

CAMBRIDGE SYNTAX GUIDES

General editors:

S. R. Anderson, J. Bresnan, D. Lightfoot, N. V. Smith, N. Vincent

Responding to the increasing interest in comparative syntax, the goal of the Cambridge Syntax Guides is to make available to all linguists major findings, both descriptive and theoretical, which have emerged from the study of particular languages. The series is not committed to working in any particular framework, but rather seeks to make language-specific research available to theoreticians and practitioners of all persuasions.

Written by leading figures in the field, these guides will each include an overview of the grammatical structures of the language concerned. For the descriptivist, the books will provide an accessible introduction to the methods and results of the theoretical literature; for the theoretician, they will show how constructions that have achieved theoretical notoriety fit into the structure of the language as a whole; for everyone, they will promote cross-theoretical and cross-linguistic comparison with respect to a well-defined body of data.

The Syntax of Early English

OLGA FISCHER
ANS VAN KEMENADE
WILLEM KOOPMAN
WIM VAN DER WURFF

down, and left the idiomatic combinations that the phrasal verbs are nowadays.

Chapter 7 is on the development of infinitive constructions, especially the origin and rise of Exceptional Case Marking constructions like *I expect him to win the race*, which were introduced sometime during the Middle English period, in part as a spin-off of the establishment of VO word order.

Chapter 8 is on the history of the 'easy to please' construction, so called because its core example in the literature is *John is easy to please*. This construction goes back to an Old English origin of adjective followed by a *to*-infinitive, which is argued to have been in essence a modal passive construction. Old English had another adjective + infinitive construction which was altogether different in structure, something like *this house is pleasant to live in*. These constructions existed side by side through the centuries, until as a result of surface similarities with new passives featuring preposition stranding, they were all reanalysed as cases of *wh*-movement.

Chapter 9 is on grammaticalization. Some of the basic tenets of grammaticalization theory are challenged, and it is shown how at least a number of aspects of these long-term changes can be analysed in an interesting way from a Principles and Parameters perspective. Two case studies are discussed to show this, the first relating to the development of the *have to* periphrasis expressing obligation, as in *I have to do this*; the second is an analysis of Jespersen's negative cycle in the history of English which focusses on the structural and morphosyntactic aspects of the change.

2

An outline of Old English syntax

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to give a descriptive overview of a number of important features of the syntax of Old English, i.e. English from the earliest texts (c. 800) to about 1100. The material in this chapter is primarily based on the evidence from the two main bodies of prose text in Old English: the prose of King Alfred (ninth century) and that of Ælfric, abbot of Eynsham (tenth century). In the final section of the chapter, we will touch on some of the ways in which the syntax of the prose differs from that of the Old English poetry.

Old English is the language imported into the British isles by the immigrations from the continent in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries. It therefore evolved from a number of continental West Germanic languages/dialects. The syntactic study of Old English can be reliably based only on one dialect: the West Saxon standard written language or *Schriftsprache*, in which the bulk of Old English writing has come down to us. There is little scope for work on dialect syntax in Old English; almost all the texts are in the West Saxon dialect, while those works of any length that were not written in West Saxon consist mostly of interlinear glosses on parts of the Vulgate bible, and are therefore of limited use for syntactic purposes. We will nevertheless be commenting upon those aspects where they do prove revealing, which is mostly in those cases where the gloss deviates from the original.

The view of Old English presented in this chapter should be seen as a digest of the consensus view in the literature. Where such consensus is non-existent, we will attempt to clarify what the issues are.

2.2 Morphology and case assignment

Old English had an inflectional system for both verbs and nouns that was a good deal more elaborate than the present-day one. It is not altogether

clear that this was in every way a functional system in the sense that it was crucially needed to distinguish grammatical relations. For instance, the inflectional endings for the majority of noun classes were syncretized for nominative and accusative, and although it was possible to distinguish them by means of demonstrative pronouns, nominative and accusative were to a considerable extent distinguished by their position in the sentence. Thus, it is not obvious what the division of labour was between inflection and position. Even so, Old English was highly inflected compared with the present-day language. We will not go into morphological detail here; the reader is referred to Campbell (1959), and, for an illuminating discussion of the inflectional system as a system, Hogg (1992b). In this section we will discuss the inflectional system's effects on the syntax, which are mainly in the domain of case assignment.

2.2.1 Old English verbal and nominal inflections

In Old English, verbs were inflected for person (first, second, third), number (singular, plural), tense (present, past) and mood (indicative, subjunctive, imperative). It should be noted that the verbal endings too in Old English show a fair amount of syncretism: for instance, the form *fremmap* 'perform' could be indicative plural, without person distinctions, or imperative plural, and a form like *fremede* 'performed', while being unambiguously past tense, could be subjunctive singular (without person distinction), or indicative first or third singular. On the other hand, the singular present indicative always has three distinct person endings, as in: *ic fremme*, *þu fremest*, *helheolhit fremep* (the third singular *-s* was a Northern form, perhaps an innovation there, in Old English); the indicative second person singular is uniquely distinguished in the present and past tenses (at least in the weak verbs) by the *-(e)st* ending; the present/past distinction is unambiguous; and the singular/plural contrast, almost completely lost in the present-day language, is always systematically marked. The conclusion must therefore be that, in spite of some syncretism, the system is still largely intact.

There are several syntactic phenomena that are often associated with comparatively rich verbal morphology. The first of these is the phenomenon of *pro*-drop that is well-known in present-day languages like Spanish and Italian, where it is possible to omit an unstressed pronominal subject, presumably because its person and number can be read off from the verbal morphology, as in the Italian sentence in (1):

- (1) hanno parlato troppo
have talked-3pl too much
'they talked too much'

There are various forms of subject omission in early English too. The most frequently occurring one is what is often termed 'conjoined subject deletion'. This refers to instances where the subject is omitted in a conjoined sentence, as in the second clause of (2):

- (2) and him comon englas to, and him ðenodon
and him came angels to, and him served
'and angels came to him, and served him' (ÆCHom I, 11.174.17)

It should be noted that this phenomenon, though often interpreted as *pro*-drop, has nothing to do with verbal morphology. The identification of the omitted subject is not related to verbal morphology, but established under coreference with the higher subject *englas*. Discourse factors seem to be of prime importance here, although there is also a clear syntactic restriction in that coreference is always with the subject of the higher clause. More discussion of this phenomenon in Old English can be found in Allen (1995).

Old English has a very Germanic form of subject omission, which in the theoretical literature is often called 'expletive *pro*-drop'. This refers to a variety of impersonal contexts in which there is no nominative subject, and no insertion of a dummy subject *it*, as sometimes with weather verbs, as in (3), and regularly in impersonal passives, as in (4):

- (3) Ða cwom þær micel snaw & swa miclum sniwde swelce micel
then came there heavy snow and 0 so heavily snowed as if much
flys feolle
fleece fell
'and it snowed so heavily, as if a lot of fleece were falling' (Alex 30.11)
- (4) ... ðætte forðy to ungemetlice ne sie geliðod ðæm scyldgan
that therefore 0 too greatly not be let-off to-the guilty
'... that therefore it must not be let off too greatly to the guilty'
(CP 20.149.24)

More discussion of the conditions that allowed such expletive *pro*-drop in Old English and other Germanic languages can be found in Hulk and van Kemenade (1993); van Kemenade (1997a). This type of *pro*-drop seems to have been largely lost by 1500.

Another syntactic phenomenon which in the theoretical literature is often associated with comparatively rich verbal morphology is that of the position of the finite verb. The putative generalization is that languages with comparatively rich morphology have a wider range of finite verb-fronting strategies than those without. This argument has been made in particular with respect to changes in late Middle English and early Modern English syntax (see chapter 3 and the detailed discussion in Roberts 1993, which also provides cross-linguistic evidence).

