On the English alternation *that/Ø* in complement clauses
An historical approach

ENG-3991

Claudio Vilches

Ackowledgements

I want to convey my sincere thanks to Thomas McFadden, the supervisor of this thesis, for all of the time he devoted to helping me create this body of work.

My thanks are also due to Kari Matthissen, Martin Vaage, Ellen Mentzoni, Jessy Grøen and Kuchy Mumibu. Finally, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my family and friends for their constant support.

Contents

Abbreviations

Aldred's Lind.	Aldred's Lindisfarne Gospels
conj.	conjunction
Corpus Christi	The Corpus Christi MS.
CH	(Ælfric's) Catholic Homily
EModE	Early Modern English (AD1500-1700)
(A-S) Gospels	Anglo-Saxon Gospels
Hatton	The Hatton MS.
KJV	King James Version of the Bible
L	late
Lindisfarne	The Lindisfarne Gospels
ModE	Modern English (AD 1700-to the present)
ME	Middle English (AD 1100-1500)
MS.	manuscript (pl. MSS.)
OE	Old English (AD 450-1100)
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
PDE	Present Day English
Rushworth	The Rushworth Gospels
SVO	word order (subject + verb + object)
7	and
*	ungrammaticality

Chapter I

Introduction

The information presented in this thesis will examine the topic of the English alternation *that/Ø* (henceforth referred to as the alternation), and the mystery surrounding it which has yet to be solved. Most studies regarding this subject, including the present research, are mainly motivated by the following criteria: a) the alternation is still unaccounted for in grammar, and b) the wrong use of the alternation leads to ungrammaticality.

Although extensive research has been conducted in regard to syntax over the years, as well as various attempts at an explanation, this study will expand upon that information by including an historical perspective of the alternation. Thus, this analysis intends to fill a gap in the evolutionary study of this topic, a linguistic aspect that has not yet been treated properly and in turn may contribute to a better understanding of the subject matter. In that sense, by adding an historical slant to the debate, this research will build an argument against the idea that an alleged principled syntactic account would regulate both the function and the distribution of the alternation, as several studies have claimed so far.

Consequently, the research proposition that will guide this investigation is the following working hypothesis:

If we consider English historical developments, then attempts to reach a syntactic principled account for the distribution of the alternation *that/Ø* in subordination might become reduced and/or blocked.

Subsequently, the objectives of this thesis are:

1) To trace the alternation back in time in order to determine when and/or how it could have been incorporated and/or developed in the language.

2) To discover which other linguistic elements might be involved in the process of the activation and/or development of the alternation.

The subject of study will be syntactic structures involving subordination or complementation in finite declarative sentences. When considering historical linguistic aspects, English writing from the periods referred to as Old English (OE), Middle English (ME), and early Modern English (EModE) will serve as the main source of examples found throughout this thesis.

Chapter II

Background

2. 1. About this approach

2. 1. 1. Conceptual framework and delimitations

The main lines of this study will be circumscribed within the framework of English historical linguistics. Because of the nature of this approach, it will acquire a diachronic slant. Most studies carried out within these parameters are faced with some intrinsic limitations or constraints, which come from the object of study itself. As we know, the non-contemporaneity of actors as well as the sometimes questionable quality and lack of availability of original sources and/or manuscripts are among the main challenges in this field. The examples utilized within this study were taken from original renderings, manuscripts and/or transcriptions made at different times throughout the history of the English language. Regarding the translations from OE and ME into ModE, they will be provided by the respective Anglo-Saxon or OE and ME professors, scholars, translators, philologists, etc., who published the texts of the early English writings which were selected for the use in this research; in a few cases where the translations were not available, they will be provided by the author of this thesis.

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED), the most complete and reliable database of English words, will be used as well to clarify certain topics.

2. 1. 2. Subordination

The main reasons that justify the delimitation of this analysis to the alternation in subordination within complement clauses are:

a) The alternation is a widespread phenomenon in English; so due to the limited extent of a master's thesis, it will prove practically impossible to treat all contexts properly.

b) Subordination in declarative sentences is one of the most typical and frequent syntactic environments in which the alternation occurs, so it is properly representative of this topic.

c) Another important structural element to consider is the fact that, along with other syntactic environments such as coordination, relative clause, etc., subordination can still be traced back to the origins of English writing, which allows for more complete and extensive evidence of its historical development. Moreover, within the topic of subordination itself, subordination in declaratives is the most common and identifiable syntactic structure in which the alternation is

a part. This can be compared to subordination in questions, for instance, which is more difficult to identify in the earliest of English writing, as they were either much less frequent or had no standard structure.

2. 1. 3. Attested data and diachronic syntax

Since no one speaks the old versions of English any longer, nor do transcripts of oral records exist, the only way to reconstruct their linguistic history is through the written texts that remain from those periods in time. Thus, early English writing constitutes the only material evidence that we have to gain access to linguistic records from the past. In fact, "the great advances of historical and comparative linguistic in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would have been impossible without the availability, interpretation, and in many cases decipherment of written documents" (Hock & Joseph 2009:63). In that sense, writing is indeed a suitable source for comparing historical syntactic structures, analysing the development of linguistic and grammatical changes, observing linguistic influences at a particular time, etc.

On the other hand, the Latin proverb *verba volanta, scripta manent* means that while spoken words fly away or are easily forgotten, written words are more conclusive and remain forever. The importance of writing is not only as a product that can showcase the results of linguistic developments over time, but also that it in turn develops contemporaneous and future influence as well. Writing provides a kind of linguistic legitimization in the sense that we suppose that a (professional) writer is a well-read person who has enough linguistic knowledge to write and publish.

Language and literature have always had a sort of symbiotic relationship. The linguistic and literary drive provides an inevitable mutual influence and feedback that is cyclical in nature. People admire certain writers and follow their writing in search of information, enlightenment, wisdom, etc.; they remember and then imitate or reproduce stories, ideas, words, expressions, structures or sentences from works that they have read or have heard about. Literary writing introduces a regurgitation of linguistic knowledge into the language, enriching it by domino effect. Most writers first look back on previous writings as a learning mechanism, and then write not only for their contemporaries, but also for posterity.

2. 2. Status of *that*

2. 2. 1. Word class and functionality

Depending on the syntactic environment, the word *that* can grammatically function as either a: a) determiner, b) demonstrative pronoun, c) relative pronoun, d) adverb, e) subordinating conjunction or complementizer.

Based on how grammar operated at the time, the functionality of *that* in OE and EME was even more differentiated than in ModE, since it carried an inflection for gender, number and case (nominative, dative, etc.). Grammatically, when functioning as a demonstrative pronoun, *that* may identify the antecedent.

Thus, because of its versatility, *that* clearly represents a multifunctional word in English.

2. 2. 2. Spelling and shape

The modern word *that* was subject to variation in spelling and forms at different times in OE and ME such as *þæt, ðæt, ðætte, þet,* and *þat*. Less used were *thæt* and *dhæt*, etc.

Despite being a short word, *that* also had abbreviations or contracted forms, like the letter Thorn with stroke $< \bar{þ} >$, found in both OE and ME.

2. 3. Regarding subordination

2. 3. 1. A complex structure

Both coordination and subordination are considered syntactic complex structures. While coordination refers to independent sentences that can stand alone, subordination is related to dependent clauses that cannot. Based on this reasoning, subordination is considered a more complex syntactic structure than that of coordination.

2. 3. 2. Form and function

Subordination introduced by the conjunction *that* is also referred to as a: a) subordinate clause, b) sub-clause, c) embedded clause, d) *that*-clause, e) complement clause or complementation, etc. In general, complements are syntactic structures mainly used to complete the meaning of verbs, nouns or adjectives.

2. 4. Regarding the alternation

2. 4. 1. Denomination and representation

The alternation *that/Ø* is also referred to as the omission of *that*, the deletion of *that*, the complementizer *that*/Ø-comp, the *that*-clause/*that*-less clause, the licensing of null C, etc. One of the key features which characterises the alternation is its peculiar distribution. This can be explained in the following general way: while certain syntactic structures require the presence of the subordinator *that* in complementation, other syntactic structures allow the same particle to be optional or omissible (Ø). The following example illustrates the alternation in subordination in a declarative sentence in present day English (PDE):

(1)
He knows (that) she is kind.

As illustrated above, the complementizer *that* is optional in this subordinate structure. On the other hand, since the alternation affects different syntactic environments in different ways, the subordinator *that* is required in some structures, as indicated below:

(2)
She whispers *(that) she loves him.

In this example, the presence of the complementizer *that* is mandatory in order to keep the structure of the sentence grammatically sound.

2. 4. 2. Subordination and environments

Although this thesis will remain focused on subordination in complement clauses, other syntactic-related structures in which the alternation can be a part may also appear, such as interrogatives or concatenated subordination.

Despite the fact that several forms of word order were acceptable in OE and/or EME, subordination in declarative sentences is still traceable back to those time periods of their use (cf. Visser 1973 II:25). Since subordination in declarative sentences has certainly been one of the most frequently used structures, this is reason to assume that it might have been one of the initial syntactic environments in which the alternation began to appear.

2. 5. The status of the matter

The current status of the alternation regarding its general function and distribution indicates that it is still unaccounted for after more than five decades of research. Aiming for a general or principled account, the implication of universals in both the underlying and surface structure has been the focus of many investigations. Several studies regarding the alternation have been conducted at different points in time in order to find an explanation, and more are undoubtedly yet to come. Some of the first important studies regarding this topic are, among others: Perlmutter (1968), Chomsky and Lasnik (1977), Taraldsen (1978), Stowell (1981), Rizzi (1997), Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), Boskovic and Lasnik (2003), etc.

A general syntactic explanation concerning what regulates the distribution of the alternation is still an enigma for syntacticians and linguists. Researchers have postulated different explanations for the alternation at different times by appealing to diverse factors, mechanisms and influences. Some of these include: a) the *that*-trace filter, b) the empty category principle (ECP), c) government and proper government, d) commanding, e) *that*-clause functionality, f) bridge and non-bridge verbs, g) PF-Merger, etc. These various attempts have proven to be insufficient or incomplete, as there is no syntactic principled account for the alternation thus far.

Although much research has been pursued within the umbrella of syntax, the difficulties in reaching a principled explanation have caused research to branch off into different directions. This has resulted in some researchers changing their approach, or even supporting an entirely new hypothesis. Although research has been thorough, the unaccountability of the alternation clearly indicates the complexity of this phenomenon. One of the reasons that most researchers may resist investigating other factors beyond syntax could be the assumption that finding an alleged ruling principle would explain the function and distribution of the alternation in any environment at any time. However, the alternation as a syntactic phenomenon is so embedded in the language that, for unknown reasons, it has been successful in resisting any single attempt at syntactic formulation. It seems as though that somewhere there is a sort of missing link.

Historical linguistics studies change in language structure. If we assume that the alternation is a language change, and that "language change is a historical phenomenon" (Croft 2000:1), then an historical approach to this topic should naturally be an intrinsic part of its analysis. Thus, the time is right for new lines of investigation. Indeed, the fact that no principled account within syntax has yet been provided gives us reason to assume that new approaches

should be attempted, involving different linguistic filters, such as this historical one. Will the alternation resist the test of an historical revision without revealing its particular syntactic behaviour? Can we find some useful information from its historical development?

The history of English linguistic and grammatical change has revealed that changes rarely occur by themselves, and they are usually related to either other ongoing changes or other linguistic aspects. It is then reasonable to think that the alternation might be deep-rooted in different linguistic factors, intertwining several elements simultaneously. This is the kind of interaction that could directly or indirectly have influenced, triggered, contributed or caused either the activation or its development at different times. Otherwise, how could we explain that a syntactic phenomenon as evident and noticeable in the English language as the alternation remains almost untraceable, or that no writing has ever explained when and/or how it came into existence?

Because of the nature of this novel analysis, it will largely draw from studies in English historical syntax rather than from previous research on this topic, as it shares neither approach nor methodological principles with that former research; however, the latter will also appear when necessary. In any case, previous research shows that this intriguing topic is much more complex than previously thought, and far from being exhausted. In fact, larger quantities of more varied approaches are needed; as we will see, even those of an interdisciplinary sort might be necessary in some particular environments. That is precisely what this analysis aims to discover in the following chapters. Therefore, with the hopes that this study might motivate further related analyses and/or improvements, I introduce here a more detailed historical perspective on the development of the English alternation *that/Ø* than has been previously presented.

Chapter III

English historical syntax

"The study of OE needs no defense."

[B. Mitchell 1985:I-lvii]

When looking back on English historical syntax, differences between OE and ME subordination systems in declarative sentences would strongly suggest that some influential linguistic developments in complementation regarding the alternation might have occurred at those times. As we will see below, the evidence would also indicate that the first idiomatic principles and new approaches in complementation indeed appeared and/or originated in late OE (LOE) and further developed through ME and EModE.

3. 1. OE Subordination

When working within an historical perspective of the alternation, one of the first and most relevant questions for our analysis at this stage is: was the alternation born with the creation of (written) language? The general answer is no. Regarding subordination in general, which included syntactic structures such as the *that*-clause, infinitival constructions, gerundives, etc., several studies carried out in OE syntax (cf. Kellner 1892, Brown 1970, Mitchell 1985, Rissanen 1999, Fischer et al. 2000, etc.) agree that the *that*-clause represented the prominent way of complementation. The following examples confirm this agreement:

Note: punctuation used in OE, ME and EModE subordination (typically a period, a comma or a semicolon) was not syntactic punctuation, i.e., it did not mark clause boundaries or independence at all (cf. Parkes 1992, Traugott 1992, etc.).

(3) Orosius AD 888:19.32-4

Wulfstan sæde þæt he gefóre of Hæðum, þæt he wære on Truso on syfan dagum 7 nihtum,

wulfstan said that he went of hedeby that he was in druzno on seven days & nights,

þæt þæt scip was ealne weg yrnende under segle.

that the ship was all way running under sail.

'Wulfstan said that he left from Hedeby, that he reached Druzno in seven days and nights, and that the ship was running under full sail all the way.'

Example (3) includes three concatenated sub-clauses with the subordinator *that* functioning as a conjunction in each one. In this case, all the subordinate elements depend upon the verb (*sæde*) in the main clause. A different instance is shown below:

(4) Boethius AD 888:180.29

Ic ƿene ðeah Ꝥ þu ƿille secgan Ꝥ hit sie fon dysige Ꝥ hi hi ne cunnon tocnaƿan.

I suppose however that you will say that it is through ignorance that they them not are able to distinguish

'I suppose, however, that you will say that it is through ignorance that they are not able to distinguish them.'

In this case, subordinate structures have also been concatenated; however, each of them depends upon a different verb.

Now, considering the use of the *that*-clause, it was in turn part of a dual pattern of OE subordination somehow determined (though not invariably) by the way of conveying discourse, as shown below:

a) A *that*-less clause for conveying direct discourse:

Structure: verb of saying + exact words of the speaker (verbatim quotation)

(5) Boethius 888:24.13

ÐA cƿæð Ꝥ Mod. ic me ongite æghƿonan scyldigne.

then said that mod I me perceive every way guilty

'Then the Mind said: "I perceive myself every way guilty."'

This structure with Ø-complementizer was also kept in some instances where direct discourse was even inserted parenthetically.

b) A *that*-clause for conveying indirect discourse and all other type of subordination:

(cf. Gorrell 1895, Mitchell 1985, etc.).

i) Indirect discourse structure: verb of saying + *that* + complement.

(6) The Blicking Homilies AD 979:8.21

Se engel hire sægde þæt heo sceolde modor beon hire Scyppendes,

the angel her   said   that she should   mother   be   her   creator

'The angel said to her that she should be the mother of her creator.'

ii) And all other types of subordination:

Structure: verb + *that* + complement

(7) Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, entry AD 911

þa wende se here þæt his fultumes se mæsta dæl wære on þæm scipum.
then thought the army that his force the greatest part was on the ships
'Then the army thought that the greatest part of his force was in the ships.'

The structure below illustrates a combination of the instances in examples (6) and (7):

(8) Boethius 888:156.24

Ðu sædest on þære ilcan bec. Ⱦ þu onȝeate Ⱦ se God ƿeolde þisses middan geardes
you   said in that same book that you knew that god governed this   earth
'You said in the same book that you knew that God governed this earth.'

Thus, what is syntactically striking about most of OE is the extended used of the *that*-clause
in complementation. Since the alternation is indeed a two-sided syntactic phenomenon (*that*
and Ø), the *that*-clause would then lay the syntactic foundation for its underlying structure.
This is proven by the fact that, even in PDE, the complementizer *that* can always be inserted
back into any finite subordinate clause (with the exception of certain cases with embedded
questions), but not the other way around. So, the sentences in (6) and (7) above represent the
mainstream way of subordination (*that*-clause) for clauses not involving direct discourse. The
dual syntactic pattern of OE subordination can be schematised in the following way:
(9)
a) Direct discourse + Ø + complement
b) Indirect discourse/other type of subordination + *that* + complement

It may sometimes seem that no linguistic generalisation is ever good enough. This is
especially true in the early stages of the language, where there are instances of syntactic
structures that are only confined to OE (cf. Traugott 1992:219). However, classifications are
necessary to a certain degree to create some order surrounding ideas or items. Thus, in order
to be consequent with the prominence of the *that*-clause parameter, and considering that "in
OE *þæt* is usually absent before a complement that represents the exact words of the reported
proposition" (Traugott 1992:236), we assume that a preliminary distinction for the alternation
based on the ways of conveying discourse is then consistent with OE idiomatic principles and

the historical development of the alternation. In other words, the distribution of the alternation in the early stages of the language (early and middle OE) was mainly regulated by the ways of conveying discourse. Indeed, data shows that the same prominence of the *that*-clause in OE makes it difficult to find *that*-less clauses in that period which do not involve direct discourse or a verb of saying (cf. Fischer 2007:304).

To make a distinction based upon discourse may seem to be a different approach, as the criteria used to determine direct or indirect discourse tend to vary among researchers. Some of the dintinguishing elements identified are tense, literary and/or linguistic context, verbatim quotation, pronoun usage, truth value of statements, etc. Nevertheless, these aspects can only be considered potential indicators or markers and not decisive factors, as they more or less depend upon the priority of the researcher. There are no infallible parameters for OE constructions and, regardless of the guidelines used, cases of borderline qualifications, idiomatic exceptions or ambiguity will probably be inevitable (for sequence of tenses cf. Visser II:778; for subjects and verbatim quotation cf. Mitchell II:5, etc.).

3. 2. Discourse and subordination

At this point, the next obvious question may be: why is there a distinction based on discourse? Because of its frequency and dynamism in human interaction, discourse is one of the most common linguistic environments in which to exchange new thoughts and ideas within the boundaries of communication, as it implies feedback and dialogue. It is then a rich syntactic environment for complement clauses as well. Discourse is mainly divided into two categories: a) direct discourse (direct speech or style), and b) indirect discourse (indirect speech or style) (cf. Visser II:771, Mitchell II:5, etc.).

Although in principle writers may choose suitable narrative methods according to their own preference, i.e, they may tell the story entirely through indirect discourse, direct discourse or a mixture of both (cf. Schaulke 1954:95), we may ask: what made writers choose one form over another? In general, the use of discourse of any type is a communicative strategy, or a narrative technique, which contains aspects to be considered when it comes to the written word. First, unlike ModE which uses single or double apostrophes to clearly mark direct discourse from the rest of the text, there was no punctuation in OE and ME, so the presence or absence of the subordinator *that* (or *how* or a *wh*-word) in complementation was one of the main syntactic distinctions between the ways of conveying discourse. Secondly, literary aspects such as style, character enhancement, accuracy, vivid narrations, testimonial

dialogues, etc., along with linguistic aspects such as identification of the grammatical subject or antecedent, are also involved in the use of either direct discourse or indirect discourse. With respect to the latter, and considering the lack of punctuation, different types of discourse may refer to different grammatical persons. For instance, in the direct discourse sentence *And he said, I called not.* (1Samuel 3:5), notice that the personal pronoun *'I'* refers undoubtedly back to the same grammatical person, in this case, *He*. However, in an indirect discourse version of the same sentence (*And he said that I called not.*), i.e., where the complementizer *that* is introduced, *'I'* now refers to the speaker, and not to the higher subject *He*. In this case, there is a distinction made between the speaker and the performer (cf. Schaulke 92). So, in order to avoid misundertstanding, ambiguity or instances of reanalysis, a sort of discourse distinction would be necessary to clarify and help the flow of communication.

In another more complex instance, Mitchell (1985) even makes a triple distinction differenciating the speaker (the original writer), the performer (the subject of the noun clause), and the reporter (who may come between the writer and the speaker) (cf. II:5). We will see later on that the latter will be a pertinent distinction when analysing the Gospels, where a writer such as St. Matthew actually hands the narrative voice over to Jesus to convey to the reader some specific events. With respect to the relationship between direct and indirect discourse, Gorrell (1895) sustains that "the cause of this variation is due to the two different points of view with which these expressions are regarded; the interest may be centred about the speaker and the time when the statement is made (…) in many cases, however, the attention is directed more specially to the statement itself, and oftentimes, by reason of this, all connection with the governing verb is lost sight of and the exact words or contents of the narration are given in direct form" (477).

The Anglo-Saxon Gospels are, for instance, full of dialogues and narrative discourses in which four different books are written by four different apostles (The Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John, respectively), narrating the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

3. 3. Beyond OE Part 1

3. 3. 1. Latin influence

"The island Britain is eight hundred miles long, and two hundred miles broad. And here in this island are five nations: English, British, Scottish, Pictish, and Latin."
[Anglo-Saxon Chronicle Part I, 1861:3]

The history of English shows that it is a melting pot language. Celtic, Latin, Scandinavian, Norman French, Greek, etc., have all had (to varying extents) an influence on English at different points in time. Latin was already being used when the Germanic tribes arrived in England around AD 445. Following the rise of Christianity, Latin also served to introduce the Latin-Roman alphabet, which helped in developing written forms of English. Latin became the official language of the English Church following Christianization in the sixth century AD.

The English people, while isolated from Europe geographically and linguistically, utilised Latin as an international auxiliary bridge to obtain access to the rich Roman and Ancient Greek cultures. Latin was Western Europe's *lingua franca* for more than a millennium. By the fifteenth century AD, the bulk of printed books (incunabula) were written in Latin (about 70%). When it comes to academia, Latin was the language used by European scholars until the nineteenth century AD. In fact, England became one of the first countries in Europe with a truly bilingual intelligentsia. English would eventually incorporate a massive word borrowing from the Latin language.

3. 3. 2. Christianity and the arrival of The Sacred Scriptures

"Now is our trust in the beloved God, that they possess bliss joyfully with Christ."
 [Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, entry AD 1036, 1861:294]

The Roman people who remained in England after the Roman withdrawal, around the beginning of the fifth century AD, had accepted Christianity as their religion. So, like Latin, Christianity was already present in England before the arrival of the Germanic tribes. By AD 700, England had adopted it as the official religion.

In addition to the linguistic situation, there were also religious, political and historical contexts to consider at the time. Religious writing was important not only to the development of English writing, but also to the English language itself. Works such as the Anglo-Saxon Gospels and Ælfric's writing (The Heptateuch, Catholic Homilies, etc.) were fulfilling King Alfred's dream of translating The Sacred Scriptures into English. In a time when Christianity was constantly expanding and deepening across England, and due to the existence of dialectal varieties, the translation of religious writing had a double political purpose. This largely involved a religious and linguistic unification of the kingdom. Thus, religious writing had, for instance, a big influence on English linguistic standardization; it displayed the proper ways to

write a good deal of syntactic structures and improve vocabulary, etc. The thought behind this idea was simple, but powerful: the divinely inspired word of God must be correct. In this sense, religious writing was creating a kind of linguistic legitimization for syntactic structures within its boundaries. For Anglo-Saxons, The Sacred Scriptures had several features that made them more precious than any other type of writing:

a) The Revelation

The Sacred Scriptures are unique books inspired by God, not man. Anglo-Saxons really believed that those texts were divinely inspired. This was not considered common writing, it was writing about God, Jesus Christ, The Saints, the creation of earth and man, heaven and hell, etc. And it was all available in English for the very first time.

The people's general interest in The Sacred Scriptures would guarantee permanent attention to the Gospels by different social groups. The Gospels were a long-expected compilation, passed down from kings to servants, and from scholars to illiterates.

b) The Sacred Scriptures were written in Latin

Anglo-Saxons considered Latin to be the perfect language, which should be admired and imitated. The Lord's word written in Latin was a sublime treasure, and one single sentence provided more credibility and persuasion than a thousand in any other writing.

c) Repetition

The Sacred Scriptures are a timeless example of writing. The same sentences were repeated over and over throughout the centuries in monasteries, churches, social meeting points, schools (about 20 in OE and more than 50 in ME), homes, etc. The word of God was quoted everywhere, and often used for support, such as in the phrases: 'It is written in the Gospels,' or 'We read in the holy writings' ("And that's the Gospel truth" Baron 2000:49).

Furthermore, both the English Church and the governments (kingdoms) regularly prioritised, if not imposed, the Gospels over any other writing.

d) Literary, social and political influential writing

As Christianity became the official religion of the kingdom, religious writing was far more popular than any other type of writing. God's word was never closer to people's minds, translated in their own voice through the English renderings.

With more than 600 pages, an unusual extension at the time, the Anglo-Saxon Gospels were undoubtedly the greatest literary works of OE and most of ME due to their social importance.

3. 3. 3. An English linguistic challenge: faithful rendering vs. idiomatic rendering

At the time when Christianity was the most influential power in society, those who were accused or suspected of altering, misinterpreting or misquoting God's word were often charged with blasphemy. Religious writing was above any rules of grammar or language. Although it at times defied idiomatic practice, God's word had to be written exactly as it was quoted. Since, in principle, nobody had the authority to alter or change the word of the Lord, the translation of The Sacred Scriptures implicitly imposed a requirement of accuracy. Thus, as a presumption of their truth (Jesus' miracles, the commandments, etc.), more faithfulness in renderings was expected.

In this way, the rendering processes put English under scrutiny by forcing it to prove its structural syntactic capacity to render Latin properly. In the Preface of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, Bosworth (1888) states that "the Scriptures contain the revelation of God's will to man, - God's word addressed to all mankind. As the Scriptures are Truth, the closer we adhere to them, the nearer we are to Truth. But the nearest approach we can make to the inspired originals, is in faithful translations" (i).

Although King Alfred also translated several pieces from Latin into English (Pastoral Care, Orosius, Boethius, etc.), faithfulness in renderings was not a requisite at the time. In fact, by prioritising idiomatic principles of the target language (English) over those of the source language (Latin), Alfred the Great used a different translation technique. He wrote that he translated "hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgit of andgiete" ('Sometimes word by word, sometimes according to the sense' Brown 1970:17). This means that possible linguistic differences in translation were adapted by this technique into more idiomatic or English-like renderings.

We will now observe how the English language dealt with such significant writing, since its mainly dual and rigid subordination system, as shown in (9), was about to be challenged.

Chapter IV

External and internal developments in English subordination by the end of the tenth century AD.

4. 1. External developments: OE and the Latin connection, the missing link.

The various manners in which the Anglo-Saxon Gospels were translated show:

4. 1. 1. Literal or word-for-word translations

According to Brown (1970), there has been some disagreement among studies regarding the structural influence of Latin on English syntax and style for a long time, involving aspects related to "a construction's ultimate origin, its extension to match the function of a Latin construction, its reinforcement by Latin influence" (12). Brown further quotes the works of Callaway (1889), von Schaubert (1954), and Scheler (1961). For his part, Jespersen (1912) affirms that "Latin has influenced English not only in vocabulary, but also in style and syntax. (…) Latin grammar was the only grammar taught in those days, and the only grammar found worthy of study and imitation" (126-7; also cf. Rissanen 2006). Data reveals that most OE writing was either inspired by, based on or translated from Latin (King Alfred's, Anglo-Saxon Gospels, Ælfric's, etc.). Latin texts of Gildas (sixth century AD) and the Venerable Bede (seventh and eighth centuries AD) were actually used in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. At this point, an important question arises: how could writers and translators complete literal translations from Latin into English, as they themselves admitted, without also importing syntactic elements and structures?

Although the Gospels were originally written in Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic, they were translated into English from the Latin Vulgate version. A highly developed Latin had no problems utilising the Greek particle *öti*, which was rendered by the Latin particles *quia* or *quod* (also *quis*, *ut*, *quoniam*). This would in turn be rendered by the English subordinator *that* (cf. Spieker 1884, Mitchell 1984, Roberts & Roussou 2003, etc.). While Latin conveyed both direct and indirect discourse with or without *quia* or *quod*, English had a smaller, stricter and syntactically less flexible subordination system.

The first attempt to bring The Sacred Scriptures into England was through the introduction of The Lindisfarne Gospels (also called The Durham Gospels), written in Latin by Eadfrith, a bishop of Lindisfarne, around AD 700. Aldred, also a bishop of Lindisfarne, eventually glossed these texts word-for-word into OE around AD 950 (OED). Unlike other writings, The

Sacred Scriptures have their own logic due to preservation of the original texts (the older, the better); thus, the linguistic and literary value of The Lindisfarne Gospels comes from being the oldest extant renderings of the Gospels into OE. Despite being incomplete, another version of an interlinear gloss of the Gospels (The Farman Gospels or The Rushworth Gospels) appeared around the same time, at approximately AD 975 (OED). The Lindisfarne Gospels made up the foundational texts of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, which appeared at about AD 990-5.

We will observe below that renderings were done in different ways, which in turn created some inevitable variation in subordinate structures. The following example illustrates, for instance, the approximate chronological transcription and renderings of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew from the original text in Latin, the interlinear gloss and different manuscripts in OE:

(10) St. Matthew 16:18

Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus	(Lindisfarne, AD 710)
7 ic cueðo ðe forðon ðu arð staðolfæst stan	(Aldred's Lind., AD 950)
Ic ðe secge þæt þu eart stænen.	(Ælfric's CH. I 364.17, AD 990-5)
And ic secge ðe, ðæt ðu eart Petrus,	(A-S Gospels, AD 990-5)
and I say you that you are peter	
'And I say to you that you are Peter.'	

The Corpus Christi and the Hatton manuscripts (MSS.) also display the same rendering as used in the Gospels. This excerpt represents the dialogue between Jesus and the apostle Simon. It appears rendered with a *that*-clause, which was included in order to remain faithful to the original text. All of these manuscripts present a literal or word-for-word rendering, including an OE equivalent or corresponding particle for the Latin *quia*, by using the English conjunction *that* (also *forðon*). Notice also that the word order in the first and the second clause both in Latin and in OE surfaces an SVO word order, with the exception of the first one in Ælfric's text. Direct discourse conveyed by a *that*-clause was not one of the mainstream syntactic structures of the time. This is because "in the Gospels the conj. *þæt* commonly introduces what is really direct speech under the influence of Latin." (Mitchell 1985:II 7; also cf. Gorrell:482, Henshaw 1894:17, etc.). For his part, Bright (1906) sustains that "the translator uses *þæt* to represent *quia* in the function of a particle to introduce direct discourse" (119). A good deal of such examples appear in the Gospels, among others: St.

Matthew 5:28, 13:17, 17:12, etc.; St. Mark 3:28, 9:1, 23:30, etc.; St. Luke 21:32, 22:16, 22:18, etc.; St. John 1:32, 3:11, 4:39, etc.

Of course, the traditional structure used to convey direct discourse at that time through a *that*-less clause is also of frequent appearance, as shown in the next example:

(11) St. Mark 8:29

   Respondens petrus   ait   ei   tú és christus.   (Lindisfarne)

  ge-onduearde petrus   cuoeð   him ðu arð crist.   (Aldred's Lind.)

Ðá andswarode Petrus him, and cwæþ, Ðú eart Crist.   (A-S Gospels)

then answered   peter   him and said   you are christ

'Then Peter answered him and said: "You are Christ."'

Compare now the variation in subordination between the two previous examples in (10) and (11). As we can observe in (11), The Lindisfarne Gospels now reveals no Latin particle in subordination. The Rushworth, The Corpus Christi, The Hatton and Ælfric's MSS. utilise the same renderings as the Gospels. A good deal of examples such as this are found in the Gospels, among others: St. Matthew 20:22, 21:41, 25:12, etc.; St. Mark 6:25, 8:12, 9:41, etc.; St. Luke 3:16, 4:21, 7:9, etc.; St. John 1:51, 5:19, 10:7, etc.

Other examples in the Gospels show a kind of variation in which similar sentences appeared rendered as direct and as indirect discourse with no other syntactic difference in subordination than the complementizer *that*. Consider the following:

(12) St. Matthew 6:2

Soþ ic secge eow, hí onféngon hyra mede.

truly I say   you they received their reward

'I truly say to you they received their reward.'

Compare now Example (12) to Example (13), which follows in the same chapter:

(13) St. Matthew 6:16

Soþ ic secge eow, ðæt hi onféngon hyra méde.

truly I say   you that they received their reward

'I truly say to you that they received their reward.'

Since these sentences are indeed translations, a relevant question here may be: is the English writer who has rendered the text in this way alternating the subordinator *that* in complementation, or is there some kind of influence from the source language of Latin? Again, a closer look into The Lindisfarne Gospels shows the following interlinear gloss:

(14) St. Matthew 6:2

Amen dico vobis, receperunt mercedem suam	(Lindisfarne)
soð is ic cueðo iuh to hie gefengon mearde hiora	(Aldred's Lind.)
Soþ ic secge eow, hí onféngon hyra mede.	(A-S Gospels)

Example (14) shows that neither the Latin *quia* (or similar) nor an OE particle is present in subordination. However, the same sentence rendered later in the same chapter introduces a variation in complementation:

(15) St. Matthew 6:16

A dico vobis, quia receperunt mercedem suam	(Lindisfarne)
soð is ic cueðo iuh to forðon hie gefengon mearde hiora	(Aldred's Lind.)
Sóþlíce ic secge eow, ðæt hig onféngo hyra méde.	(A-S Gospels)

These sentences in (15) use both the Latin *quia* and the corresponding OE particle *dæt/forðon*. It appears that the English writer is doing nothing else other than following the previous manuscripts and rendering them literally into English. Examples like these represent the syntactic evidence of external influence on the OE used to render Latin, where alternation in subordination is directly introduced by literal or word-for-word renderings.
Another similar example is illustrated in Example (16) when the same sentence spoken by Jesus is actually rendered with variation in subordination by two different apostles. According to St. Matthew, Jesus said:

(16) St. Matthew 4:4

Hit ys áwriten, Ne leofaþ se man be hláfe ánum;
 it   is written   not live the man by bread only
'It is written: "Man shall not live on bread only.'

However, according to St. Luke, Jesus said:

(17) St. Luke 4:4

Hit is áwriten, Ðæt se man ne lyfaþ be hláfe ánum.

  it is written that the man not live by bread only

'It is written that man shall not live on bread only.'

The evidence shows that this variation in subordination is the result of a literal translation, as shown below:

(18) St. Matthew 4:4

scribtum est non in pane solo vivit homo   (Lindisfarne)

awritten is ne in hlaf ane hlifes menn   (Aldred's Lind.)

Hit ys áwriten, Ne leofaþ se man be hláfe ánum,   (A-S Gospels)

  it is written   not live the man by bread alone

'It is written: "Man shall not live by bread alone."'

Compare the structure of the previous example, which contains no Latin *quia* and no corresponding or equivalent OE *that*, to the following one:

(19) St. Luke 4:4

scribtum est quia non in pane solo uiuet homo   (Lindisfarne)

 auritten is Ⱦte ne in hlafe ane lifes monn   (Aldred's Lind.)

Hit is áwriten, Ðæt se man ne lyfaþ be hláfe ánum,   (A-S Gospels)

 it is written that the man not live by bread alone

'It is written that man shall not live by bread alone.'

The structure *It is written (that)…* also presents variation in different sentences, as in the two instances of St. Matthew 4:7 (Ø) and St. Matthew 4:6 (*that*), respectively.

On the other hand, syntactic structures involving neither discourse nor verb of saying also appear in the Gospels, as shown in the next example:

(20) St. John 21:25

nec ipsum arbitror mundum capere eos qui scribendi sunt libros.   (Lindisfarne)

ne doemo ic Ⱦti middangeord mægi bifoa ðailco ðaðe to aurittene sint boéc. (Aldred's Lind.)

ic wene ne mihte þes middan-eard ealle þa bec befon.   (Corpus Christi)

ic wéne ne mihte ðes middan-eard ealle ða béc befón.   (A-S Gospels)

I suppose Ø not might the world   all the books comprehend

'I suppose the world might not grasp all the books.'

The sentence in Example (20) represents a *that*-less clause (also cf. Foxe 408, Liuzza 202, etc.).

There is also variation within the structure of the phrase *It came to pass (that)…,* as shown in Examples (21) and (22):

(21) St. Luke 7:11

et factum est inceps ibat in ciuitatem	(Lindisfarne)
7 aworden wæs æfter ðon foerde on ceastre	(Aldred's Lind.)
Þa wæs syððan gewórden he férde on þa þa ceastre	(Corpus Christi)
Þa wæs syððen ge-worðen he ferde on þa ceastre	(Hatton)
Ða wæs syððan geworden he férde on ða ceastre,	(A-S Gospels)

then was after came to pass Ø he went on the city
'It afterward came to pass (that) he went into a city.'

(22) St. Luke 8:1

et factum est deinceps et ipse iter faciebat per ciutatem	(Lindisfarne)
7 aworden wæs æfter ðon 7 he geong dyde ðerh ceastra	(Aldred's Lind.)
Syððan wæs geworden Ᵽ he ferde þurh þa ceastre.	(Corpus Christi)
Syððon wæs ge-worðen þæt he ferde þurh þa ceastren.	(Hatton)
Syððan wæs geworden, ðæt he férde þurh ða ceastre,	(A-S Gospels)

after was came to pass that he went through the city
'It afterward came to pass that he went through the city.'

Examples like these illustrate variation in subordination as a direct result of the translation of the Gospels. Now, we will observe below more variation in subordinate structures of a different sort, i.e., as the result of rather different rendering processes than that of literality.

4. 1. 2. Mistakes in renderings

In addition to literal or word-for-word renderings seen in the previous section, the evidence also shows that different types of translation mistakes were sometimes made. The implicit faithfulness requirements that such significant writing implied were not always followed literally. In agreement or disagreement with the original Latin, English renderings failed several times to represent the Latin particles properly, and in several instances, the Gospels

even show "misapprehensions of the meaning" (Harris 1901:12, 35, 38, etc.). Moreover, the fact that literal translations could produce some unidiomatic structures in English forced omissions, adaptations and paraphrasing in many renderings, and not always in the same places. Several examples reveal that the subordinator *that* was either lost, gained or substituted in translations, which in turn provoked the emergence or activation of the structure of the alternation. Bright (1906) sustains, for instance, that even though the structure conveying direct discourse with a *that*-clause is "of frequent occurrence… in some instances the particle is not reproduced" (119), and he quotes several examples in St. John 7:12, 9:9, 9:17, 9:23, 11:31, 20:18, etc., (also cf. Gorrell 1895).

4. 1. 2. 1. Lost in translation

There are several cases where the subordinator *that* or a conjunctive particle is present in The Lindisfarne Gospels, but not in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels. These include instances of omissions in translations, as the following examples show:

(23) St. Mark 1:24

scio quis es sanctus dei	(Lindisfarne)
ic wat hwæt ðu arð haligwer godes	(Aldred's Lind.)
ic wat þu eart godes halga;	(Corpus Christi)
Ich wat þu ert godes halge.	(Hatton)
ic wát ðú eart Godes hálga.	(A-S Gospels)

I know Ø you are god's holy man

'I know you are God's holy man.'

The structure that appears in the Gospels, the Hatton and the Corpus Christi MMS. (also cf. Foxe 122, Liuzza 64, etc.), a *that*-less clause that involves neither discourse nor verb of saying, did not represent the idiomatic complement clause in OE. A similar case is presented in the next example:

(24) St. John 4:19

domine uideo quia propheta és tú	(Lindisfarne)
drihten ic geseom Ᵽte ðu arð uitga	(Aldred's Lind.)
Leof þas me þincð þu ert witega;	(Hatton)
leof. þæs me ðincþ þu ert witega.	(Corpus Christi)

Leof, ðæs ðe me þincþ,   ðú eart wítega.   (A-S Gospels)

  sir   because   I think Ø you are prophet

'Sir, because I think you are a prophet.'

As we can observe in Example (24), while The Lindisfarne Gospels include both the Latin particle *quia* and the corresponding OE *that*, the manuscripts of The Hatton, The Corpus Christi and the Anglo-Saxon Gospels show a Ø-complementation (also cf. Foxe 327, