In this talk, I investigate the conditions in Old English on the types of subject pronouns, i.e. not using a pronoun, using an *h*-pronoun, or using an independent demonstrative. First, I argue that, in Early Middle English, (verbal) agreement features are reanalyzed from interpretable to uninterpretable (with first and second person leading the way) and that changes in pro-drop and agreement are the result. In present-day English a similar change may be under way. Secondly, I argue that Old English personal pronouns are not deictic/referential but that demonstrative pronouns are. This situation reverses itself in early Middle English, due to both internal factors (feature reanalysis) and external ones (contact).

1. Introduction

Many issues regarding subjects:  
- pro-drop in OE,  
- loss of pro-drop and verbal agreement,  
- new pronouns (reflexives, *she, they*),  
- loss of experiencer subjects

(1) *Heah wæs þæt handlean and him hold free,*  
high was that reward and him kind lord  
*gesealde wæpna geweald wið wraðra gryre,*  
gave weapons power against hostile terror  
ofercom mid þy campe cneomaga fela  
overcame with it in-fight warriors many

(Talking about Moses), 'Great was his reward and God was gracious to him and gave him weapons against hostile terror. **He** overcame many warriors with it in battle.' (*Exodus* 19-21)

(2) *Nu hebbe ge gehyred ...*  
now have you heard (Aelfric *Homilies* I, 280.4)

(3) *þæt wit unc wite warian sceolden*  
that we 1.DUAL penalty guard should  
'that we should guard ourselves.' (*Genesis* 801)

(4) *þa him wæs elnes þearf*  
when him was courage need  
'he was in need of courage.' (*Beowulf* 2876)

Based on Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993) ideas on anaphora, van Gelderen (2000) argues that between Old and Middle English, there is a reanalysis from interpretable features to uninterpretable ones, e.g. where Case on dependents and agreement on verbs is concerned. In this talk, I come back to that but extend it to a fuller picture of subjects and agreement.
Why does Minimalism assume interpretable and uninterpretable features?

Agreement and Case in Modern English are not relevant to the interpretation, so uninterpretable and (5) is understandable despite the wrong agreement and case:

(5) Me see he

As Holmberg (2005: 536) puts it, in (6), the gender on the verb doesn’t make the verb have a special kind of tiredness. Hence, gender on the V is uninterpretable:

(6) Las chicas están cansad-as  
    the girls are-3P tired-FP, ‘The girls are tired’.

In Old English, Case and agreement are different. I will describe the situation and then suggest an analysis whereby the verbal [i-phi] > [u-phi] and the pronominal and demonstrative deixis and phi-features are ‘rearranged’.

2. Pro-drop, agreement, and pronouns: some background

Early assumptions about variation and language change:

(7) Functional categories are all present (Cinque 1999) or parametrized (e.g. Iatridou 1990, van Gelderen 1993, Thráinsson 1996)

Minimalist assumptions:

(8) Features are either all present (e.g. Cinque and Rizzi 2008) or parametrized (e.g. van Gelderen 2000).

If all features are there: burden on UG (how and why did they arise); if not, how does the child learn: Feature Economy?

(9) Adjunct semantic Specifier interpretable [iF] Head affix uninterpretable [uF]

Various approaches to pro-drop

Rizzi (1982), Huang (1984), Safir (1985), Ura (1994), Platzack (1995), Holmberg (2005), Neeleman & Szendro (2008), Barbosa (2009), Roberts & Holmberg (2010), etc. Holmberg (2005) has two minimalist solutions: interpretable agreement (and no pro) or uninterpretable agreement (and pro to value them). He recognizes 3 types of pronouns and 4 types of pro-drop languages.

Some of this is reminiscent of the Baker – Jelinek debate on Pronominal Argument Languages. My take on this:
Table 1: Languages with and without Case and agreement

Cartographically, agreement and case are distributed as follows and Figure 1 mainly applies to the TP layer:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) \quad & \text{Topic etc marked on dependents (e.g. Japanese)} \\
& \quad \text{Grammatical role/finite verb marked} \\
& \quad \text{Semantic role marked on dependent} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Various views of pronouns and demonstratives**, e.g. Cardinaletti & Starke (1996) and Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002). The approach in this paper:

First and second person pronouns may consist of interpretable phi-features (person and number) whereas third person pronouns may have more features and they vary cross-linguistically in their features. They can include gender and can be +/- referential (deictic), as in (11). Demonstratives have deictic features, as in (12).

