John decided on the boat in Chomsky (1965, 142).

---

11 This construction must be distinguished from the frequent OE examples in which a preposition precedes the verb and (at least in print) is separate from it: *by les hie weorðan up ahaefene (Aelfred, C. P. 1973). I take these to be particle–verb constructions. One should also mention the construction with withal (They were fought withal), where the corresponding active always has with (People fought with them). Furthermore, one might speculate on a possible relation between the appearance of prepositional passives and the development of preposition stranding with wh-phrases, which also becomes much freer after ME; see Wat (1978) for interesting discussion of preposition stranding in OE.

12 For example, (56a) might be ruled out by something like Kuno’s (1973) “Clause Nonfinal Incomplete Constituent” Constraint, if such a theory could be substantiated. This precludes fragments of constituents (such as stranded prepositions) anywhere other than in clause-final position. (56c) would be ruled out by a revised version of the A-over-A Constraint in Chomsky (1977) or by most standard formulations of Passive. There are of course other possibilities, but those cited have some independent motivation. Sentences like (56) could not arise in OE and ME if there were no transformational passive; therefore, such principles would not be needed for these constructions.
(56) a. *He was suggested to that he leave.
b. *The tree was painted under.
c. *Nixon was written a book about.

Our argument that the transformational Passive was introduced in the fifteenth-sixteenth century has consisted in a demonstration first that before that time all the occurring passive forms had the properties and distribution of adjectives and could be properly related to a corresponding active by a lexical rule, and second that the non-adjectival passives were introduced simultaneously during the period of 1450–1550. There is a major fallacy in the argument as presented so far, which is that we have defined the properties of a lexical rule partly in terms of the distribution of NE adjectives. We then proceeded to see if these properties, so defined, held of ME passives. It is important to see that this is a fallacious mode of argumentation unless it is also demonstrated that ME adjectives have the same relevant distribution as their NE counterparts. Put differently, one needs to show that the ME passives had the relevant properties of ME, not NE, adjectives. Such a case can be made, but some observations are necessary. ME adjectives and passive forms could occur prenominally, after verbs such as seem, sound, and look, and with an un-prefix. In fact, in the sixteenth century, even nonpassive past participles could occur prenominally, as in sour turned wine (1548), new comen up matter (1562), a gone man (1598). Both adjectives and passive forms also occurred postnominally (57) and even in comparative and superlative form (58), rendering the parallelism more extensive.

(57) a. Kyng crowned. c1400 Mandeville 12,23
b. By the fruyte of the tre forbeden. c1410 Nich. Love, Mirrour Lyf Jesu Chr. (ed. Powell) 33

(58) a. The hop bushe is called...of ye Barbarus writers humulus, of the later learnedewriter Iupulus. 1562 Turner, Herbal II, 43
b. the damnedest body 1603 Shakespeare, Measure III i 96
c. the weather-beatenest Cosmographicallyall Starre-catcher of em all 1607 Thomas Dekker, A knight's conjuring, done in earnest. ii D I D

However, in one respect the parallelism is more restricted: ME past participles could not occur with the adjectival intensifier very. Visser (§1127) cites only three examples from before the eighteenth century, but it becomes common from then on. The expression was denounced by many grammarians and labelled an Americanism in 1873 by Fitzedward Hall (Modern English, 54). Visser (§1127–1169) offers documentation of further parallelisms between ME participles and ME adjectives, such as their being able to occur as a noun, with a -lice suffix, and adverbially with -ly. Consequently, it can be
seen that ME passives had the relevant properties not only of NE but also of ME adjectives, and therefore that the fallacy does not arise.

3. Conclusion

The argument developed here has made crucial use of the simultaneity of the changes discussed. It is claimed, for example, that the innovations all follow from the introduction of a transformational Passive, a special case of the more general rule of NP Preposing (see Lightfoot (1979, §6.1)). The simultaneity of the changes, all first occurring between 1450–1550, may be fortuitous or may indicate that they are the various surface manifestations of a single change in the abstract grammar. We have shown here that current versions of the EST make descriptions available whereby the changes may be related and their simultaneity be explained. This could not have been done under earlier forms of transformational grammar which did not distinguish between transformational and lexical redundancy rule classes.13

Theories of grammar can be made responsive to data from diachronic change, and thus the way grammars change historically can influence our views about the possible form of particular grammars. In Lightfoot (1979) I present a variety of diachronically based arguments for particular statements in a theory of generative grammar. One move is to require that theories of grammar should make available, where possible, a means of relating clusters of simultaneous but apparently unrelated changes in permitted surface structures, rather than requiring that the simultaneity of the changes be treated as fortuitous. This, of course, is not to say that a grammar can undergo only one change per generation and that simultaneous changes must always be the manifestation of a single change in the abstract grammar. Rather, I claim that diachronic data can help choose between competing descriptions and theories of grammar, providing one more domain where a theory of grammar makes testable predictions. In this article, I hope to have shown that a theory of grammar distinguishing lexical and transformational rules in a principled way permits an orderly account of a set of changes taking place between 1450 and 1550, claiming that all of these changes were the surface manifestations of a single change in the abstract grammar, the introduction of a “Passive transformation” (in fact, one instantiation of a more general rule of NP Preposing); it is difficult to see how the simultaneity of these changes could be treated as anything other than fortuitous in a theory of grammar which did not distinguish such rule classes. I therefore offer a diachronically based argument in support of the distinction and against Postal’s notion of “homogeneous” grammars.

13 However, one thing which does not follow from the EST is the apparent gradual spread of some of the constructions discussed. For example, it was noted that 68 new forms of the prepositional passive occur in the fifteenth century, a further 124 in the sixteenth, more in the seventeenth, and so on. Lest this be adduced as support for some principle of lexical diffusion, one should calculate the chances of all the presently possible combinations being attested in the fifteenth century, given the limited corpus of available texts. This apparent gradualness is probably an artifact of the restrictions on our data.
References


Engels Instituut
Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht
Oudenoord 6
Utrecht
Netherlands