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In this paper, I sketch the CP layer in main and embedded clauses in the history of English. The Modern English main clause is not as easily expandable as the Old English one, but the reverse is true in the subordinate clause, where Modern English has a more flexible embedded CP than Old English. I focus on the developments of the embedded CP. It has been claimed that Old English lacks an embedded split CP and therefore lacks embedded V2 and a host of other embedded root phenomena. I show this to be true for complements to both assertive and non-assertive verbs. In contrast, the Modern English matrix verb has an effect on the strength of the C-position. Assertive verbs in Modern English allow main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses whereas non-assertives typically do not. The main point of the paper is to chronicle the changes that ‘stretch’ the embedded clause and the changing role of main verbs. It is descriptive rather than explanatory, e.g., in terms of changes in phase-head status.
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1. Introduction

Cross-linguistically, root clauses typically have a more expanded CP than embedded clauses because their mood, tense, and pragmatics are independent of an embedding verb. This results in the CP splitting into a Force Phrase, Top(ic) Phrase, Focus Phrase, and Fin(ite) Phrase. The expanded CP is visible as topic and focus positions in the main clause, as (1) shows, or a number of focus elements in the CP, as in (2).
Embedded clauses depend on the higher verb, e.g., *wonder* requires an interrogative complement, and are therefore more restricted in their tense and mood.

Old English also has a flexible CP layer in the main clause, as we will see in Section 2, but less so in the embedded clause. Modern English, on the other hand, has an expanded embedded CP, as in, e.g., (3) with a high complementizer *that* and a topicalized element, and (4) with a complementizer and two topics; however, Modern English has a relatively limited main clause CP, as shown by (5) and (6), which are judged as awkward by native speakers of (American) English.

(3) … think that as for computer skills I am very good at word processing.

(http://dana.ucc.nau.edu/amb96/newpage1.htm)

(4) McCain: Oh, I think that frankly any person who's the vice presidential nominee, it's his job, his or her job to get along with – with the nominee.

(COCA 2000 ABC)

(5) Instructions, we always avoid (them).

(6) No mountain lion do I ever need to encounter again!

In this paper, I focus on the CP in the embedded clause but start in Section 2 with the evidence for a split CP (or more expanded left periphery) in the Old English main clause, to show that we cannot attribute the absence of a split embedded CP to the absence of one in the main clause. Section 3 considers embedded clauses in Modern and Old English and concludes that the assertive/non-assertive division is relevant in Modern but not in Old English. The behavior of the embedded CP in Old English mostly shows a non-split CP. Section 4 considers further evidence for the non-split CP in Old English and its introduction in Middle English. Section 5 provides a conclusion and some speculations on the reasons behind the changes.

2. Evidence of split CP in Old English main clauses

In this section, I review the literature that argues that Old English main clauses have multiple positions in the left periphery. There are several ways to view this, either as a split CP where high and low C-positions can be occupied by verbs (e.g.,
Roberts 1996) or as one position in the CP and one in the TP (e.g., Pintzuk 1991). I will choose the former but little depends on that for the main point of the paper.

Old English wh-questions always trigger Verb-second (V2) and some topics do as well, as was shown in, e.g., van Kemenade (1987). In addition, pronouns follow topics in southern Old English varieties, resulting in Verb-third (V3; van Kemenade 1987; Kroch & Taylor 1997; Lightfoot 1999:155–7; Haeberli 2002; Hinterhölzl & van Kemenade 2012). Using an expanded CP-layer, as in (7), there are two positions for the V, Force or Fin. If the wh-element is in the Spec of ForceP, the V has to move all the way up and this results in V2. However, if there is a clitic in the head of Top this V-movement is blocked and the result will be V3 (see, however, Bech 2001 for problems with the clitic status).

(7)  
```
(7)                   ForceP
     |                  Force’
     |                |_____Force’
     |                |       TopP
     |                |       |_____V
     |                |       |_____Top’
     |                |       |       |_____Top’
     |                |       |       |       |_____FinP
     |                |       |       |       |       |   clitic
     |                |       |       |       |_____Fin’
     |                |       |       |       |_____Fin’
       V
```

Examples of V2 and V3 are given in (8) and (9) respectively; the indefinite pronoun man patterns with regular pronouns.

(8)  
```
(8)  Hu lomp eow on lade, leofa Biowulf
    how happened you on trip, dear Beowulf
    ‘How was your trip, dear Beowulf?’
    (Beowulf 1987)
```

(9)  
```
(9)  On þyssum geare man halgode þet mynster æt Westmynstre on
    In this year one hallowed the monastery at Westminster on
    Cyldamesse dæg
    Childermass day
    ‘In this year, the monastery at Westminster was hallowed on Childermass day.’
    (Peterborough Chronicle, year 1066)
```
Kroch & Taylor (1997) argue that Scandinavian-influenced, northern and eastern texts are more strictly V2, while southern texts can be V3. Whereas this generalization holds for (10) with V2 in the (more eastern) East Midlands Peterborough Chronicle and with V3 in the (more southern) Parker Chronicle, it does not hold for (11), in which the opposite of the predicted order occurs.

(10) a. *Her for se myccla here* 
    Then went the big army 
    ‘Then, the big army went …’. 
    *(Peterborough Chronicle, year 893)*

b. *Her on þysum geare for se micla here* 
    Here in this year went the big army 
    ‘Then, the big army went …’. 
    *(Parker Chronicle, year 893)*

(11) a. *Her Ecgbriht cining ge feahť ...* 
    Here Ecgbriht king part fought ... 
    ‘In this year King Ecgbriht fought ...’ 
    *(Peterborough Chronicle, year 833)*

b. *Her gefeahť Ecgbryht cyning ...* 
    Here fought Ecgbriht king. 
    ‘In this year King Ecgbriht fought ...’ 
    *(Parker Chronicle, year 833)*

So, main clauses in many varieties of Old English show clear evidence for a split CP with a high and low position for the verb (or a more elaborate left periphery), resulting in V2 and V3 constructions, respectively. Main clauses include information in the CP on pragmatics, sentential mood, and tense. I will now concentrate on embedded CPs, where some of this information can depend on the matrix verb.

3. **Subordinate clauses in Modern and Old English**

In this section, I first show that Modern English subordinate clauses show evidence of a split CP and that certain verbs fill their embedded ForceP and render the clausal complement less flexible (Section 3.1). Old English is interestingly different in that (a) unlike Modern English, most verbs have subjunctive complements, (b) that there is no double C, and (c) there is no V2 in embedded clauses, which also show a simple CP. The first characteristic shows that the complement is independent, and the latter two show that Old English does not provide much empirical evidence for a split subordinate CP (Section 3.2).
3.1 Modern English

In Modern English, the matrix verb determines if the subordinate clause can have a split CP or not. Adapting Hooper & Thompson (1973), Meinunger (2004), van Gelderen (2004), and Salvesen & Walkden (2014), I divide verbs into assertive and non-assertive types. A definition of assertive is “the speaker or subject of the sentence has an affirmative opinion regarding the truth value of the complement proposition” (Hooper 1975:95). Some of these verbs are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saying <em>(say)</em></td>
<td>emotive factive <em>(resent, regret)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinking <em>(believe)</em></td>
<td>negative verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-factive <em>(discover)</em></td>
<td>causative <em>(make)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>volition <em>(want, intend)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assertive verbs allow embedded topics and (negative) focus elements, as in (12a) and (13a); lack *for-to* infinitives, as in (14a); allow raising and ECM, as in (15a) and (16a); and generally do not allow subjunctives, as shown in (17a). Non-assertive verbs show the opposite characteristics in that they do not allow topics or negatives, as in (12b) and (13b); have *for-to* infinitives, as in (14b); and do not allow raising and ECM, as in (15b) and (16b); but allow (periphrastic) subjunctives, as in (17b).

(12) a. John believes that *this book* Mary read often.
     b. John regrets that *this book* Mary read often.

(13) a. I believe that *never in my life* have I done that.
     b. I regret that *never in my life* have I done that.

(14) a. *John believes for you to be nice.*
     b. I regret for you to be in this fix. \(\text{(K&K 169)}\)

(15) a. He was believed to be pro-French.
     b. *He was regretted to be pro-French.* \(\text{(BNC-CRK 998)}\)

(16) a. I believe him to be nice.
     b. *I regret him to be nice.*

(17) a. *I believe you be nice.*
     b. ‘... people in India who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any government to leave you at liberty’, he ... \(\text{(BNC C90 1004)}\)
Van Gelderen (2004) argues that the Modern English (finite) CP is always split but that non-assertive predicates such as *regret* have the fact that in the ForceP. The occupied ForceP blocks movement to the Topic position in English, perhaps because the entire proposition is presupposed. English complements to assertives are split because topicalization is allowed after *that* but their Force has no special mood features.