---

1 Baker (2008a: 39; 153) argues that T is not a probe in, for instance, Japanese, which is similar to not having probing phi-features. In these languages, I assume that independent subjects may be absent too, with radical pro-drop as the result.
3. **The various types of empty subjects in Old English (many taken from Visser)**

**Expletive-drop**

(13) a. *Nap nihtscua, norðan sniwde*
    darkened night-shadow, north-from snowed
    ‘The shadow of the night darkened, it snowed from the North’.
    (Exeter, *Seafarer* 31)

b. *hit hagolode seofon niht*
    ‘it hailed seven nights.’ (Alfred, *Orosius* 5.10)

**Pro-drop controversy in OE:** Hulk & van Kemenade (1995) argue only expletive pro-drop; van Gelderen (2000) argues for referential pro-drop in all persons and numbers. Schrader (1887: 43) says concerning Aelfric "die verwendung des pronomens [ist] häufig, doch reicht . . . das verb auch allein noch aus". Hard to come up with the determining factors (cf. also Axel 2007: 300).

(14) *Nu scylun hergan hefænricaes uard*
    Now must praise heavenly-kingdom guard
    ‘Now we must praise the lord of the heavenly kingdom.’ (beginning of the Northumbrian version of *Caedmon’s Hymn*).

(15) *Wæs beaw hyra þæt hie oft wæron an wig gearwe,*
    was custom their that they often were one war ready
    *wæs seo þeod tilu. Sigon þa to sleepe*
    was that people good sank then to sleep
    ‘It was their custom always to be ready for war. They were a good people. They went to sleep.’ (*Beowulf* 1246-51)

(16) Extended context from (1):

Hwæt! We feor and neah gefrigen habað ofer middangeard *Moyses domas,* ‘Moses’ laws’ wraeclico wordriht, wera cneorissum, in uprodor eadigra gehwam
aeftær bealusiðe bote lifes, liffigendra gehwam langsumne ræd,-- hæleðum secgan. Gehyre se ðe wille! ‘he ≠ Moses’ þone on westenne weroda drihten, soðfæst cyning, mid his sylfes miht

gewyrðode, and him wundra fela, ‘him = Moses’ ece alwalda, in æht forgeaf. He wæs leof gode, leoda aldor, ‘he = Moses’ horsec and hredørgleaw, herges wisa, ‘army’s leader’ freom folctoga. Faraones cyn, ‘valiant commander’
godes andsacan, gyrdwite band, þær him gesælde sigora waldend, modgum magoræswan, his maga feorh, onwist eðles, Abrahames sunum. Heah wæs þæt handlean and him hold frea, ‘him = Moses’
gesealde wæpna geweald wið wraðra gryre, ofercom mid þy campe cneomaga fela, pro-drop feonda folcriht. ða wæs forma sið þær he him gesægde soðwundra fela, ‘him = Moses’
25 hu þas woruld worhte witig drihten, eorðan ymbhwyrft and uprodor, gesette sigerice, and his sylfes naman, ðone yldo bearn ær ne cuðon, frød fædera cyn, þeah hie fela wiston. (Exodus 1-30)

(17) Gesihst þu nu þæt þa rihtwisan sint laðe & forþrycte, forþam hi pinum willan see you now that the virtuous are loathed and oppressed because they thy will woldan fulgan, & þa unryhtwisan seondan up ahafene þurh heora won daða & want follow and the unvirtuous are up lifted through their lacking deeds and þurh heora selflice? þæt hi ðy eð maegen heora unriht gewill forðbringan hi sind through their selflove? that they the better may their evil will accomplish they are mid gifum & mid gestreonum gefyrðrode. Forþam ic nu wilde geornlice to Gode with gifts and riches promoted. therefore I now want earnestly to God cleopian. Ongan þa giddien & þus singende cwæð. speak. began then sing and thus singing said. (Mind is speaking) ‘Don’t you see that ... Therefore, I now want to speak to God earnestly. Then he (Boethius?) began to sing.’ (Alfred, Boethius, Sedgefield 1899: 9. 28-9)
Is V-fronting (and main clause) relevant, as claimed by Adams (1987) for Old French and Axel (2007) for OHG? No. Pogatscher (1901: 261) already also “im nebensatze” and he gives 176 clear examples.