Old English had a wider range of verb fronting strategies than late Middle English. In those contexts in which the present-day language still has fronting of the auxiliary only, i.e. questions and negative-initial sentences, all finite verbs could be fronted in Old English. In (5), examples of the relevant contexts are given:

- (5) a. *Hwæt sægest þu, yrþlingc? Hu begæst þu weorc þin?*
 what say you, ploughman? How perform you work yours?
 'What do you say, ploughman? How do you go about your work?'
 (*ÆColl* 22.23)
- b. *ne sende se deofol ða fyr of heofenum, þeah ðe hit*
 not sent the devil then fire from heavens, though that it
ufan come
 from-above came
 'the devil did not send fire from heaven, though it came from above'
 (*ÆCHom* I, (Pref)6.13)

This option of fronting finite lexical verbs was lost in the course of the early Modern English period, as the modal auxiliaries achieved their modern status, and *do*-support became firmly entrenched. Whether the loss of this option results from the loss of verb morphology is a matter of considerable debate, for which the reader is referred to Roberts (1993), Lightfoot (1997) and Warner (1997).

There is clear evidence that Old and Middle English also had a second verb fronting strategy, particularly apparent in main clauses introduced by a topic. Let us consider the following examples (finite verbs and subjects italicized):

- (6) a. *On twam þingum hæfde God þæs mannes sawle gegodod*
 in two things had God the man's soul endowed
 'With two things God had endowed man's soul' (*ÆCHom* I, 1.20.1)
- b. *Be ðæm we magon suiðe swutule oncnawan ðæt . . .*
 by that we can very clearly perceive that . . .
 'By that, we can perceive very clearly that . . .'
 (*CP* 26.181.16)

While both clauses are introduced by a topicalized PP, and while in both clauses the finite verb is fronted with respect to the position of the non-finite verb, the nominal subject in (6a) follows the finite verb, whereas the pronominal subject in (6b) precedes it. We will discuss this construction in more detail in chapter 4, and present evidence that the position of the finite verb reflects a verb fronting option which was lost at the close of the Middle English period, with pronominal and nominal subjects occupying different positions. Here again there is cause for debate whether the loss of this strategy resulted from the loss of verbal inflections. Also, it is not clear in any detail how the loss of the two types of finite V-movement described here can be related to each other. They represent movement to different positions, but the

dating of their respective losses, some way into the early Modern English period and the close of the Middle English period respectively, is just a bit too far apart to relate them both to the same loss of verb inflections. With respect to the former movement strategy, it has been argued that the loss of verb morphology was a necessary condition, but a further triggering factor was needed. We will leave this matter as one for which further research is needed.

We now turn to a discussion of the system of nominal cases and its effects upon the syntax. Old English NPs show a four-way case system with nominative, accusative, dative and genitive, although the noun itself never has more than three distinct forms; the nominative/accusative distinction is not marked on the noun except in the singular of the feminine *-o* nouns and the masculine and feminine weak nouns, but there, dative, genitive and accusative are not distinguished. Case contrasts within the NP are further marked by demonstrative pronouns, which in the masculine and feminine singular do distinguish nominative from accusative; and by adjectives, which have two main conjugations depending on whether the NP is definite or indefinite (see Spamer 1979). Demonstrative pronoun, adjective and noun always agree in case, number and gender.

There is good cause to assume that nominative case is associated with the syntactic subject. Accusative is associated most typically with the direct object, although, like dative and genitive case, it may be determined by the lexical properties of its governing verb or preposition. It is common in the literature to distinguish between structural and inherent case (see Chomsky 1981). Structural case is assigned to a NP according to its position in the syntactic structure: thus, nominative is assigned to the grammatical subject, accusative to the direct object. One criterion for deciding that it is structural is that accusative case is neutralized under passivization: the accusative object in an active sentence will be found as the nominative subject in a corresponding passive sentence:

- (7) a. *Gregorius hine (A) affigde*
 Gregory him put to flight
 'Gregory put him to flight' (*ÆHom* 22.624)
- b. *Da wearð se god (N) affiged of þære fulan anlicnyse*
 then was the god expelled from the foul idol
 'Then the god was expelled from the foul idol' (*ÆHom* 22.593)

This is not true for other object cases: objects marked for dative or genitive case will retain their case under passivization. We call this inherent case, because the case is lexically associated with the governing verb or preposition. In (8), there is an example with the verb *helpan* taking a dative object, both in the active and in the passive.

- (8) a. *Helpað earmum 7 hæfenleasum*
 help poor (D) and needy (D)
 'Help the poor and the needy' (WHom 11.197)
- b. *Ac ðæm mæg beon suiðe hraðe geholpen from his lareow*
 but that (D) may be very quickly helped by his teacher
 'But that may be remedied very quickly by his teacher' (CP 33.225.22)

A second reason for saying that accusative is structural is that the correlation between accusative case and the nature of the semantic relation between the verb and its accusative object is less than straightforward. We can establish such a correlation by contrasting accusative with other object cases, as discussed below, but it is a partial one at best, since there are also NPs marked accusative which do not entertain a direct semantic relation with the verb. This is particularly clear in ACI constructions with causative and perception verbs, in which the subject of the non-finite complement clause is marked for accusative case:

- (9) a. *Se cing het hi feohtan agien Pihtas*
 the king commanded them (A) fight against Picts
 'The king commanded them to fight against the Picts'
 (ChronA(Plummer) 449.5)
- b. *He hine geseah sittan æt tolle*
 he him (A) saw sit at toll
 'He saw him sitting at the toll' (ÆCHom II, 37.273.24)

It is clear that the accusative NP receives its case under structural case marking here, since it bears no direct semantic relation to the verb. Other object cases do show such a correlation; this is another reason for calling dative and genitive inherent cases; they seem to be determined by a combination of association with semantic roles and selection by their governing verb or preposition. While it seems impossible to establish a one-to-one correlation between case and semantic role, some general correspondences can be drawn: dative is associated primarily with the experiencer role, with the animate goal (indirect object) and with other NPs that signify a participant not directly involved in the scene. The latter is best illustrated by contrasting dative with accusative case in monotransitive complementation. Some verbs tend to show a distinction here (see Plank 1983). Consider the following two examples, both with the verb *folgian*, which is a verb that can take a dative or an accusative object:

- (10) a. *and ða folgode feorhgeniðlan*
 and then followed deadly foes (A)
 'and then he pursued his deadly foes' (Beo 2928)
- b. *him folgiað fuglas scyne*
 him (D) follow birds fair
 'Fair birds shall follow him' (Phoen 591)

If the object of *folgian* 'follow' is accusative, as in (10a), this indicates that the NP, as the direct object, is engaged in direct interaction with the subject. This is less clearly the case if the object is dative, as in (10b). We can also tell this from the distinction in meaning: where the verb is followed by a dative, it means 'follow', where it is followed by an accusative, it means 'pursue'.

The genitive case corresponds with the role of Source and very often has partitive connotations. These readings may be illuminated by considering the most typical paraphrases of sentences with genitive objects in the present-day language, which show that they are predominantly part of a PP introduced by *from* or *of*, as in the following examples:

- (11) a. *Dæt ilce eac Dryhten oðwat Israhela folce, ða hie*
 The same also Lord reproached Israel's people when they
wæron geheargeode & of hiera earde alædde, & swaðeah
 were ravaged and of their country led away and nevertheless
noldon gestucan hiera yfelenaweorca, ne hie noldon
 not-wanted turn from their wicked deeds (G) nor they not-wanted
awendan of hiera won wegum;
 turn from their perverse ways (CP 37.267.13)
 'With the same also the Lord reproached the people of Israel, when their
 lands were ravaged, and they were led away from their country, and yet
 they would not cease their wicked deeds, nor turn from their perverse
 ways'
- b. *Se scamfæsta hæfð genoh on ðæm to his bettrunge dæt his*
 the modest has enough in that for his reform that his
lareow hine suiðe lythwon gemyndgige his unðeawa (G)
 teacher him very gently remind of his faults
 'It is enough to reform the modest man, if his teacher would remind him
 very gently of his faults' (CP 31.207.3)

Beside such uses for the genitive object, genitive case is, of course, typically the case used to express possession.

In ditransitive complementation, the case marking for the two objects is usually a combination of accusative and dative, less commonly of accusative and genitive or dative and genitive, with semantic correlations as noted above.

- (12) a. *Gif þu geoffrast Gode ænige lac æt his weofode*
 if you offer God (D) any sacrifice (A) at his altar
 'If you offer any sacrifice to God on his altar' (EHom 16.19)
- b. *Ne mæg þara yfena yfel þa goodan beniman heora goodes*
 not can of-the evil-ones evil the good (A) deprive their good (G)
 'The evil deed of the wicked cannot deprive the good of their goodness'
 (Bo 37.113.4)
- c. *and his magas ðancodon mycclum ðæs Gode*
 and his kinsmen thanked much this (G) God (D)
 'and his kinsmen thanked God greatly for this' (ÆLS(Swithun) 219)

Prepositions in Old English are typically associated with a selected case, mostly dative case, very often corresponding with a location or goal. Some prepositions select the accusative case, with connotations such as 'extent of time' (e.g. *op* 'until'), 'extent of space' (How far?, e.g. *geond* 'throughout', *ymb* 'around', *purh* 'through'), and some the genitive case (e.g. *utan* 'outside of'). Quite a few can take more than one case, often dative and accusative. It is sometimes said that the choice of case marks a semantic distinction, with the dative indicating rest and the accusative indicating motion, but this is not consistently observed. The objects of prepositions could not be passivized in Old English, which is another indication that prepositions assign an inherent case. We come back to this below.

2.2.2 Impersonal verbs

The Old English impersonal construction and its historical fate have attracted a good deal of attention from historical linguists of various persuasions. The term 'impersonal' is a rather vague one in that different scholars subsume different things under it. Strictly speaking, it refers to constructions which have no nominative subject and have the verb in the default 'agreement' form: third person singular.

- (13) *ðonne ofðyncð him ðæs ilcan ðe he ær forbær*
 then displeases him (D) the same (G) that he before endured
 'then he regrets what he endured before' (CP 33.225.18)

Verbs such as *ofþyncan* 'displease, regret' in (13), which have two arguments, denote a mental or cognitive experience in which one argument is expressed as the animate experiencer, the other as the cause/source of the experience. This is why such verbs are often called psych verbs. The class of such verbs in Old English includes: *hreowan* 'rue'; (*ge*)*sceamian* 'shame'; *eglian* 'ail'; *ofþyncan* 'displease'; (*ge*)*lician* 'like'; (*ge*)*lystan* 'desire'; *langian* 'long'; (*ge*)*lustfullian* 'please'. In syntactic treatments, the two arguments are often referred to as the EXPERIENCER argument and the THEME argument. They can be realized in the following core case configurations:

- (14) a. EXPERIENCER – dative THEME – nominative
 b. EXPERIENCER – nominative THEME – genitive
 c. EXPERIENCER – dative THEME – genitive

(13) is an example of type (14c), which is attested with considerably less frequency than the two alternative types (see Fischer and van der Leek 1983, Anderson 1988, Allen 1986). (14a) and (14b) are exemplified by (15a) and (15b) respectively:

- (15) a. *þæt we þurh þæt calle Gode lician*
 that we (N) through that all God (D) please
 'that we all please God with that' (HomU 20(BIHom 10) 42)
 b. *Hwæt þa se mæssepreost þæs mannes ofhreow*
 lo then the priest (N) the man (G) pitied
 'Lo then the priest had pity on the man' (ÆLS(Oswald) 262)

In (15a) the nominative THEME precedes the dative EXPERIENCER, perhaps because it is a pronoun. If both arguments are full NPs, the order dative–nominative is by far the most frequent. This phenomenon is widely attested in impersonal constructions in the Germanic languages and is often called nominative–dative inversion. An Old English example is (16):

- (16) *Gif ðam gifran ungemetlicu spræc ne eglde*
 if the greedy (D) eloquent speech (N) not afflicted
 'if the greedy were not afflicted by loquacity' (CP 43.309.2)

While the EXPERIENCER is always an animate NP with nominative or dative case, the THEME may be alternatively realized as a clause, as in the following examples.

- (17) a. *and me ofhreow þæt hi ne cuþon ne næfdon þa*
 and me (D) regretted that they not knew nor not-had the
 godspellican lare on heora gewritum
 evangelical doctrines among their writings
 'and I regretted that they knew not nor had not the evangelical doctrines
 among their writings' (ÆCHom I, (Pref)2.7)
 b. *Gif we ðonne scomiað ðæt we to uncuðum monnum suelc*
 if we (N) then shame that we to unknown men so
 spreccen
 speak
 'If we are ashamed to speak to strangers like this' (CP 10.63.5)
 c. *Us gelustfullað gyt furður to spreccenne be ðan halgan were*
 us (D) delights yet further to speak of the holy man
 Iohanne
 John
 'It delights us to speak yet further of the holy man John'
 (ÆCHom I, 25.360.29)

There is in fact a group of verbs that is attested almost exclusively with a clausal THEME, consisting of the verbs (*ge*)*byrian*, *gerisan*, *gedafenian*, *behofian*, all meaning more or less 'behave', and (*ge*)*lympan*, (*ge*)*weorþan* 'happen'; *þyncan* 'seem'. Two examples are given in (18):

- (18) a. *Ðe gedafenað to lerrenne and me to hlistenne*
 you (D) behaves to learn and me to listen
 'It befits you to study and me to listen' (Solil 1.33.4)

- b. & him ðuhte, ðæt...
and him (D) seemed that
'and it seemed to him that ...'
(*Bede* 28.362.32)

2.3 Word order

It has often been said that Old English word order was rather free, and that this was at least in part due to the relatively rich system of case endings and other inflectional morphology. More recently, it has emerged that the label 'free' would be an overstatement for the positional variety of Old English. For a number of aspects of word order, there are strong preferences, and these are often not that different from the norm today. This is as true at the constituent level as it is at the clause level. Let us first consider word order inside the nominal group.

2.3.1 Word order at the NP level

For NPs, the preferred situation is for all modifiers to precede the head noun, and the most frequent order closely resembles that of the present-day language: quantifier, demonstrative pronoun/possessive pronoun, numeral, *oper* 'other', adjective (one or more), genitive noun, head. NPs containing all these elements simultaneously are not attested, but the examples in (19) illustrate the relative order (see also Mitchell 1985: § 143).

- (19) a. anum unwisum cyninges þegne
to-an unwise of-king thane
'to an unwise thane of the king'
(*ChronA*(Plummer) 874.5)
b. ealle his woruldlican æðelborenysses
'all his worldly nobility'
(*ÆCHom* II, 9.73.36)
c. monige oþre cyninges þegnas
many other of-king thanes
'many other thanes of the king'
(*ChronA*(Plummer) 894.85)

Exceptions to the preferred word order are not hard to find: *monig* 'many' can follow a demonstrative pronoun, as in (20a); *oper* can precede a quantifier, as in (20b):

- (20) a. þara monigena gewinna
'of the many battles'
(*Or* 5.2.115.29)
b. oðre fela bisceopas
other many bishops
'many other bishops'
(*ÆLS*(Basil) 629)

Postmodification is attested with quantifiers and with modifiers in *-ward*:

- (21) a. hlafordswican manige
traitors many
'many traitors'
(*WHom* 20.1.64)
b. þa scipo alle
the ships all
'all the ships'
(*ChronA*(Plummer) 885.7)
c. alle Cent eastwearde
all Kent eastward
'all eastern Kent'
(*ChronA*(Plummer) 865.1)

Other cases of following modifiers are infrequent and some of them only occur in poetry. Some examples are:

- (22) a. mægwine mine
kinsmen-dear mine
'my dear kinsmen'
(*Beo* 2479)
b. þa roda þreo
the roods three
'the three roods'
(*El* 867)
c. tamra deora unbeboþtra syx hund
tame (G) deer (G) unbought (G) six hundred
'six hundred unsold tame animals'
(*Or* 1.15.8)

We also find cases with both the demonstrative and the modifying adjective in postposition. In these cases the demonstrative precedes the adjective:

- (23) cyle þone grimmetan
cold the grimmest
'the grimmest cold'
(*HomS17*(BIHom5) 136)

Certain constituents always follow the rest of the NP: this is true for prepositional modifiers, as in (24), and also for relative clauses, as in (25):

- (24) ... ane boc be cyrclicum ðeawum
'... a book about ecclesiastical customs'
(*ÆCHom* II, 5.49.237)
(25) to þam ylcan campdome þe heora fæderas on wæron
to the same military service which their fathers in were
'to the same military service which their fathers were in'
(*ÆLS*(Martin) 31)

The second of two conjoined premodifiers, with or without demonstrative, can also follow the head:

- (26) a. se byrdesta sceall gyldan ... and berenne kyrtel oððe
the highest-born must pay and bearskin garment or
yterenne
otterskin
'the highest born must pay ... and a garment of bearskin or otterskin'
(*Or* 1.15.17)

