Respecting 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.
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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 focuses on the structural and morphosyntactic aspects of the change.

### 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 fremmæp ‘perform’ could be indicative plural, without person distinctions, or imperative plural, and a form like fremde ‘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: í: færem, þu færemest, helheolhit færeme (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 pronounal 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 ðemodon
    and him came angels to, and him served
    ‘and angels came to him, and served him’ (ÆCElom 1, 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 correspondence with the higher subject englas. Discourse factors seem to be of prime importance here, although there is also a clear syntactic restriction in that correspondence 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 ïr, as sometimes with weather verbs, as in (3), and regularly in impersonal passives, as in (4):

(3) Du cwom þær micel snaw & swa mícum sniwde swelce micel
    then came there heavy snow and so heavily snowed as if much
    fleece fell
    ‘and it snowed so heavily, as if a lot of fleece were falling’ (ÆCElom 30.11)

(4) . . . ðætte forþy to ungemælce ne ðie gelíod ðem scyddgan
    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. Hwet seges þu, yrplinge? Hu begest þu weorc pín?  
   What say you, ploughman? How perform you your work?  
   ‘What do you say, ploughman? How do you go about your work?’  
   (ÆCol 22.23)

b. ne seonde se deofol ða fyr of heofonum, þeah ðc hit 
   not sent the devil then fire from heavens, though that it 
   afan come 
   from-above came 
   ‘the devil did not send fire from heaven, though it came from above’  
   (ÆChom 1. (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 pingum hæfde God þæs mannes swæu egodeof 
   in two things had God the man’s soul endowed 
   ‘With two things had God endowed man’s soul’  
   (ÆChom 1.1.20.1)

b. Be ðæm we wægon suitæ swutyla oncwænan ðet... 
   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) aligde 
   Gregory him put to flight 
   ‘Gregory put him to flight’  
   (ÆHom 22.624)

b. Da wearð se god (N) aligede of þære fulan anlícynse 
   then was the god expelled from the foul idol 
   ‘Then the god was expelled from the foul idol’  
   (ÆChom 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.
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:

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:

- 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:

- 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.
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. _of_ 'until'), 'extent of space' (How far?), e.g. _geond_ 'throughout', _ymnd_ '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) _donne offynoc him ðaes ðe ðæs he xer forber then displeas him (D) the same (G) that he before endured ‘then he regrets what he endured before’ (CP 33.225.18)

Verbs such as _offynoc_ '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: _hreowen_ 'rue'; _ge)sceatian_ 'shame'; _eglian_ 'ail'; _offynoc_ 'displease'; _ge)licean_ 'like'; _ge)lystan_ 'desire'; _langian_ 'long'; _ge)hystalian_ 'please'. In syntactic treatments, the two arguments are often referred to as the EXPERIENCER 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 Leck 1983, Anderson 1988, Allen 1986). (14a) and (14b) are exemplified by (15a) and (15b) respectively:

(15) a. _ære we purh ælle Gode licien that we (N) through that all God (D) please ‘that we all please God with that’
   (HomU 20(BIHom 10) 42)
b. _Hwæt _ja se messesan _ja _mennes offreow _lo the priest (N) the man (G) pitied ‘Lo then the priest had pity on the man’
   (ELS(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 ðæm gisan ungemeticlicu sprec _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 ofshreow ðæt hi ne cupon ðæt feol on ðæt ðæm as a me (D) regretted that they not knew nor not-had the godspellinc lairc on leoræ gewritum ‘and I regretted that they knew not nor had not the evangelical doctrines among their writings’
   (ÆCHom I, (Pref)2.7)
b. _Gif we _donne sceomað ðæt we to uncaðan mænum suelc if we (N) then shame that we to unknown men so spreecn speak ‘If we are ashamed to speak to strangers like this’
   (CP 10.63.5)
c. _Us geliustfulæh _ge fyrror to spreecnæ be ðæl 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)lyrian, gerisan, gedafenian, behofian, all meaning more or less 'behave', and (ge)lympan, (ge)weorpan 'happen'; _plecan_ 'seem'. Two examples are given in (18):

(18) a. _De _gedafenað to lerenne and me to hlistennæ you (D) behoves to learn and me to listen ‘It befits you to study and me to listen’
   (Solid 1.33.4)
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'
(Chron A (Plummer) 874.5)
b. ealle his woruldliscan ægelborenynsse
'all his worldly nobility'
(ÆChom II, 9.73.36)
c. monige òpre cyninges þegnas
many other of-king thanes
'many other thanes of the king'
(Chron A (Plummer) 894.85)

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

(20) a. þara moningen gewinna
'of the many battles'
(Or 5.2.115.29)
b. ðære fela biseopas
other many bishops
'many other bishops'
(ÆLS (Basil) 629)

Postmodification is attested with quantifiers and with modifiers in -weord:

(21) a. hlaðorreowsian manige
traitors many
'many traitors'
(WHorn 20.1.64)
b. þa scipo alle
the ships all
'all the ships'
(Chron A (Plummer) 885.7)
c. alle Cent easteþearde
cent Kent eastward
'all Kent eastward'
(Chron A (Plummer) 865.1)

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

(22) a. meggwine mine
kinsmen-dear mine
'ny dear kinsmen'
(Beo 2479)
b. þa rodan þrego
the roods three
'the three roods'
(EI 867)
c. tamra deora unþeþröhran syx hund
tame (G) deer (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 grimmestæa
cold the grimmest
'the grimmest cold'
(HomSe/7 (BlHorn) 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) . . . aen boc be cyrculum ðæcaum
'a book about ecclesiastical customs'
(ÆChom II, 5.49.237)
(25) to þam ymcan campdome þe heora fideras on weron
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 scelað gyldan . . . and berenice kyrtel ðære
the highest-born must pay and bearskin garment or
otterskin
'the highest born must pay . . . and a garment of bearskin or otterskin'
(Or 1.15.17)
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 gionce
      ‘Sidroc earl the young
      ‘The young earl Sidroc’

      (Chron.A(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)  heahheidereas, cawfaete and wuldorfulle weras on heora lifi, witegena
      patera networking religious and glorious men in their life of-Prophets
      fideres, þera gemynd þe bið forgotan . . .
      ‘fathers whose memory not is forgotten.
      ‘patrons, religious and glorious men in their lives, the fathers of
      ‘the prophets, whose memory shall not be forgotten’

      (ÆCHom I, 36.546.17)

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

(29)  a. He cwæð, se apostol Paulus
      ‘He said, the apostle Paul’

      (ÆCHom I, 9.146.33)

      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 pe manegum waeran his wundra cupe pe god worht
      because that to-many were his miracles known that God performed
      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 hæbbe hweæcre þæ þysne on halgum bocum
      ‘We have, notwithstanding, 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 welde God swa lyttes þinges him forwyrman
      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 lāðaðorðe
      what owe 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 dege worhtie God leoh, and merigen, and xefen on that day made God light and morning and evening 'On that day God made light, morning, and evening' *(ECHom I, 6.109.5)*

b. Das ðære ðing forgifð God his geccœrennum these three things gives God his chosen 'These three things God gives to his chosen' *(ECHom I, 18.250.12)*

(35) a. Forðon we scealan mid ealle mod & aegene to Gode gecyｒ yan 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 ðam we magon sceal se swētle omenwunan 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. Nonetheless 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 mēhtan swa bealdlice Godes gelecað hīdæn that they could so boldly God's faith preach 'that they could preach God's faith so boldly' *(ECHom I, 16.232.23)*

b. þæt we sceal þæt æmne gelecað hābban 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 wērcp þæt swercn onweg 'that he threw the sword away' *(Bede 1.7.38.18)*

b. gif hio ne bīs hrædlece æweg ædrifne 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 hwaeræc þa bysne on halgum boþum 'We have, nevertheless, the examples in holy books' *(ECHom I, 31.474.33)*

b. þæt he forgæfe ægðe willan þæm scealan hæðæn that he granted good will the sick heathen 'that he granted good will to the sick heathen' *(ECHom 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 PP's 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. þæs mann nolde cyðan ðæm syngedænum hecra synna this man not-wanted make-known the sinning their sins 'this man would not make known to the sinning their sins' *(ECHom II, 22.194.148)*

b. Se mæsespreost sceal munnan bodian þone sóðan gelecæn the masspriest must people preach the true faith 'The masspriest must preach the true faith to the people' *(ECLe(2(Wulfstan)} 175)*

c. þe goearman wile ece myrrhe æt ðæm sóðan 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 xum godæm goécı rian mɑnðân sóðuðr onsegæδynysse that they our gods offer may grateful sacrifice 'that they may offer a grateful sacrifice to our gods' *(ECHom I, 38.592.31)*
write by syðdan faran scolden geond ealne middaneard
that they afterwards must throughout all world
"that they must afterwards travel throughout the world" (WHom 7.78)
front by hiton swa healdlice Godes geleanan bodian
that they could so boldly God's faith preach
"that they could preach God's faith so boldly" (ÆCHom 1, 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 óng neæc on ðissum lif ærowian
he who no thing no-wants in this life suffer
"He who will suffer nothing in this life" (ÆCHom 1, 10.164.22)
b. Gif he ðonne ðæt wif wille forsæcan
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 óng/ðæt wif)
appears left of the finite verb (ærowian/forsæcan). 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 there 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 sub-
ordinate clauses. Consider (41):

(41) 7 pa ongeat se cyning þæt he on pa dura eode 7
and then perceived the king that and he on the door went and
þæt unhealllice lice werede
then nobly himself defended
"and then the king perceived this and he went to the door and then nobly
defended himself" (ChroN A(Plummer) 755.13)

The first coordinate clause of (41) shows inversion after pa, which is characteristic
of main clauses, but the second coordinate clause has no Verb-Second
and the finite verb follows the PP on pa dura, 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) Truwaest ðu nu þe selfiaum and þinum giferum bet þonne
trust you now you self and your companions better than
þam apostolum...?
the apostles
"Do you trust yourself now and your companions better than the
apostles...?" (Soli 2.61.24)

In wh-questions a constituent is questioned by fronting an interrogative
pronoun or adverb, such as hwelc ‘which’, hwæt ‘where’, hwæt ‘why’, and hwæ
‘who’. An example is:
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(43) Eala, hwæ is ðis gold adeorcæd?
   ‘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 ðæm hællican; hwæfer þu nu fullice then answered the wisdom and said whether you now fully
   ongite forhyt hi ðonne swa sceat?
   understand (subj) why it then so is (subj)?
   ‘Thea 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) .gæter heora nan ne mehtæ nanes weardnes gewældan that of-them none not could no weapon wield
   ‘.gæter 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 decof ða fyr of heofenum, þeoh he 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 andwyrdæd 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 navint are also attested. An example with na is (49):

(49) Ne bið na se leorningsaht furðor þonne his lareow
   not is not the apprentice further than his master
   ‘The apprentice is not ahead of his master’
   (ÆCHom 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: nas in (50a) is the contracted form of ne wæs; nabbað in (50b) the contracted form of ne habbað.

(50) a. þær nas eac nan geðæungen there not-was also no consent
   ‘there was also no consent’
   (ÆCHom I, 11.176.7)

b. Staðas sind gesceafsta, 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) Alc ðære manna ðe hine forheæðs from unalyzed fecere gesiðe ... each of the of-men who himself abstains from unallowed sight ðe hæfðs mardeces namen for ðære anwollæsse
he has of-maiden name for that purity
'Each of the men who abstains from ... he has the name of virgin for that purity'  
(AEChon 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 cwæð þæt he cœde sumne man on Romen byrig ... se leg bedryða fræm cildhade
'He said that he knew a man in Rome ... he/who lay bedridden from childhood'  
(AEChon 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) Dæ cwæð se halga biscep þæt þæm beanume nere man
then said the holy bishop that in that tree not were no
special holiness
'Then the holy bishop said that there was no special holiness in that tree'  
(ELS(Martin)) 396)

It is as if a new main clause is introduced (with a topic and subject–verb inversion), in spite of the subordinate (*þæt*) and the fact that it is in the subjunctive mood. The reinterpreted 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 heftigene om ðysere worule
if it is difficult in this world’  
(AEChon I, 3.56.3)

b. sibbam he papanhad underfeng
after he papal-office received
'after he received the papal office
(AEChon II, 9.77.164)

c. Seccað eowrum hlaforde þæt he unforht sy
say your lord that he fearless be (subj)
'Say to your lord that he should be fearless'  
(AEChon 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) *sibbam* 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) *sibbam* 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 *pa* 'then/when', used at a goodly rate in practically all Old English texts. It appears often in so-called correlative constructions, like (55):

(55) Dæ se wisdom pa ðis spell ased hæfde, pa ongan he eft
when the wisdom then this story said had then began he again
sing
'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 f.) 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 Aristonuscus þæm cyninge, se wolde he went with army against Aristonucus the king who wanted geagnian him þæt læsan Asiam usurp to-himself the lesser Asia 'then he went with an army against King Aristonucus, 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. *pe* relatives, combining a form of demonstrative *se* with the indeclinable relative *pe*:

   (57) þæt heo ne woldon heora Gode hyran, þone þæt 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. *pe* relatives, introduced by the indeclinable relative *pe*:

   (58) Þæt sende se sciscop ðæm wifhe ðæt ðær utrum læg sumne dael then sent the bishop the woman who there sick lay a part

   (Bede 5.4.396.1)

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

The case form of *se* in the *se pe* relative in (57) is the accusative (*hopone*) 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 genorednisse heora freonad þæt ðære 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 þæt ær was feolce 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 *par* as the object of a locative preposition (as in (61d)), in *pe* relatives (without a relative pronoun) like (61e) and some minor types of relatives without a relative pronoun. Such cases of preposition stranding are discussed further in 2.6.

   (61) a.  

   (AEC)  

   b. Hwæt sind þæs buton ðrymsself heora Scyppendes, on þæs þæs he what are these but thrones of their Creator, on which he wænimende mannum demð dwelling men judges 'what are these but thrones of their Creator, on which he, abiding, judges men'  

   (AEC)
c. On ðam munte Synay, þe se Ælmihtiga on becom, wearð on the mountain Sinai which the Almighty on came was
mikel þunor gehryed
great thunder heard
‘On mount Sinai, on which the Almighty came, great thunder was heard’
(_ÆChEom_ II, 12.1.116.226)
d. þa fyr for to ðære byrg, þæt Ambira se cyning on wunode then went to the 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 _þanþon_(_þanþon_ (pe) (62a), and _þider_ _þider_ (pe) (62b), and infinitival relatives (62c):

(62) a. þa gelomp for samum intingan, þæt he semninga gewat in then happened for some reason that he suddenly left for
Hibernia Scotta ealond, _þanþon_ 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 ðám ecan _life_ _þider_ þæt he us gelæðode purh lead us to the everlasting life to where he us invited through
hi and ðiþh heora aftergan them and through their successors
‘lead us to the everlasting life to which he has invited us through them and their successors’
(_ÆChEom_ II, 41.309.139)
c. Gif þær _sonne_ _sieg_ mid to ðregeæanne, _sieg_ eac stæf _if_ there then be _rod_ with to _beat_ be there also _staff_ 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 _pe_ relative (type 3; see (58)), or whether it is a _se pe_ relative (type 2; see (57)) with an included antecedent. (64) represents another type which is often called a free relative:

(63) þæt ælc peost scealf and dedbote þece _pam_ _pe_ him that each priest hear confession and penience teach him who him andette
confesses
‘that each priest should hear confession and teach penitence to the person who confesses to him’
(_WCæn_ 1.1.(Fowler) 68)
(64) Fader and moder moten heora bearni to swa hylecum crefte father and mother must their child to so which occupation
gedon swa him leofost _byð_ put him most pleasing is
‘Father and mother must put their child to whatever occupation is most pleasing to him’
(_ÆChEom_ 20.54)

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

(65) Him þæt andswarde his ealdor bisceop, Cefi was _hætan_ 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 _peat_ rice Constantiu se _pene_ he herfæle and gave his son the kingdom Constantiu whom he had _be_ Ælæn his ciefsæ before by Helen his concubine
‘and gave the kingdom to his son Constantiu whom he had by his concubine Helen’
(_Or_ 6.30.148.8)
(67) mycel swiðor we sceolan _pam_ sodæstan gode _pam_ lac _geæflrian_ pe much rather we ought the true God this gift offer whom us alüşe from _dæðe_ us delivered from death
‘much rather we ought to offer this gift to the true God who delivered us from death’
(_ÆLS(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 _pat_ ‘that’. The subordinating conjunction is sometimes omitted if the verb is one of saying, such as _cwepan_ _segnan_ ‘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) Đa behet God pæt he holdi næfre eft eal mancyynn mid
then promised God that he would never again all mankind with
water destroy
'Then God promised that he would never again destroy all mankind with
water' \(\text{(ECHom I, 1.22.8)}\)

(69) pæce ře nu pice sceat ðu durweyræ ðeoh fordoren habbe
though to-y ou now seems that you precious good lost have
'Though it may seem to you that you have lost precious goods'
\(\text{(Be 20.48.17)}\)

The finite clauses range from pæt ‘that’ clauses to dependent questions introduced by a range of question words. Finite object clauses always follow all other clause material. The conjunction pæt 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 -en, 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 þincenne ‘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 montransitive verbs. A prominent group forms the verbs of intention like þincan ‘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 þencæ fædæ godra wearca to wycanæ
how the mind when it thinks many good works to do
*‘How the mind... when it intends to do many good works’\(\text{(CP 9.55.14)}\)

b. Ðonne ðæt mod þencæ gægipan him to upahfenæsæ ðæ
when the mind thinks seize itself to pride the
earthmoodnesse...
*‘When the mind thinks of making humility a pretext for pride...’\(\text{(CP 8.55.12)}\)

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 subcategorized 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 þæt ‘when’, þonne ‘when’, nu ‘now’, sibban ‘after’, of þeht ‘until’, and þæ hwele þe 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 ryhte ‘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 *pæt*), which is however sometimes left out. Some combinations are: for *pæn/pon pe* (for that which = 'because'), *mid pæm pe* (with that which = 'when') and *ar pæm 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 þies middenearðes wælæ 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 beðyldon þæt heofon... þæt hit bebyrged ne wærc
          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. peah se lichamæ 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 per, this order may be inverted, and the pronoun can also appear further to the left. We illustrate this here for per:

(76) a. and com... to ðæm treow, sóhte wæstm ðaron...
   and came to the tree, sought fruit therein
   ‘he got to the tree, sought fruit in it...’
   (ECHom II, 30.237.72)

b. ðæt þu per nane myrhpæ on nafdest
   that you there no joy in not-had
   ‘that you did not take joy in that’
   (Bo 7.15.11)

c. he ðær weardo from þam 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 per is also used as a locative relative pronoun, this is where we find preposition stranding in relative clauses:

(77) eð þæt he gested 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’
    (ECHom 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 be-relatives and infinitival relatives, we find preposition stranding, as in (78):

(78) a. On þam muote Synay, þe se Æelmihtiga on becom, wæro
    on the mountain Sinai which the Almighty on came, was
    nicel þunor gelyrred
    great thunder heard
    ‘On mount Sinai, on which the Almighty came, great thunder was heard’
    (ECHom II, 12.1.116.226)

b. Gif þær þonne sie gierl mid to ðregeanne, sie þær ecst staf
    if there then be rod with to beat he there also staff
    mid to wrecianne
    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. Þæt fur getaðnode ðone Halgan Gus, ðærð ðone we beðo gehalgode
   ‘The fire betokened the Holy Ghost, through whom we are hallowed’
   (ECHom 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 per (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.