(18) \( \text{þa wæs Hroðgare heresped gyfen, wiges weorðmynd, } \)
\( \text{þæt him his winemagas georne hyrdon, } \)
\( \text{oðð þæt seo geogð geweox, magodriht micel. Him on mod bearn } \)
`Hrothgar was given fortunes of war. Friends and kinsmen came to him, a force that grew into a mighty army. His mind thought ...'
\( \text{þæt healreced hatan wolde medoærn micel men gewyrcean } \)
that palace command would meadhall large men to-build
`that he would order his men to build a big hall, a big meadhall.' (Beowulf 64-69)

(19) \( \text{þæt ic gumcystum godne funde } \)
\( \text{beaga bryttan breac þonne moste } \)
`that I found a noble bestower of rings and enjoyed it as long as I could.' (Beowulf 1486-7)

(20) \( \text{swylcum gifeþe bið } \)
\( \text{þæt þone hilderæs hal gedigeð } \)
`May it be that he will withstand unhurt the heat of the battle.' (Beowulf 299-300)

(21) \( \text{þæt syðþan na } \)
\( \text{ymb brotne ford brimliðende } \)
`that they after that never kept people from passing that water.' (Beowulf 567-9)

(22) \( \text{Nolde ic sweord beran } \)
\( \text{wæpen to wyrme gif ic wiste hu } \)
`I would bear no sword, weapon against the dragon, if I knew how against that monster otherwise might'
\( \text{wið ðam aglæcean elles meahte } \)
`though the treasure held long, 'though he held the treasure long.' (Beowulf 2344)

(23) \( \text{Notþe ic sweord beran } \)
\( \text{wæpen to wyrme gif ic wiste hu } \)
`I would bear no sword, weapon against the dragon, if I knew how against that monster otherwise might'
\( \text{wið ðam aglæcean elles meahte } \)
against that monster otherwise might

Something on **generic (inclusive) pro-drop**. Holmberg (2010: 92) argues that consistent NSLs do not express generic pronouns with pro-drop, e.g. European Portuguese (24).

(24) \( E \text{ assim que se faz o doce } \)
European Portuguese
`This is how one makes/you make the dessert.' (Holmberg 2010: 92)
Is Old English (14) generic? There are adhortative pros, e.g. in recipes. Axel finds the same on OHG. Would that make OE a non-NSL? (only only if one relates pro-drop to D in T). There is that-trace, as in (25).

(25)  
\[Ac \text{ hwaet saegst ðu ðonne ðaet} \text{ s}c\text{e} \text{ forcudre ðonne sio ungesc} \text{eadwisnes?}\]  
But what say you then is wickeder than be foolishness  
`But what do you say is wickeder than foolishness?' (Boethius 36.8, from Allen 1977: 122, Sedgefield 1899: 109.1-2)

Overt pronouns

(26)  
\[Ic \text{ þæt gehyre þæt þis is hold weorod}\]  
I that hear that this is friendly army  
\[f\text{rean Scyldinga. Gew} \text{itah forð beran} \text{ wæpen ond gewedu. Ic eow wisige swylce ic maguþegnas mine hate ...}\]  
Go on carrying your arms and armor. I you will lead just as I will command my men (to ...). (Beowulf'290-3)

Subject split

Although all subjects are dropped, there is a person split. Berndt (1956) argues that pro-drop occurs more with third than with first and second persons (unlike in Mod English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lin 1</th>
<th>Lin 2</th>
<th>Rush 1</th>
<th>Rush 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>9/212 (96%)</td>
<td>9/656 (99%)</td>
<td>6/191 (97%)</td>
<td>21/528 (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>0/53 (100%)</td>
<td>1/120 (99%)</td>
<td>1/44 (98%)</td>
<td>2/100 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>16/103 (87%)</td>
<td>22/308 (93%)</td>
<td>12/90 (88%)</td>
<td>22/226 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>10/206 (95%)</td>
<td>21/428 (95%)</td>
<td>20/168 (89%)</td>
<td>62/302 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>445/116 (21%)</td>
<td>1292/225 (15%)</td>
<td>223/246 (54%)</td>
<td>995/186 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>263/108 (29%)</td>
<td>618/154 (20%)</td>
<td>130/141 (52%)</td>
<td>528/124 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Numbers of Null versus Overt Subject in Lindisfarne and Rushworth (Glosses)

Interim summary: (a) pro-drop is in all persons; (b) there is no requirement of V-fronting for pro-drop to occur; and (c) there is more third person than first and second. Comparing this with e.g. OHG (Axel 2007), the main difference is the main-subordinate clause split.