- b. liflice onsægednysse and halige and Gode andfenge
 living sacrifice and holy and to-God acceptable
 'living and holy sacrifice, and acceptable to God'
 (*ÆCHom* I, 32.482.8)

Two nouns or NPs may stand in an appositive relation where one specifies or modifies the other. A frequently occurring type is that of an appellative in combination with a title:

- (27) Sidroc eorl se gioncga
 Sidroc earl the young
 'The young earl Sidroc'
 (*ChronA*(Plummer) 871.14)

In Old English, the name usually precedes the title. Middle English has more variation in this respect. In Old English, there are examples with several appositions in one group:

- (28) heahfæderas, eawfæste and wuldorfulle weras on heora life, witegena
 patriarchs religious and glorious men in their life of-prophets
 fæderas, þæra gemynd ne bið forgotten...
 fathers whose memory not is forgotten
 'patriarchs, religious and glorious men in their lives, the fathers of the
 prophets, whose memory shall not be forgotten' (*ÆCHom* I, 36.540.17)

Pronouns can be modified by an appositive NP, as in (29):

- (29) a. He cwæð, se apostol Paulus
 'He said, the apostle Paul'
 b. se heora cyning
 the their king
 'he, their king'
 (*Or* 1.14.35.14)

NPs may also be discontinuous in Old English. Those elements that may occur as postmodifiers at the end of the NP can be separated from the rest of the NP:

- (30) Maran cyle ic geseah, and wyrstan
 greater cold I saw and worse
 'I have seen a greater and worse cold'
 (*ÆCHom* II, 23.202.107)

A similar example involving a relative clause is:

- (31) forðan þe manegum wæron his wundra cupe þe god worhte
 because that to-many were his miracles known that God performed
 purh hine
 through him
 'because the miracles that God wrought through him were known to
 many'
 (*ÆLS*(Martin) 1)

2.3.2 Word order at the clause level

Word order at the clause level in Old English is a puzzling combination of the familiar and the alien: while some word orders are rather like those of the present-day language, others are very different. Closer inspection indeed reveals that Old English word order differs in major respects from that of Modern English, and that some important changes must have taken place between the Old and Modern periods. The Old English situation and its subsequent upheaval are discussed in detail in chapters 4 and 5. We will therefore confine ourselves here to a broad outline.

It has often been said that Old English is of the SOV word order type. In reality, there is a good deal of variation, but we can see this clearly only when we distinguish the position of the finite verb from that of the non-finite verb. Let us first consider the position of the finite verb.

The word order of quite a few Old English main clauses with one finite verb is like that of the present-day language. An example is a subject-initial main clause with one verb:

- (32) We habbað hwæðere þa bysne on halgum bocum
 'We have, nevertheless, the examples in holy books'
 (*ÆCHom* I, 31.474.33)

In other sentence types, however, we see immediately that there are important differences: main clauses introduced by question words, negatives and topics have subject-verb inversion, which is illustrated for questions in (33):

- (33) a. Hwi wolde God swa lytles þinges him forwyman
 why would God so small thing him deny
 'Why should God deny him such a small thing?' (*ÆCHom* I, 1.14.2)
 b. Hwæt scealt þu þinum hlaforde?
 what owe you your lord
 'What do you owe your lord?' (*ÆHom* 17.142)

An important difference between inversion contexts in Old English and their present-day counterparts is that the phenomenon is not restricted to auxiliaries in Old English; all finite main verbs may undergo inversion as well, as (33b) illustrates. Old English is like the present-day language in that inversion is restricted to main clauses.

Main clauses introduced by a constituent other than the subject show an interesting quirk: while inversion takes place with all types of finite verb in a large majority of cases when the subject is nominal, a personal pronoun subject remains in preverbal position. This is illustrated in (34) vs. (35) (see also (6a) and (6b)):

- (34) a. On ðam dæge worhte God leoht, and merigen, and æfen
on that day made God light and morning and evening
'On that day God made light, morning, and evening' (*ÆCHom I*, 6.100.5)
- b. Ðas ðreo ðing forgið God his gecorenum
these three things gives God his chosen
'These three things God gives to his chosen' (*ÆCHom I*, 18.250.12)
- (35) a. Forðon we sceolan mid ealle mod & mægene to Gode gecyrran
therefore we must with all mind and power to God turn
'Therefore we must turn to God with all our mind and power'
(*HomU19*(*BIHom8*) 26)
- b. Be ðæm we magon suiðe swutule oncnawan ðæt...
by that we may very clearly perceive that
'By that, we may perceive very clearly that...'
(*CP* 26.181.16)

While the facts concerning inversion in questions and main clauses with a nominal subject introduced by a topic may tempt us to view Old English as a Verb-Second language like Dutch, German and the continental Scandinavian languages, the facts in (35) complicate this picture in an intriguing way. We will discuss this in detail in chapter 4.

Word order in embedded clauses is different from that of the present-day language as well. In general, inversion with front position of the finite verb does not occur there. Nevertheless a number of cases suggest that a form of finite verb fronting is operative in embedded clauses (see also Pintzuk 1991). First consider the following examples:

- (36) a. þæt hi *mihton* swa bealdlice Godes geleafan *bodian*
that they could so boldly God's faith preach
'that they could preach God's faith so boldly' (*ÆCHom I*, 16.232.23)
- b. þæt we ealle *sculon* ænne geleafan *habban*
that we all must one faith have
'that we all must have one faith'
(*Or* 5.14.131.13)

There are also a few examples with fronting of a finite verb from a verb-particle combination, as in (37a), where the particle remains in clause-final position, as can be seen when we compare it with (37b), where the auxiliary, but not the non-finite verb, is fronted.

- (37) a. þæt he *wearp* þæt sword *onweg*
'that he threw the sword away'
(*Bede* 1.7.38.18)
- b. gif hio ne *bið* hrædlice *aweg* adrifen
if she not is quickly away driven
'if it is not quickly driven away'
(*CP* 13.79.23)

The behaviour of verb-particle constructions will be discussed in detail in chapter 6. The kind of verb fronting illustrated in (36) and (37) differs in several ways from that in main clauses. Specially fronted constituents such as

topics and question elements do not occur in subordinate clauses of this type. The constituent preceding the finite verb is always the subject (nominal or pronominal), except in special constructions such as passives. Moreover, verb fronting in main clauses is vastly more frequent than in subordinate clauses.

It has often been said that English changed from an OV language to a VO language. But this statement requires considerable qualification, since even in Old English, there is a good deal of variation between OV and VO word orders. We saw above that in main clauses, and to a more limited extent in embedded clauses, the finite verb can be fronted. It therefore comes as no surprise that VO word orders are most frequent in clauses with a single finite lexical verb, since fronting of the finite verb very often results in VO word order. This is illustrated by (32), repeated here as (38a), and by (38b):

- (38) a. We habbað hwæðere þa bysne on halgum bocum
'We have, nevertheless, the examples in holy books'
(*ÆCHom I*, 31.474.33)
- b. þæt he forgeafe godne willan þam seocan hæðenan
that he granted good will the sick heathen
'that he granted good will to the sick heathen'
(*ÆCHom II*, 2.12.28)

Given the fact that the finite verb can be fronted, it is only to be expected that in subject-initial sentences, a single finite lexical verb follows the subject, resulting in an SVO order. This is much more frequent in main clauses, which is again unsurprising because verb fronting is more prominently established there. The position of the non-finite verb, unlike that of the finite verb, is independent of clause type. This is where we get a picture of variation between OV and VO word orders, and it becomes clear that objects and PPs can appear on the left or the right of the non-finite verb in main (39a–b) and embedded (39c–f) clauses alike (the nonfinite verbs are italicized):

- (39) a. þes mann nolde *cyðan* ðam syngigendum heora synna
this man not-wanted make-known the sinning their sins
'this man would not make known to the sinning their sins'
(*ÆCHom II*, 22.194.148)
- b. Se mæssepreost sceal mannum *bodian* þone soþan geleafan
the masspriest must people preach the true faith
'The masspriest must preach the true faith to the people'
(*Ælet2*(*Wulfstan1*) 175)
- c. þe *geearnian* wile ece myrhðe æt ðam soðan Gode
who earn wants eternal joy from the true God
'who wants to earn eternal joy from the true God'
(*WHom* 7.22)
- d. þæt hi urum godum *geoffrian* magon ðancwurðe onsægednysse
that they our gods offer may grateful sacrifice
'that they may offer a grateful sacrifice to our gods'
(*ÆCHom I*, 38.592.31)

- e. *ƿæt hy syððan faran scoldon geond ealne middanearc*
 that they afterwards go must throughout all world
 'that they must afterwards travel throughout the world' (WHom 7.78)
- f. *ƿæt hi mihton swa bealdlice Godes geleafan bodian*
 that they could so boldly God's faith preach
 'that they could preach God's faith so boldly' (ÆCHom I, 16.232.23)

Nominal objects and PPs are the constituents whose position is variable with respect to the non-finite verb; the position of other elements is rather fixed. Personal pronouns almost always appear somewhere left of the non-finite verb (this is discussed in chapter 4). The same can be said for a variety of adverbs, including negation markers, and stranded prepositions and particles are usually immediately left of the non-finite verb. On the other hand, finite clauses and infinitives with *to* almost always appear in sentence-final position. The issues of OV and VO word order are addressed in chapter 5.