The differences between assertive and non-assertive verbs shown in (12) to (17) are summarized in Table 2. That non-assertives would have subjunctive complements is intuitively appealing and fits the data; assertives are mainly subjunctive. Three other differences result in more mixed results; I have added them to the table. For more details, see van Gelderen (2004).

Table 2. Modern English complements (adapted from van Gelderen 2004:64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semi-factive (discover)</td>
<td>factive (regret)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think (believe)</td>
<td>volition (want, intend)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From (12)–(17):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emb Top</th>
<th>for-to</th>
<th>Raising</th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emb Top</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for-to</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no/yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not shown with examples (see van Gelderen 2004); mixed results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neg Raising</th>
<th>the fact</th>
<th>it that</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg Raising</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fact</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it that</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, Modern English has an expanded embedded CP which is free (i.e., can be occupied by topics) for assertives as in (18a) but is not free for non-assertives. In the case of factive non-assertives, the ForceP is occupied by *the fact/it that*; with volition verbs, and also non-assertives, the CP is specified for irrealis and therefore is never reducible since an irrealis/future marker *for* is present. We can collapse (18bc) if factives have [+realis] features and non-factives [−realis].
3.2 Old English subordinates

I first show in 3.2.1 that, unlike what is shown in Table 2, Old English subjunctives appear with both assertives and non-assertive verbs. This prompted Visser (1966:825) to say that “it should not be inferred that the [higher verbs] are determinative” for the choice between indicative and subjunctive. In 3.2.2, I show that the seven other complement types listed in Table 2 are introduced in Middle English and are due to a splitting of the CP. Their absence in Old English shows Old English lacks a split subordinate CP (cf. also van Gelderen 2004:51; 65).

3.2.1 Subjunctives and indicatives

In this section, I show that all kinds of matrix verbs can be complemented by subjunctives. This gives the mood in the subordinate clause independence, as Julien (2007) has argued for Scandinavian, to express its own assertion. I start with complements to non-assertive verbs.
Old English non-assertives, e.g., the emotives *hreowan* ‘be sad’, *sorgian* ‘be sad’, and *sweorcan* ‘be troubled’, have indicative complements, as in (19), or subjunctive, as in (20).

(19) *þæt me is on minum mode swa sar, on minum hyge hreowed ðæt hie that me is on my mind so sorrowful, on my heart is. sorrow that they heofonrice agan to alдрe. heaven have.IND for ever ‘My mind is full of sorrow, my heart is sad that they have the heavenly kingdom forever.’ (DOE, Junius, Genesis 425–6)

(20) *æc ðæt he sorgode, hu mycel se scyliga þæs weorces forlure innan his But that he cared how much the guilty that Work lose.SUBJ in his sawle. soul ‘He cared how much the guilty would lose in his soul.’ (DOE, *Gregory’s Dialogues*, Hecht, 291.10–11)

Causative verbs, such as *don* ‘do’ in (21), and volitional verbs, such as *willan* ‘want’ in (22), are also non-assertive and their complements can be either indicative, as in (21), or subjunctive, as in (22).

(21) *ðære scame & ðære scande ðe … ic gedoo ðæt ðu forgietsð* The shame and the disgrace REL … I make that you forget.IND ‘I’ll make you forget the shame and disgrace (committed in your youth)’.

(22) *Ic wille … þæt þu forgyte ðæt ic þe nu secge* I want that you forget.SUBJ that I you now say.SUBJ ‘I want you to forget what I am telling you now’.

(Byrhtferth’s *Manual* 154.14, Visser 1966: 841)

Assertive complements such as the semi-factive *forgietan* ‘forget’ occur with a clausal complement in the indicative, as in (23), and subjunctive, as in (24). The latter is surprising given the situation in Modern English summarized in Table 2.

(23) *hig forgæton ðæt hig hlafas namon* They forgot that they bread took.IND ‘They had forgotten to take bread’.

(Gospel, *Matthew* 16.5, from Visser 1966: 832)

(24) *ðæt hie forgieten hwider hie scylen* that they forget whither they should.SUBJ ‘That they forget where to go’.

(DOE, Alfred, *Pastoral Care*, Hatton 387.14)
Perception verbs are assertive. In Old English, see occurs as a mental perception verb, as in (25), and as a physical one, with both indicative and subjunctive complements, unlike Modern English.

(25) Gesihst þu nu þ þa rihtwisan sint laþe 7 forþrycte
Seest you now that those virtuous are.IND hated and oppressed
‘Do you see that the virtuous are hated and oppressed’.

(DOE, Alfred, Boethius, 9.24-5)

(26) bonne gesihþ se deofol þæt ge hine forseod
then sees the devil that you him despise.IND

(DOE, Aelfric, Lives of Saints, 376.166)

Verbs of saying occur with subjunctive complements, as in (27), as well indicatives, as in (28), in Old English. (See Warner 1982:189 that verbs of thinking work the same). From a Modern English point of view, the subjunctive use is again unexpected with assertives.

(27) þe secgad þæt þeos world sy nu wyrse
REL say that this world be.SUBJ now worse
‘who say that the world is now worse …’

(DOE, Orosius, Bately 27.11)

(28) Ealle þas goldsmiðas secgad þæt hi næfre ær ... ne gesawon.
All the goldsmiths say that they never before ... not saw.IND
‘The goldsmiths say that they never before saw (such a piece of gold).’

(DOE, Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies, Clemoes 209.92)

As mentioned earlier, Visser suggests that the complement expresses its own mood, something that Julien (2007) has also argued. How the subjunctive is interpreted is very varied cross-linguistically. For instance, Farkas (1992:70), writing about Romance, says there is a change of meaning, e.g., between (29) and (30) in Romanian. The indicative “reports an assertion” whereas the subjunctive “reports a directive”. This may be true in Old English as well.

(29) Ion a spus ca Maria a plecat
Ion has said that Maria has.IND left
‘Ion said that Maria left’.

(30) Ion a spus ca Maria sa plece imediat
Ion has said that Maria that.SUBJ leave immediately
‘Ion said that Maria should leave immediately’.

(from Farkas 1992:70)

So far I have shown that in Old English, assertive and non-assertive verbs do not have different complements: both allow subjunctives as well as indicatives. These complements express their mood independently from that of their main predicate.
In the next subsection, I show that when *for-to*, ECM, and the other complements provided in Table 2 start to occur after Old English, a difference in the CP comes about and the subjunctive is gradually replaced.

### 3.2.2 Other complement types

In this section, I discuss the seven other complement types listed in Table 2, namely *for-to* complements, ECM, Raising, Negative Raising, embedded topicalization, and complements introduced by *the fact* or *it*. These arose after Old English, which is expected if they need an expanded CP which is not available in Old English.

As is well-known from Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) and Table 2, non-assertive factives such as *be important* and *regret* allow *for-to* complements. This use “is hardly ever met with before” the late 19th century, according to Visser (1973:2244–45). There are, however, earlier instances he mentions, as in (31) and (32). The earliest I have found is (33), from early Middle English.

(31) *Whan man or womman preyen for folk to auancen hem ...*  
‘When men or women pray for people to promote them.’  
(Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales* I 786, from Visser 1973:2247)

(32) *and wishing for those hands to take off his melancholy bargain.*  
(1681 Dryden, from Visser 1973:2248)

(33) *moche he lofde ech(e) cniht. bat lofde for to segg(e) riht*  
Much he loved every knight who loved for to say truth  
‘Much he loved every knight who loved to say the truth’ (Layamon, *Otho*, 5523)

In Chaucer, this construction becomes more frequent; and so do (34) and (35), where the position of the subject indicates where *for* and *to* are. This construction can also be seen as evidence that the verb selects *for* as a complementizer with deontic verbs such as *desire* that indicate volition. As mentioned above, the CP is still ‘expandable’, even though most instances of split CP are with adjunct CPs as in (36), not complements.

(34) *Nedeth namore for hym to go ne ryde*  
need.3S nomore for him to go not ride  
‘He didn’t need to ride out anymore.’  
(Chaucer, Merchant’s Tale IV, 1615)
(35) *That oother manere is whan men or wommen preyen for folk to avauncen*  
That other way is when men or women pray for people to help them only for wicked fleshly devotion that they have for the person.  
‘The other way is when men or women ask people to help them only out of wicked, fleshly devotion that they have for the person.’  
(Chaucer, Parson’s Tale X, 786)

(36) *Assembled been, his answere for to heere.*  
assembled are, his answer for to hear  
‘are assembled to hear his answer.’  
(Chaucer, Wife of Bath’s Tale III, 1029)

So, when verbs such as *expect, hope, desire* start having *for* clauses as complements, an expanded *CP* becomes incompatible with these verbs, as in (36).