Agreement: interpretable?

| Present | 1 | -e |
|         | 2 | -(e)s(t) |
|         | 3 | -(e)ð |
| P       | -að |
| Preterite | 1 | -de |
|         | 2 | -des(t) |
|         | 3 | -de |
| P       | -dun, -don, dan |

Table 3: OE Verbal agreement in SV with weak verbs
In first and second person, there is loss of agreement in VS in late Old English:

(27) *Nelle* we ðæs race na leng teon
not-want we that argument no longer extend
`We don't want to extend that argument any more.' (Ælfric, *Homilies I*, 88.32)

(28) a. *Nu hæbbe* ge gehyre ...
Now have you heard (Ælfric, *Homilies I*, 280.4)
b. *Ac wite* ge ðæt nan man ne meeg fullice ymbe god sprecan
But know you that no man not may fully/foully around god speak
(Ælfric, *Homilies I*, 286.15)

(29) a. *Wendes* ðu ðurh wuldor ðæt þu woruld ahtest
believe you through splendor that you the world own (Christ and Satan 59)
b. *yfele cwæde* ðu þæt ðu þa hal3æn mæ3ne to 3yrdon næmdest
evilly spoke you that you the holy power to rods named
`You spoke evil when you ascribed the holy power to the branches.' (History of the Holy Root Tree, 16.5-6)

By Aelfric, this loss is very obvious:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inflection:</th>
<th>-e/Ø</th>
<th>full</th>
<th>suppletive</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homilies I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homilies II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Loss of inflection in VS in Aelfric

But not with third person:

(30) *Donne hæfð* he wiðsacen
`Then has he rejected.' (Aelfric, *Homilies II*, 27.278)

**Interpretable > uninterpretable**

In Old English, pro-drop is possible but there is a person split suggesting that, if we think of pro-drop as `strength' of T/V, third person features are the ones that retain the interpretable features the longest. This is also clear from the agreement where the same split occurs in VS position.

**Pro-drop and agreement?**

There is never pro-drop with the loss of agreement. So, [i-phi] = agreement. The [i-phi] on T/V for first and second is reanalyzed as [u-phi] on C/T, and the pronoun provides the [i-phi] features:

(31) \( ge \) \( witað \) \( >> \) \( ge \) \( witað \) \( >> \) \( ge \) \( wite \)
\( wite \) \( ge \) \( >> \) \( wite \) \( ge \)
\( [i-1/2] \) \( [u-1/2] \) \( [i-1/2] \)
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This is quite different from varieties of Dutch, where the pronoun is renewed:

(32) a. **Gij gaat daar vaak heen** Brabant Dutch
2S go-2S there often to
`You are going there often.'

b. **Ga-de (gij) daar vaak heen?**
go-2 (2S) there often to, `Do you go there often?'

**Summary to 3:** pro-drop in OE shows `strength’ of verbal [phi]-features but with a third person bias.

4. **Changes in the D system**

The main changes: Shift in demonstratives (to articles and loss of gender); and introduction of new pronouns (third person and reflexive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>[i-phi]</th>
<th>[i-loc]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>article</td>
<td>[u-phi]</td>
<td>[i-phi] [u/i-T]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>[u/i-T]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Feature changes

**Pronouns and demonstratives.** As mentioned, many pronouns `feel’ like they could be pro-drop but demonstratives are special in OE, e.g.:

(33) ðæt fram ham gefrægn *Higelaces þegn*, god mid Geatum, Grendles dæda; se wæs moncynnes mægenes strengest on þæm dæge þysses lifes, æþele ond eacen. Het him yðlidan godne gegyrwan, cwæð, *he guðcyning ofer swanrade secean wolde, mærne peoden, þa him wæs manna þearf. ðone siðfæt him snotere ceorlas lythwon logon, þeah he him leof wære.*

`Hygelac’s thane’ heard about Grendel’s deeds while in Geatland; **he (=Hygelac’s thane)** was mankind’s strongest man on earth, noble and powerful. (**He**) ordered **himself** a good boat prepared and said that **he** wanted to seek **the king** over the sea since **he** (=the king) needed men. Wise men did not stop **him** (=Hygelac’s thane) though **he** was dear to them.’ (Beowulf 194-98)

(34) is a sentence both Traugott (1992) and Kiparsky (2002) use to show the difference between pronouns and demonstratives; I have provided more context:
(34)  *Pa cylypode an ðæra manna Zebeus gehaten and cwæð to ðam cyninge;*

`Then cried one of-the men Zebeus called and said to the king:
Eala ðu cyning þas fulan wuhta þu scoldest awurpan of ðinum rice.
Oh you king the foul creatures you should throw-out of your kingdom
dylæs ðe *Hi* mid heora scyppend forseoð. and to deofolgyldum bugad;
in-case that they [= the foul creatures] with their filth us all affect
Hi habbað mid him awyriedne engel. mancynnes feond. and se hefð andweald on
ðam mannum ðe heora scyppend forseoð. and to deofolgyldum bugad;
They [= the foul creatures] have with them corrupt angel, mankind’s enemy, and
he [the angel] has power over those men that their creator despise and to idols
bow.’

(DOE Segment 8 Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*, second series M. Godden 1979, p. 283. 110 – 115)

(35)  *Oft Scyld Scefing sceaþena þreatum monegum mægþum meadosetla ofteah often Scyld Scefing shadows crowd many family mead-benches away-took
egsode eorlas syððan ærest wearð feasceaft funden he þæs frofre gebad
scared brave-men since early became poor found he that consolation waited
weox under wolcnum weorðmyndum þah oðþæt him æghwylc þara ymbsittendra
grew under clouds honor accepted/grew unt il him every that sitting-around
ofer hronrade hyran scolde | gomban gyldan þæt wæs god cyning
across sea obey should | tribute pay that was good king
`Scyld Scefing often drove away troops from the mead-halls and terrified many.
He had once been a foundling but he found consolation and grew in glory until
everyone had to pay tribute to him. That was a good king’.  (*Beowulf* 4-11)

Is this like Dutch? Comrie (2000): "The demonstrative is used where there are two
potential antecedents for a pronoun. ... The demonstrative is the marked choice. ..., it
must establish less expected coreference". But problems in Dutch too; both personal and
demonstrative are possible:

(36)  Hij had Stern gesproken en aan *deze* enige woorden en zaken uitgelegd, die *hij*
niet begreep. Die Stern niet begreep, meen ik.
`He had talked to Stern and explained to this one some words and matters which
he did not understand. Which Stern did not understand, I mean’. (Multatuli, Max

**Demonstrative > article in late OE** (see e.g. Strang 1970: 267-269):

(37)  & gaddresst swa *pe* clene corn All fra *pe* chaff togeddre
and gather-2S so the clean wheat all from the chaff together
`and so you gather the clear wheat from the chaff.’
(Ormulum 1484-5, Holt edition)

Also, real changes in demonstratives, according to Pysz (2007): PC before 1121 has 65%
correct; 1121-1131 has 46% correct; and after 1131 only 13% is ‘correct’ OE use.
New third person pronouns

**OED:** the districts in which *she* or *sho* first appears in the place of *heo* are marked by the abundance of Scandinavian elements in the dialect and place-names; and in Old Norse the dem. pron. (of all genders) is often used as a personal pron. It is also noteworthy that in OS. and OHG. the fem. pers. pron. nom. sing. was *siu* (mod.G. *sie*, Du. *zij*), corresponding to OE. *sio* (the oblique cases, and the masc. and neut. in the sing., being f. the stems *hi-*, *i-*); and in OFris. *se* ‘she’ occurs beside *hiu*.

(38) *þæræfter toforan Candelmæssan on Windlesoran him to wife forgyn* *Adelis* & *syððan to cwene gehalgod. seo wæs þæs heretogan dohtor of Luuaine.*

‘thereafter before Candlemas at Windsor was given him to wife Adela and after hallowed queen. She was the duke of Louvain’s daughter.’ (PC 1121)

(39) *He brohte his wif to Engleland. & dide hire in þe castel on Canteberi. God wimman scae wæs. oc scae hedde litel blisse mid him. & Crist ne wolde ðæt he sculde lange rixan. ... & his suen Henri toc to þe rice. & te cuen of France todælde fra þe king. & scae com to þe iunge eorl Henr&e;: & he toc hire to wiue.*

‘He brought his wife to England and put her in a castle in Canterbury. She was a good woman but she had little bliss with him. And Christ didn’t want him to have a long rule … and his son Henry took the throne and the queen of France parted from the king and she came to the young count Henry and he took her to wife.’ (PC 1140)

In the *Ormulum*, from 1200, FS is always *3ho*.

(40) *3ho wass ... Elysabæþ 3ehatenn*  

`She was called Elisabeth.’ (*Ormulum* 115)

The introduction of *they* is due to Scandinavian influence.

(41) *& swa pe33 ledenn heore lif Till þatt te33 warenn alde*  

`and so they led their lives until they were old.’ (*Ormulum* 125-6)

Pronouns also start being used demonstratively, as the *OED* puts it:

(42) *For he and he had samen ben, forwit selcuth wrath.*  

`Because they had together been debating.’ (*Cursor Mundi*, Cotton 16161)

From the late Old English through the Middle English period, special reflexives are also introduced: starting with 3rd person.

(43) *mon forgit his selves ... he sceal hine selfne gedencean*  

man forgets his-GEN self-GEN ... he must him-ACC self-ACC remember  

`man forgets himself ... he must remember himself.’ (Alfred, *Pastoral Care*, 34.7)

These changes seem to suggest a ‘strengthening’ of the third person personal pronoun and a shift in the relationship.
How to handle ambiguity?
Earliest ‘fixes’:

(44)  *Riht swa summ he pe forrme mann Ær oferrcumenn haffde*
just so as he the former man earlier overcome had *(Ormulum 12494-5)*

(45)  *þin forrme win iss swiþe god, þin lattre win iss bettre.*
‘Your earlier wine is very good, your later wine is better.’ *(Ormulum 15409)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>se (M.NOM) --&gt; the</td>
<td>seo/heo --&gt; she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that (N.NOM) --&gt; that</td>
<td>hi/pa --&gt; they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Changes in Late Old English

The internal changes involve iF > uF; the external ones new semantic features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Middle English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. se</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[i-loc]/[i-phi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. he/hi</td>
<td>is replaced by he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is replaced by she (possibly via seo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is replaced by they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i-phi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Changes in terms of features

And:

(46)  *To Samaria and them partes.* (1596 H. Clapham, *Bible Hist.* 92, from the OED)

(47)  *Oh they used to be ever so funny houses you know and in them days and The er you never used to see in the oh a lot of houses and you never used to see big windows like these. They used to have big windows, but they used to a all be them there little tiny ones like that.... Used to have to be very rather experienced in them days to do this here net mending.* (BNC - FYD 72; 112)

And currently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spoken</th>
<th>fiction</th>
<th>newspaper</th>
<th>academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>409960 (4.1%)</td>
<td>836836 (5.3%)</td>
<td>644043 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>147335 (1.5%)</td>
<td>78129 (.5%)</td>
<td>19501 (.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>15,900,000</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The article the and demonstrative that in the BNC

Table 6: *that* could be a sign of renewal of the [u-phi] in D, a change in progress. In the same corpus:

---

2 There are many other forms but I just give the most frequent ones.
Another cycle of [i-phi] > [u-phi]?
Currently, there is another subject cycle going on (van Gelderen forthcoming), again with first and second leading. This time it may be the pronominal

(48) a. if I had seen her, er prints I maybe I would of approached this erm differently. (BNC F71)

b. I actually I'd like to see that again. (BNC-HMN 901)

(49) Me, I've been a night person longer than I can remember. (BNC-GVL 335)

(50) a. You maybe you've done it but have forgotten. (BNC-FUH 1047)

b. Erm you actually you know you don't have to say I'm. (BNC-JYM 79)

(51) % might/could/will possibly I (not attested on a Google search or on the BNC)

(52) What else could possibly he be?

(53) Subject Agreement Cycle

emphatic > full pronoun > head pronoun > agreement

[i-phi] [i-phi] [u-1/2] [i-3] [u-phi]

5. Conclusion

Two sets of changes have been discussed. First, the agreement features are reanalyzed from interpretable to uninterpretable, with the inevitable result that a subject becomes obligatory. This is a typical stage in the subject cycle. Secondly, pronouns and demonstratives undergo two types of change, internal and external. The demonstratives lose features in a grammaticalization process and pronouns are renewed externally.

Abbreviations
F feminine
i- interpretable
M masculine
OED Oxford English Dictionary
P plural
ps person
S singular
u- uninterpretable
# number
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