Finally, we should touch briefly on a recalcitrant phenomenon in embedded clauses. In embedded clauses with two verbs, there are some intriguing variations in the relative positioning of finite and non-finite verb. If this variation were restricted to examples like (39f), where we could say that the finite verb is fronted by the rule of Verb-Second, and (39d), in which it is not fronted, we could straightforwardly say that we have optional verb fronting in embedded clauses. But this picture is complicated by examples like (40):

- (40) a. *Se ðe nan ðing nele on ðissum life ðrowian*
 he who no thing not-wants in this life suffer
 'He who will suffer nothing in this life' (ÆCHom I, 10.164.22)
- b. *Gif he ðonne ðæt wif wille forsacan*
 if he then the woman wish refuse
 'If he then wishes to refuse the woman' (CP 5.43.15)

These are embedded clauses in which a nominal object (*nan ðing/ðæt wif*) appears left of the finite verb (*ðrowian/forsacan*). The finite verb is left of the non-finite verb, but next to the subject (as in (39f)), which is expected if fronting took place. The analysis of these word order patterns is rather problematic. One approach to the problem would be to say that they are variations on the types of verb clustering found in many of the present-day continental West Germanic languages and dialects. Detailed work still needs to be done here, but we think the problem may well continue to resist precise analysis.

2.3.3 Word order in coordinate clauses

Having considered main and subordinate clauses, we should, following Mitchell (1985) and others, distinguish a third type of clause: the coordinate

clause. Failure to recognize it as a separate category yields a very misleading picture of main clause word order. We saw above that main clauses generally have Verb-Second. By analogy, we would expect coordinate main clauses to exhibit Verb-Second phenomena, have topics, show inversion and have the word orders typical of main clauses. But very often they do not. Although a small number of main clauses have no Verb-Second (Koopman 1995), the number of coordinate main clauses lacking it is far greater (even ones starting with a topic) and they often have the verb-final word orders usually associated with subordinate clauses. Consider (41):

- (41) *7 ƿa ongeat se cyning ƿæt 7 he on ƿa duru eode 7*
 and then perceived the king that and he on the door went and
ƿa unheanlice hine werede
 then nobly himself defended
 'and then the king perceived this and he went to the door and then nobly
 defended himself' (ChronA(Plummer) 755.13)

The first coordinate clause of (41) shows inversion after *ƿa*, which is characteristic of main clauses, but the second coordinate clause has no Verb-Second and the finite verb follows the PP *on ƿa duru*, while the third coordinate clause does not repeat the subject and again has the verb in clause-final position (see also Stockwell and Minkova 1990).

2.4 Some clause types

2.4.1 Questions

Question formation in Old English does not differ greatly from its counterpart in the present-day language. Most questions are of two main types: yes-no questions and wh-questions. The two types share the prominent syntactic feature of subject-verb inversion. In yes-no questions the truth value of the whole statement is questioned: they ask for an affirmative or negative response and are typically verb-initial:

- (42) *Truwast ðu nu ƿe selfum and ƿinum geferum bet ƿonne*
 trust you now you self and your companions better than
ðam apostolum . . . ?
 the apostles
 'Do you trust yourself now and your companions better than the
 apostles . . . ?' (Solil 2.61.24)

In wh-questions a constituent is questioned by fronting an interrogative pronoun or adverb, such as *hwelc* 'which', *hwær* 'where', *hwy* 'why', and *hwa* 'who'. An example is:

- (43) Eala, hwy is ðis gold adeorcad?
'Oh, why is this gold tarnished?' (CP 18.133.10)

The word order in both types of questions is the inverted order *finite verb-subject*, except when the question word is itself the subject. The main difference with the present-day language is that inversion is not restricted to auxiliaries; all lexical finite verbs take part in this, as noted above. When the question word is part of a PP, the preposition is fronted with its complement. There is no 'P-stranding' of the preposition equivalent to present-day 'Who did you give the book to?':

- (44) To hwæm locige ic buton to ðæm eaðmodum...?
to whom look I except to the humble
'To whom do I look except to the humble...?' (CP 41.299.18)

There are also (independent) questions introduced by *hwæper*, which differ in important ways from the yes-no and wh-questions discussed above. The wh-word is always *hwæper*, inversion does not occur as it does in other independent questions and the verb is in the subjunctive (almost always in the present tense):

- (45) Da andsworede se Wisdom 7 cwæð: Hwæper þu nu fullice
then answered the wisdom and said whether you now fully
ongite forhwy hit þonne swa sie?
understand (subj) why it then so is (subj)?
'Then Wisdom answered and said: Do you now understand why it is so?'
(Bo 33.74.25)

The subject-verb order, the use of the subjunctive and the frequency of OV word orders are all characteristics of subordinate clauses. This betrays the origin of this type of question as an indirect question, with *hwæper* as a conjunction.

2.4.2 Negation

Old English is a negative concord language: any negative sentence can contain multiple negative elements, but this results in only one single logical negation. An example:

- (46) ... þæt heora nan ne mehte nanes wæpnes gewæaldan
that of-them none not could no weapon wield
'... that none of them could wield any weapon' (Or 4.10.103.24)

A key element in Old English negation is the negative particle *ne*. This is used almost invariably in any negative clause and always occurs on the immediate left of the finite verb. In sentence negation, *ne* alone is used in the vast majority of cases:

- (47) ne sende se deofol ða fyr of heofenum, peah þe hit
not sent the devil then fire from heavens though that it
ufan come
from above came
'the devil did not send fire from heaven then, though it came from above'
(ÆCHom I, (Pref)6.13)
- (48) He ne andwyrde ðam wife æt fruman
he not answered the woman at first
'He didn't answer the woman at first' (ÆCHom II, 8.68.45)

There is a small minority pattern where two negation elements are employed to express sentence negation. In that case, the element *na* or *no* is used as the second element, although *noht* and *nawiht* are also attested. An example with *na* is (49):

- (49) Ne bið na se learningcniht furðor þonne his lareow
not is not the apprentice further than his master
'The apprentice is not ahead of his master' (ÆHHom 14.134)

Constituent negation is usually expressed by prefacing the relevant constituent with *na* or a phonological variant thereof. (46) is a case in point, *nan* being a contraction of *na an*. Some other examples are given in (50). Observe further in (50) the frequently attested contraction of the negative particle *ne* with the finite verb: *næs* in (50a) is the contracted form of *ne wæs*; *nabbað* in (50b) the contracted form of *ne habbað*.

- (50) a. þær næs eac nan geðafung
there not-was also no consent
'there was also no consent' (ÆCHom I, 11.176.7)
- b. Stanas sind gesceafta, ac hi nabbað nan lif
stones are created things but they not-have no life
'Stones are created, but they have no life' (ÆCHom I, 21.302.13)

2.5 Subordinate clauses

Subordinate clauses are usually divided into adjective (=relative) clauses, complement clauses and adverbial clauses, according to their function. We will look at them in turn in sections 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.3. First, we briefly address the issue of the origin and marking of subordinate clauses.

It is a widely held view that subordination ('hypotaxis') arose through the reinterpretation of a sequence of independent clauses ('parataxis'). Harris and Campbell (1995: chapter 10) show that this is unlikely to be the origin of all subordinate clauses, but given the properties of main and subordinate

clauses noted above, the features of some Old English subordinate clauses can reasonably be explained in this way. We discuss two examples.

The pronoun *se* 'the/that' as a demonstrative usually precedes the noun, but it can also be used independently, as in (51):

- (51) *Ælc ðæra manna ðe hine forhæfð from unalyfedlicere gesihðe ...*
 each of-the of-men who himself abstains from unallowed sight
se hæfð mædenes naman for ðære anwalhnysse
 he has of-maiden name for that purity
 'Each of the men who abstains from . . . he has the name of virgin for that
 purity' (ÆCHom II, 44.328.40)

Se can also function as relative, as we will see below in 2.5.1. The source for this may well have been two independent main clauses, the first with an NP (e.g. the object) in final position, the second beginning with independent *se* reinterpreted as relative. This would account for the fact that a comparatively large number of such *se*-relatives have Verb-Second word order. *Se* is in fact often ambiguous between demonstrative and relative, as illustrated by (52):

- (52) *He cwæp þæt he cude sumne man on Romabyrig . . . se læg bedryda fram*
 cildhade
 'He said that he knew a man in Rome . . . he/who lay bedridden from
 childhood' (ÆCHom II, 6.58.168)

Paratactic origin seems a likely source for certain object clauses as well. We saw above that Verb-Second and topics are really main clause phenomena, yet the complements of verbs of saying can show Verb-Second and have topics. Consider (53):

- (53) *Ða cwæð se halga bisceop þæt on þam beame nære nan*
 then said the holy bishop that in that tree not-were no
synderlic halignyss
 special holiness
 'Then the holy bishop said that there was no special holiness in that tree'
 (ÆLS(Martin) 396)

It is as if a new main clause is introduced (with a topic and subject-verb inversion), in spite of the subordinator (*þæt*) and the fact that it is in the subjunctive mood. The reinterpretation plausibly came about by juxtaposing two main clauses ('The bishop said that. In that tree . . .'), with the demonstrative *þæt* reinterpreted as a subordinator. The fact that the second clause may be interpreted as a quoted main clause may have helped this along. Sentences such as (53) would then exemplify the initial stage of the process, later followed by word order changes bringing the clause into line with subordinate syntax.

Let us now look at subordinate marking in Old English. The word order in main and subordinate clauses today is identical (leaving aside questions and

inverted main clauses) and it is not surprising that unambiguous subordinating conjunctions are employed, in the almost complete absence of further morphological or syntactic signals. Old English, beside unambiguous subordinators, has other important clues such as word order and subjunctive marking on the verb. Consider the examples in (54):

- (54) a. *gif hit is hefigtyme on ðyssere worulde*
 'if it is difficult in this world' (ÆCHom I, 3.56.3)
 b. *siððan he papanhad underfeng*
 after he papal-office received
 'after he received the papal office' (ÆCHom II, 9.77.164)
 c. *Secgað eowrum hlaforde þæt he unforht sy*
 say your lord that he fearless be (subj)
 'Say to your lord that he should be fearless' (ÆCHom I, 37.568.30)

The word order in (54a) is SVO (frequent in main clauses), but *gif* clearly marks it as a subordinate clause. In (54b) *siððan* could be an adverb or a conjunction, but in this case the OV word order is decisive for interpreting it as a conjunction. Finally, the subjunctive *sy* combines with OV word order in marking (54c) as subordinate. Subordinate marking is achieved by the interplay of various signals then, and readers usually have little trouble recognizing subordinate clauses because of these signals, in conjunction with the wider context.

In (54b) *siððan* is used as a conjunction, but it can also function as an adverb. There are several more 'ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions', to borrow Mitchell's phrase (1985: § 2536), the most prominent among them *þa* 'then/when', used at a goodly rate in practically all Old English texts. It appears often in so-called correlative constructions, like (55):

- (55) *Ða se wisdom þa ðis spell asæd hæfde, þa ongan he eft*
 when the wisdom then this story said had then began he again
 singan
 sing
 'When Wisdom then had told this story, she began to sing again'
 (Bo 34.89.4)

The OV word order in the first clause of (55) suggests a subordinate clause, while the VS word order in the second clause is typical of main clauses. We saw above that inversion of pronominal subjects is regular only in questions, negative clauses beginning with *ne* and this group of adverbs. These are precisely the ones that can also be used as conjunctions. Inversion therefore plays an important disambiguating role. The lengthy discussion in Mitchell (1985: § 2536 ff.) makes it clear, however, that there are occasional cases where the expected VS word order fails, and therefore interpretative problems sometimes arise.

2.5.1 *Relative clauses*

Relative clauses are adjectival in the sense that they modify a noun. It is customary to make a distinction between restrictive relatives (which add essential information) and non-restrictive relatives (which give additional information), as in the present-day English *The car that was used in the robbery has now been found* vs. *The police found the car, which had run out of fuel*. The distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive is one of meaning, which in the present-day language is, however, reflected in important phonological and syntactic effects: non-restrictive relatives are often separated from their antecedent by an intonation break (in writing commas are used) and the relative pronoun/conjunction *that* or the 'zero' relative are employed in restrictive relatives alone. For Old English, we do not have many clear-cut criteria: the punctuation of the surviving manuscripts is different from what we use today, and it is not always easy to make a consistent distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses.

We can make a formal distinction between three major types of relative clauses by the relative marker(s) used in them, and some minor types. The major types are:

1. *se* relatives, with a form of the demonstrative pronoun *se* as a relative pronoun:

- (56) he gefor mid firde ongean Aristonocuse þam cyninge, se wolde
 he went with army against Aristonocus the king who wanted
 geagnian him þa lessan Asiam
 usurp to-himself the lesser Asia
 'then he went with an army against King Aristonocus, who wanted to
 usurp Asia Minor' (Or 5.4.118.1)

This is the type which was said above to illustrate plausible paratactic origin. This makes it likely that they were mostly non-restrictive relatives.

2. *se þe* relatives, combining a form of demonstrative *se* with the indeclinable relative *þe*:

- (57) þæt heo ne woldon heora Gode hyran, þone þe heo gelyfdon
 that they not wanted their God (D) obey who (A) they believed
 'that they did not want to obey their God, in whom they believed'
 (Bede 3.15.222.22)

3. *þe* relatives, introduced by the indeclinable relative *þe*:

- (58) Ða sende se biscop ðæm wife ðe þær untrum læg sumne dæl
 then sent the bishop the woman who there sick lay a part

þæs haligwætres
 of-the holy water
 'Then the bishop sent the woman who lay sick there some of the holy
 water' (Bede 5.4.396.1)

The *þe* relatives are by far the most frequent (for some figures for Ælfric, see Mitchell 1985: § 2165).

The case form of *se* in the *se þe* relative in (57) is the accusative (*þone*) required by the relative clause, but it is not determined by its antecedent *Gode*, which is in the dative. Case attraction, however, is possible, as illustrated in (59):

- (59) fore generednisse heora freonda þara ðe of weorulde
 for relief of-their friends (G) whom (G) which of world
 geleordon
 departed
 'for the relief of their friends who had departed from the world'
 (Bede 4.23.330.16)

The case of the antecedent and the case of the relative required by the relative clause can, of course, also be identical:

- (60) þæt se wære leoda cyning se þe ær wæs folce
 that he was of-people king (N) who (N) before was to-people
 þeow
 in-bondage
 'that he would be king who had been in bondage to the people'
 (Or 4.6.95.32)

When the relative pronoun corresponds with a prepositional object, the preposition is fronted along with the relative pronoun. This is called *pied piping* and is illustrated in (61a) and (61b). However, the preposition is 'stranded' in preverbal position when the relative pronoun is *þar* as the object of a locative preposition (as in (61d)), in *þe* relatives (without a relative pronoun) like (61c) and some minor types of relatives without a relative pronoun. Such cases of preposition stranding are discussed further in 2.6.

- (61) a. þæt fyr getacnode ðone Halgan Gast, ðurh ðone we beoð gehalgode
 'The fire betokened the Holy Ghost, through whom we are hallowed'
 (ÆCHom II, 17.167.190)
 b. Hwæt sind þas buton ðrymsetl heora Scyppendes, on ðam ðe he
 what are these but thrones their of-Creator on which he
 wunigende mannum demð
 dwelling men judges
 'What are these but thrones of their Creator, on which he, abiding, judges
 men'
 (ÆCHom I, 24.346.11)

- c. On ðam munte Synay, *þe* se Ælmihtiga on becom, wearð
 on the mountain Sinai which the Almighty on came was
 micel ðunor gehyred
 great thunder heard
 'On mount Sinai, on which the Almighty came, great thunder was heard'
 (*ÆCHom* II, 12.1.116.226)
- d. þa for he to oðre byrg, *þær* Ambira se cyning on wunode
 then went he to other city where Ambira the king in lived
 'then he went to another city where King Ambira lived'
 (*Or* 3.9.73.28)

Minor types of relative clause include those introduced by adverbs such as *panon/ponon* (*þe*) (62a), and *þider þe* (62b), and infinitival relatives (62c):

- (62) a. þa gelomp for sumum intingan, þæt he semninga gewat in
 then happened for some reason that he suddenly left for
 Hibernia Scotta ealond, *ponon* he ær cwom
 Ireland of-Scots island from-where he previously came
 'Then it happened for some reason that he departed to Ireland, the island
 of the Scots, from where he had come'
 (*Bede* 4.26.352.2)
- b. gelæde us to ðam ecan life *ðider ðe* he us gelaðode þurh
 lead us to the everlasting life to-where he us invited through
 hi and ðurh heora æftergengan
 them and through their successors
 'lead us to the everlasting life to which he has invited us through them
 and their successors'
 (*ÆCHom* II, 41.309.139)
- c. Gif ðær ðonne sie gierd mid to ðreageanne, sie ðær eac stæf
 if there then be rod with to beat be there also staff
 mid to wreðianne
 with to support
 'If there is a rod to beat with, let there also be a staff to support with'
 (*CP* 17.127.1)

There are also relative clauses with an included antecedent. These are often taken to include examples like (63), in which it is not entirely clear whether it is the demonstrative pronoun that acts as antecedent for a *þe* relative (type 3; see (58)), or whether it is a *se þe* relative (type 2; see (57)) with an included antecedent. (64) represents another type which is often called a free relative:

- (63) þæt ælc preost scrife and dædbote tæce þam þe him
 that each priest hear confession and penitence teach him who him
 andette
 confesses
 'that each priest should hear confession and teach penitence to the person
 who confesses to him'
 (*WCan* 1.1.1(Fowler) 68)
- (64) Fæder and moder moton heora bearn to swa hwylcum cræfte
 father and mother must their child to so which occupation

gedon swa him leofost byð
 put as him most pleasing is
 'Father and mother must put their child to whatever occupation is most
 pleasing to him'
 (*ÆHom* 20.54)

Finally, relatives can be used without a relative pronoun. This happens primarily when the relative clause contains the verb *hatan* and the relative corresponds with the subject:

- (65) Him þa andswarode his caldorbisceop, Cefi was haten
 him then answered his high priest Cefi was called
 'The high-priest, who was called Cefi, then answered him'
 (*Bede* 2.10.134.11)

The word order patterns in relative clauses are the patterns which occur in subordinate clauses in general, though they are more frequently OV than other subordinate clauses.

Relative clauses usually follow their antecedents immediately, as in most of the examples given so far, but, as was pointed out in section 2.3.1, they can be separated from them and then occur in clause-final position:

- (66) & gesealde his suna þæt rice Constantinuse þone he hæfde
 and gave his son the kingdom Constantine whom he had
 ær be Elenan his ciefese
 before by Helen his concubine
 'and gave the kingdom to his son Constantine whom he had by his
 concubine Helen'
 (*Or* 6.30.148.8)
- (67) myccl swiðor we sceolan þam soðfæstan gode þas lac geoffrian þe
 much rather we ought the true God this gift offer who
 us alysde fram deaðe
 us delivered from death
 'much rather we ought to offer this gift to the true God who delivered us
 from death'
 (*ELS*(Basil) 279)

2.5.2 Complement clauses

Complement clauses are those clauses which function as complement to a verb, adjective or noun. They can be finite or non-finite. A complement clause which is a statement is usually a finite clause introduced by *þæt* 'that'. The subordinating conjunction is sometimes omitted if the verb is one of saying, such as *cwæpan*, *secgan* 'say', where the clause reports what is being said. The most important type of non-finite complementation in Old English is the infinitival clause. As in the present-day language, there are infinitives with and without *to*, but the system underlying the choice is different, as will be sketched below. In Old English, the distribution of the various types of

complementation is quite different from that of the present-day language. While the *to*-infinitive is now the most extensively employed type, it was used less frequently and in fewer environments in Old English, where the *that*-clause was the most prominent form of complementation.

2.5.2.1 Finite clauses

Verbs of saying and declaring are obviously often found with a finite clause complement, as in (68), but many other verbs can take a finite clause complement as well, as in (69):

- (68) Ða behet God þæt he nolde næfre eft eal mancynn mid
then promised God that he not-would never again all mankind with
wætere acwellan
water destroy
'Then God promised that he would never again destroy all mankind with
water'
(*ÆCHom* I, 1.22.8)
- (69) þeah þe nu þince þæt ðu deorwyrðe feoh forloren habbe
though to-you now seems that you precious good lost have
'Though it may seem to you that you have lost precious goods'
(*Bo* 20.48.17)

The finite clauses range from *þæt* 'that' clauses to dependent questions introduced by a range of question words. Finite object clauses always follow all other clause material. The conjunction *þæt* is sometimes left out (Mitchell 1985: § 1981 ff.), but not nearly as frequently as in Modern English.

2.5.2.2 Non-finite clauses

The most frequent and important type of non-finite complementation in Old English is by infinitives. There are two basic types of infinitive: the first is the 'bare' or 'zero' infinitive, ending in *-an* or *-ian*, e.g. *þincan* 'think', *lufian* 'love'; the second is the inflected infinitive or *to*-infinitive, which consists of *to*, followed by a verb stem and the ending *-enne*, e.g. *to þincerne* 'to think', *to lufienne* 'to love'. *To* in Old English infinitives is never separated from the verb form, as in present-day English *I intend to clearly show that . . .* The status of *to* as an infinitive marker is something of a puzzle. It is thought by some scholars to be a preposition governing the dative case on the infinitive form, which is nominal in origin. But the nominal character of Old English infinitives has been overestimated, and recent work (Los 1998) shows that *to*-infinitives behave more like clauses than like nominals.

Variation in the choice of infinitive is found only with monotransitive verbs. A prominent group forms the verbs of intention like *þencan* 'think, plan'. Two examples are given here; (70a) has a *to*-infinitive, while (70b) has a bare infinitive:

- (70) a. Hu ðæt mod . . . ðonne hit ðencð fela godra weorca *to* wyrcanne
how the mind when it thinks many good works to do
'How the mind . . . when it intends to do many good works'
(*CP* 9.55.14)
- b. Ðonne ðæt mod ðenceð gegripan him *to* upahefenesse ða
when the mind thinks seize itself to pride the
eaðmodnesse . . .
humility
'When the mind thinks of making humility a pretext for pride . . .'
(*CP* 8.55.12)

The system governing the selection of bare and *to*-infinitives has undergone some significant changes since the Old English period. The most conspicuous difference from today is that the bare infinitive, which in the present-day language is virtually restricted to the complementation of modals and verbs of direct perception and causation, occurs frequently in Old English as the object clause of a variety of verbs. In all other environments, adjuncts, complement to noun or adjective, the *to*-infinitive is the norm. It has therefore been held by many that after the Old English period, the *to*-infinitive encroached upon the territory of the bare infinitive. Los (1999), however, argues that this is not the case. One fact here is that Gothic had no complement *to*-infinitives. Another is that diachronically, *to*-infinitives tended to replace *that*-clauses, but not the other way around. Los (1999) believes we are dealing with free variation in (70). Fischer (1995; 1996a) thinks this is not the case for Middle English. This clearly needs to be explored further.

The non-finite complementation of adjectives and nouns is always formed with a *to*-infinitive. The history of the non-finite complementation of adjectives shows a number of interesting developments, which are the topic of chapter 8.

2.5.3 Adverbial clauses

A large number of subordinate clauses function as adverbials. They are usually subclassified on semantic grounds: clauses of time, place, purpose and so on (for an elaborate description see Mitchell 1985: §§ 2416–3721). The different types of clauses differ in the conjunctions that can be used to introduce them and in the extent to which the subjunctive is used. We will briefly discuss these issues in turn.

A wide range of subordinating conjunctions is available, depending on the type of clause. Clauses of time can be introduced by *þa* 'when', *þonne* 'when', *nu* 'now', *sippan* 'after', *op þæt* 'until', and *þa hwile þe* 'while' to mention a few. Not every type of adverb clause has such a wide range of subordinators. Conditional clauses are commonly introduced by *gif* 'if', but a few others are occasionally used too such as *þær* 'if', *butan* 'except' and *nympe* 'except'.

A particularly distinctive feature of Old English adverbial clauses is the use of 'compound' conjunctions, which disappear from English later on. They take the form of a preposition followed by the appropriate form of *se* (usually the dative or instrumental) and then the relative particle *pe* (occasionally *þæt*), which is however sometimes left out. Some combinations are: *for þam/þon pe* (for that which = 'because'), *mid þam pe* (with that which = 'when') and *ær þam pe* (before that which = 'before').

The subjunctive mood in Old English was indicated by endings that were distinct in some respects at least from the indicative (see section 2.2.1). Clear subjunctive endings are found in the present tense except for the first person singular, in the past tense first and third person singular of strong verbs, in the second person singular of weak verbs and in the past tense plural of all verbs. Theoretically this plural subjunctive ending (*-en*) of all verbs is distinct from the indicative (*-on*), but later texts in particular do not always make a consistent distinction in the spelling.

Although the subjunctive is found in main clauses, it is more properly a subordinate clause phenomenon, but it is not found by any means in all types. Some adverbial clauses that regularly have the subjunctive are conditional clauses expressing hypothetical condition (71a), clauses of purpose (71b), and clauses of concession (71c):

- (71) a. Gif nu eall þises middaneardes wela come to anum men
if now all of-this of-earth wealth came to one man
'If now all the wealth of this earth came to one man' (Bo 13.28.8)
- b. and behyddon þæt heafod... þæt hit bebyrged ne wurde
and hid the head so that it buried not were
'and hid the head so that it would not be buried' (ÆLS(Edmund) 130)
- c. þeah se lichama geendige
'though the body ends' (ÆCHom I, 1.20.4)

Detailed information can be found in Mitchell's extensive discussion of subordinate clauses (1985, volume II).

2.6 Preposition stranding

In this section we draw together the observations made on prepositions through this chapter, and clarify the status of the phenomenon called preposition stranding. It is useful to consider the facts of preposition stranding in the present-day language first.

Preposition stranding refers to those constructions in which the object of a

preposition is fronted, for instance by wh-movement (72) or by passivization (73):

- (72) a. Who did you talk to?
b. Which garage did you put the car in?
c. Which allegation did you take offence at?
- (73) a. The doctor reassured Harry that his mother was cared for
b. John was taken advantage of
c. Fred was kept tabs on

The effect of moving the object of the preposition is to leave the preposition stranded. The restrictions on such stranding are quite a bit more rigorous in passives than in sentences involving wh-movement. A general restriction is that the stranded preposition is part of a complement PP, i.e. a PP that is an argument of the verb. This is true for all the examples in (72)–(73); (74) illustrates the impossibility of stranding in a prepositional time adjunct:

- (74) a. *Which dinner did you arrive after?
b. *The dinner was served an excellent Sauternes after

In wh-movement constructions, the stranded preposition is therefore always somewhere in the VP. The restrictions in passivization are even stricter: prepositional passives are really restricted to those cases where the preposition is adjacent to the verb, as in (73a), and to fixed lexical combinations of the sort exemplified in (73b–c). Thus, it is not the case that all prepositional objects in a complement PP can be passivized, as the ungrammaticality of the following examples shows:

- (75) a. *The garage was put the car in
b. *The allegation was taken offence at
c. *Syntax was written a book about

Preposition stranding in Old English had a very different distribution. We can be brief on prepositional passives: passivization of a prepositional object was impossible in Old English, presumably because prepositions governed an inherent case in Old English. We saw in section 2.2.1 (see (7a–b)) that only objects marked for structural case can be passivized, and there are no obvious further restrictions in Old English that would block passivization.

We turn then to preposition stranding in wh-movement constructions. Wh-movement constructions comprise questions, relative clauses (including infinitival relatives), and some types of adjective + infinitive constructions which will be discussed in chapter 8. What these constructions share is movement of some constituent, a question word or relative pronoun (which may be phonetically empty), to the specifier of CP. This is called *wh*-movement. Our

discussion is facilitated if we first discuss the status of pronominal objects of prepositions. The order of a preposition and its object when the object is a full NP is always: P-NP. When the object is a personal pronoun, or the locative pronoun *þær*, this order may be inverted, and the pronoun can also appear further to the left. We illustrate this here for *þær*:

- (76) a. and com . . . to ðam treowe, sohte wæstm ðæron . . .
and came to the tree sought fruit therein
'he got to the tree, sought fruit in it . . .'
(*ÆCHom* II, 30.237.72)
- b. ðæt þu þær nane myrhþe on næfdest
that you there no joy in not-had
'that you did not take joy in that'
(*Bo* 7.15.11)
- c. he ðær wearð from þæm burgwarum in abroden
he there was by the citizens in dragged
'he was dragged in there by the citizens'
(*Or* 3.9.73.8)

Since *þær* is also used as a locative relative pronoun, this is where we find preposition stranding in relative clauses:

- (77) oð þæt he gestod bufon ðam gesthuse, þær þæt cild on wunode
until that he stood above the inn where the child in stayed
'until it (the star) stood above the inn where the child was staying'
(*ÆCHom* I, 5.78.21)

Apart from this type of relative clause, there is a simple generalization to be made about PPs in *wh*-movement constructions: when there is no overt pronoun, as in *þe*-relatives and infinitival relatives, we find preposition stranding, as in (78):

- (78) a. On þam munte Synay, þe se Ælmihtiga on becom, wearð
on the mountain Sinai which the Almighty on came, was
micel ðunor gehyred
great thunder heard
'On mount Sinai, on which the Almighty came, great thunder was heard'
(*ÆCHom* II, 12.1.116.226)
- b. Gif ðær ðonne sie gierd mid to ðreageanne, sie ðær eac staf
if there then be rod with to beat be there also staff
mid to wreðianne
with to support
'If there is a rod to beat with, let there also be a staff to support with'
(*CP* 17.127.1)

When an overt NP, *wh*-constituent or relative pronoun, moves to Spec,CP, the preposition moves along, as discussed in the various sections on questions and relatives above, and briefly illustrated again here in (79). This is called pied piping.

- (79) a. To hwæm locige ic buton to ðæm eaðmodum . . . ?
to whom look I except to the humble
'To whom do I look except to the humble . . . ?'
(*CP* 41.299.18)
- b. Ðæt fyr getacnode ðone Halgan Gast, ðurh ðone we beoð gehalgode
'The fire betokened the Holy Ghost, through whom we are hallowed'
(*ÆCHom* II, 17.167.190)

These facts are discussed in meticulous detail in Allen (1977, 1980) and in van Kemenade (1987). Allen argues that they motivate the postulation of two strategies of relativization in Old English, one by *wh*-movement, as in (79), the other by controlled unbounded deletion of a relative pronoun, as in (78). We can then say that it was impossible in Old English to move a relative pronoun out of a PP, hence we get pied piping when a PP or prepositional object is relativized. Unbounded deletion of a prepositional object was possible, hence we get preposition stranding there. As far as we can ascertain, however, the two strategies, preposition stranding and pied piping, have exactly the same properties with respect to conditions on movement, and on the relation between a Spec,CP element and its trace(s). This, van Kemenade (1987) argues, supports the idea that they are both *wh*-movement constructions; and she goes on to analyse preposition stranding constructions in terms of *wh*-movement of the phonetically empty counterpart of a personal pronoun or *þær* (which we know can be moved out of a PP). We will not discuss the finer points of the analysis here. For our purposes, it is important to bear in mind the distinction between passives and *wh*-movement constructions here: preposition stranding in passives is not attested at all in Old English.