The history of *important* is worth noting in that its use as a predicative adjective with a complement is very recent. It is a loanword from French but quite a late one, namely late 16th century according to the OED (the verb *import* is from the early 16th century), and was initially only used attributively. Even 18th and 19th century texts, such as those of George Berkeley, David Hume, Emily Bronte, and Jane Austen only contain attributive use, so the subjunctive use, as in (37), must have arisen late. Some early American texts (e.g., Samuel Adams’s 18th century writing) just have subjunctives, as in (37), not yet infinitival complements.

(37) Some of our military gentlemen have, I fear, disgraced us; it is then *important that* every anecdote that concerns a man of real merit among them, and such I know there are, be improved, as far as decency will admit of it, to their advantage and to the honor of a colony, which, for its zeal in the great cause, well as its sufferings, deserves so much of America  
(Samuel Adams, letter to E Gerry 1775, Cushing ed, University of Virginia e-texts)

George Washington (in the 37 volumes of his work written between 1745 and 1799) uses *important for* with an infinitive several times, as in (38), but continues to use the subjunctive.

(38) ‘*Tis almost as important for* us to know what does not happen as what does happen.’  
(1780, Volume 19, from http://etext.lib.virginia.edu)

Thus, the *for-to* replacement of the subjunctive arises after 1700.

There has been a long debate (Callaway 1913, Zeitlin 1908, Lightfoot 1979) as to whether Old English has verbs with ECM complements. The evidence shows, I think, that it does not. It is not particularly important for the question of whether
or not Old English has a split CP, and I will therefore not go into it here (see van Gelderen 1993: 43). Raising verbs do not appear either: clausal complements to *seem* and *appear* are introduced in Middle English.

As for Negative Raising, a clear marker for the factive verbs, Fischer (1998) provides evidence that the earliest instances are from the ME3 and ME4 periods of the Helsinki Corpus, i.e., 1350–1500. Her earliest example with *think* is (39) from the 15th century. Thus, a differentiation in complement types arises quite late.

(39) I cannot thinke that he hath informed us all truely.

(*Paston Letters*, from Fischer 1998: 71)

The introduction of complements starting with *the fact that* is also quite late. In general, it occurs quite rarely (see Jespersen 1926: 31–2). According to the OED, the phenomenon starts in the 19th century, and the first instances are factive, as in (40) to (43), but are slow to get started. There are some early instances, as in (43), with *evyll* rather than *fact*.

(40) I would not agree to the fact that ennui prevailed.

(OED, 1803, s.v. *fact*)

(41) ... ought to be made aware of the fact that among the reigning Sovereigns, [they] have not ... .

(OED, 1851, s.v. *fact*)

(42) We cannot ignore the fact that aeroplaning is beginning to progress as a past-time.

(OED, Observer 1927, s.v. *aeroplane*)

(43) We have done evyll that we have not taken surete
we have done evil that we have not taken safety
‘We have done wrong that we aren’t in safety’.

(OED, 1489 Caxton, s.v. *that*)

Related to the introduction of (40) to (43), when do sentences with *it* start appearing? Heralding objects, as Visser calls them, occur in Old English but are problematic in terms of their analysis. Visser’s examples with *it* (1963: 460) occur with all kinds of verbs, as with the semi-factive *understand* in (44), and others such as *hear* and *believe*, as in (44). This is unexpected if they lack a split CP. However, the heralding objects typically precede the verb and hence do not contribute to an expanded CP.

(44) *and þæt georne understandan, þæt þær symble heofonlicra engla neawest*  
and that eagerly understand, that there feast of-heavenly angels nearest

*bið*

is

‘and eagerly to understand that there is a feast of heavenly angels near’.

(*Wulfstan Polity* 252.15, from Visser 1963: 460)
The introduction of the modern variant of (44), one that provides evidence for a split CP, is quite late. It does not occur in the Early Modern English section (up to 1710) of the Helsinki Corpus or in Shakespeare’s First Folio (1623). The earliest examples I have found are in the Corpus of Historical American, as in (46) and (47).

(46) We regret it the less, however, that it gives a variety to the work

(COHA 1828 fiction)

(47) He regretted it, therefore, that the counsel for the complainant would not exhaust his case

(COHA 1886 NF)

In conclusion to Section 3, Modern English assertive and non-assertive verbs choose different complements but this distinction is not relevant in Old English, where assertive and non-assertive verbs have indicative and subjunctive complements and where embedded clauses show little evidence for a split CP. The expanded CP of (18) starts gradually in the 13th century and the complement types are differentiated then as well: *for to* complements start very gradually from the 13th century onwards, and ECM occurs in Middle English as well. The introduction of *it/the fact* becomes available after the split CP is there. In the next section, I examine further evidence for when the split CP arises.

4. V2, complementizer doubling, and topics

The evidence presented in the previous section suggests that Old English lacks a split embedded CP. In the current section, I show this is confirmed by the absence of double complementizers and embedded V2. I start in 4.1 with the data that Salvesen & Walkden (2014) present on the sparsity of V2 in embedded clauses. Then, I discuss the status of the C in Old and Middle English in 4.2 and I add more on embedded topicalization in 4.3.

4.1 Embedded V2

Salvesen (2014: 3) argues that “the existence of V2 is contingent on the possibility of having high and low complementizers”. A high complementizer in the embedded clause “permits embedded V2” (p. 4). Salvesen & Walkden (2014: 13) provide the data in Table 3, where A and B verbs are assertive, C and D non-assertive, E verbs vary, and V are verbs of volition. As is clear from the table, there is very limited V2 with all verb types.
Table 3. Embedded V2 in Old English
(from Salvesen & Walkden 2014:13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results confirm my conclusions in Section 3 that the assertive/non-assertive distinction is not relevant in Old English and that the CP is not split. This fits with the fact that double complementizer heads do not occur in Old English, which I now discuss.

4.2 The status of C

There are what look like double Cs in Old English. I first examine cases where þat is followed by þe and I argue these are a not a double C.

A pretty normal set of Old English CPs is shown in (48). Thus, there are clauses introduced by þæt, a wh-phrase, and hwæðer ‘whether’.

(48) He sæde þæt he æt sumum cirre wolde fandian hu longe þæt land norþryhte he said that he at some turn wanted explore how long that land north læge opþe hwæðer ænig mon be norðan þæm westenne bude. lay or whether any man to north that waste lived ‘He said that he wanted to explore how far that land lay northwards or whether anyone lived noth of that empty land.’ (DOE, Orosius, Bately 14.5)

However, there are also instances of what look like double Cs, as in (49) to (55), from Beowulf. This use is frequent in Old English, e.g., there are 70 instances in Orosius, but it stops by the OE3 period of the Helsinki Corpus. Some instances occur as complements of cwedan ‘say’, as in (50), a verb known to have had some V2 (Visser 1966:771), and some are subject clauses, as in (49), (51), (52), and (55). Many of these forms are shortened and contracted, as in (51), (53), (54), and (55), a sign that we may have a single C.
Therefore, all mankind found out in sad tidings that Grendel fought against Hrothgar. (Beowulf 149–151)

It was often said that no better one could be found north or south. (Beowulf 858)

Then it became clear that a revenger was still alive. (Beowulf 1255–6)

'I firmly believe if it comes to pass that the lord dies …' (Beowulf 1845–6)

That is not the behavior of a queen, even though she is beautiful, that she as a peacemaker deprive people of their lives. (Beowulf 1940–2)

(I) don't expect (this), but were it widely known that Ongentheow killed …'. (Beowulf 2923–4)

Allen (1977:129) says that she “know[s] of no evidence … to suggest that δætte was anything more than a variation of δæt during the literary period”. Zupitza's (1959) facsimile edition of Beowulf shows δæt and δe are quite separate most of the time, as I have indicated in (49) to (55). If δe is the generalized complementizer, these constructions show either that δæt is in the specifier position, expected if it is a demonstrative originally, or that it is a high C. The latter is unlikely given the absence of any material following δæt in Old English, as I now show.
4.3 Topics

Van Kemenade (1997) argues there are few embedded topics in Old English, as in (56). Similarly, van Gelderen (2004:51) claims that Old English lacks a split subordinate CP partly on the basis of the rarity of topics following a C. López Martínez (2015) finds a few but these are in subject clauses, as in (57), and in relatives.

(56)  Gregorius se trahtnere cwæd þæt forði wolde drihten getrahtnian …
Gregorius the translator said that therefore wanted God to-translate
‘Gregorius, the translator, said that therefore God wanted to translate …’.  
(van Kemenade 1997:333, from Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies)

(57)  þonon gelomp [þætte þa seolfan moldan þær his lichoma gefeol monige
hence happened that the same clay there his body fell many
men neomende wæron]
men taking were
‘Hence, it happened that, the same clay where his body fell, many men were
taking.’  
(López Martínez 2015, from Bede, Miller, 178, 5–7)

Though rare, sentences such as (56) and (58), together with a few cases of embedded V2, show that split CPs may be starting to occur in Old English.

In Middle English, embedded topics become frequent. I now turn to sentences where topicalization provides evidence for a high for and a high that.

4.3.1 High for in Middle English

The main evidence that Old English for is in the head position of a PP (which itself is in Spec) is that (a) it occurs as a head in sentences such as (58), and (b) it does not occur before another C or before a topic. In Middle English, for becomes a head and actually helps to expand the CP.

(58)  ac for þæm þe hie us near sint, we … ne magon …
but for that that they us close are, we … not may …
‘but we can’t for those that are near to us …’.  
(DOE, Orosius, Bately 122.18–9)

In Middle English, embedded topics appear, e.g., in adverbial clauses, as in (59) to (64); noun complements, as in (65); and as complements to assertive verbs, as in (66) and (67).

(59)  for ne uuæren næure nan martyrs swa pined alse hi wæron
for not were never no martyrs as tortured as they were
‘because there were never any martyrs as tortured as they were’.  
(Peterborough Chronicle, 1137, 20)
(60)  *For in this erthely lyffe* Ar non to God more bouné Then is I and my wyffe, for in this earthly life are none to God more bound than is I and my wife
*For frenshippe we haue foune.*
because friendship we have found
‘Because in this earthly life none are more bound to God than my wife;
because friendship we have (indeed) found.’

(York Plays, 10.10-13, from van Gelderen 2004:44)

(61)  *For hardly I hym heete* for indeed I him threaten
‘Because indeed I threaten him.’

(York Plays, 11, 286, from van Gelderen 2004:44)

(62)  *And I so semely in syghte myselfe now I se,*  *For lyke a lorde am I lefte* And I so seemly in sight, myself now I see, Because like a lord am I left
to …
to
‘And I, so seemly in sight, I now see myself. Because, like a lord, I am left to …’

(York Plays, 1.51)

(63)  *For in a glorius gle* my gleteryng it glemes; I am so … for in a glorious glee my glittering it gleams; I am so
‘Because, in a glorious glee, my glittering, it gleams; I am so …’

(York Plays, 1.81–2)

(64)  *And thus I lyved ful many a day*  *That trewely I hadde no ned*  *Ferther than …* And thus I lived fully for many days so that really I had no need other than …
‘And thus I lived fully for many days so that really I had no need other than …’

(Chaucer, Book of the Duchess 345.1252–3)

(65)  *Ther may swich cause ben … That hardly thou wolt thiselven saye* there may such reason be … that certainly you want yourself say
‘There may be such a reason that certainly you want to say …’

(Chaucer, Troilus & Criseyde 577.1305–6)

(66)  *Blanchardyn answerd,*  *that for no drede nor fere that he had of hym he* Blanchardyn answered, that for no dread nor fear that he had of him he
should kepe …
should keep
‘Blanchardyn answered that not for dread or fear of him should he …’

(Caxton’s Blanchardyn 84/3, Kellner edition)
(67) But now is tyme to yow for to telle: How that we baren us that ilke nyght, but now is time to you for to tell: how that we carry us that same night Whan we were ...

when we were

‘But now is the time for you to tell how we conducted ourselves that night when we were …’ (Chaucer, Canterbury Tales 721)

The earliest instance of for as a finite complementizer in English is in the Peterborough Chronicle, if the OED is correct, and is from the entry for 1135, as in (68). There are two other examples from the entry for 1135, as in (69) and (70), and of course the one in (59) above from 1137. Note that in these, there is topocalized material, so that with the use of for as C, the CP is expanded. The reason may be because the for is used as an adverbial C so it is in Force.

(68) for þat ilce gaer warþ þe king ded þat opor daeþ efþer Sancte Andreas for that same year was the king dead that other day after St. Andrew’s massedæi on Normandi.

mass day in Normandy

‘Because (in) that same year the king was dead, on the second day after St. Andrew’s, in Normandy.’ (Peterborough Chronicle, 1135, 4–6)

(69) for æuric man sone raewedæpe þe mihte. for every man soon robbed another that could ‘because everyone that could robbed someone else’.

(Peterborough Chronicle, 1135, 7–8)

(70) for agenes him risen sone þa rice men for against him rise soon the rich men ‘because against him the powerful men soon rise’.

(Peterborough Chronicle, 1135, 16–18)

Once for occurs as a C, it almost immediately grammaticalizes to Force and triggers a split embedded CP. The evidence for that split is the occurrence of for followed by þat, as in (71) and (72), which occurs frequently in the Helsinki Corpus Middle English section (namely 111 times), although only as a causal adjunct, not as complement. It also precedes if in (73).

(71) we cleped him fader for þat he us feide here we call him father for that he us feeds here ‘We call him father because he feeds us here.’

(from HC ME1, OE Homilies, Morris 25)
(72) **for** *pat* he *hadde isleh3e moche of hire cunne*  
  for that he had slain much of their people  
  ‘because he had slain many of their people.’  
  (Layamon, *Otho* 5453)

(73) **For** *3if we here 3erneþ wonie mid Greckes*  
  for if we here agree live with Greeks  
  ‘because if we agree to live among the Greeks.’  
  (Layamon, *Otho* 483)

Forte (*pat*) ‘until’ gets used as a conjunction with finite clauses in 1200 for the first time in (74) and (75) (again *OED* entry) and, here too, very early it moves to Force. In Layamon, there is additional evidence that *for* is in Force since negative verbs move to *C* when *for* is there, as in (76) and (77), from both versions.

(74) **forte** *pat* he *come to Maximian to Rome*  
  for that he came to Maximian to Rome  
  ‘Until he came to Rome to Maximian.’  
  (Layamon, *Otho* 5746)

(75) **forte** *pat* ich *mihte bet borewes a-winne*  
  for that I might better boroughs win  
  ‘Until I might the better conquer boroughs.’  
  (Layamon, *Otho* 7700)

(76) **for** *nes he neuer þi fader*  
  because not was he never your father  
  ‘because he was never your father.’  
  (Layamon, *Caligula* 1146)

(77) **for** *nis par no kinelond*  
  because not is there no kingdom  
  ‘because there is no kingdom.’  
  (Layamon, *Otho* 6660)

In short, the beginning of the Middle English period sees a double *C*, which is evidence for a high and low area in the CP, i.e., a split CP.

### 4.3.2 High *that* in Middle English

Topicalization, as in (78) and (79), shows clear evidence for a high *C*. Examples from late Middle and Early Modern English, expected with assertive matrix verbs, as in (78), occur even with non-assertives, as in (79).

(78) *And I told him that, as for such mony that shuld ..., I wold ...*  
  (Paston Letters, #75 1465)

(79) *I am sorrie that with better speed and judgement I had not quoted him.*  
  (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, II, i, 111)

Future work needs to find when *that* starts to occupy this high position.
In conclusion to Section 4, I have examined evidence for a single CP in Old English by considering the lack of double Cs and of topicalizations. There is perhaps the beginning of a split in Old English but there is clear evidence in early Middle English.

5. Conclusion and questions about the change

In this paper, I have compared main clauses and subordinate complements in Old and Modern English. There are three clear conclusions. (a) The distinction between assertive and non-assertive is not relevant in Old English for the selection of indicative or subjunctive, whereas in Modern English only non-assertives select subjunctive complements. It may be, as Visser says for Old English and Julien for Scandinavian, that the subordinate clause is more independent in Old English. (b) The independence of the complement in Old English does not translate into a split CP, as evidenced by very infrequent V2 structures and topicalizations. (c) A clear difference between assertive and non-assertive verbal complements arises after Old English and this can be tied to the structure in (18).

As for the motivation behind these changes, I can only speculate that the demise of the inflectional system and the introduction of modals and infinitives must have triggered the increasing dependence of the subordinate clause on the main verb. The subjunctive, which could stand on its own, is replaced by for and to, which cannot stand on their own. It is not clear to me why, after the introduction of the for complementizer, topicalizations arise as well. My description has been cartographic and descriptive; one could imagine an explanation of the differences between older and newer stages on a different level, e.g., through shifting phase head choices.
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Abbreviations

COCA  Corpus of Contemporary American (http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/)
COHA  Corpus of Historical American (http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/)
DOE   Dictionary of Old English (http://doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html)
ECM   Exceptional Case Marking
FOC   Focus
IND   indicative
OED   Oxford English Dictionary
PST   past
REL   relative marker
SUBJ  subjunctive
TOP   Topic
V2/V3 Verb-second/Verb-third
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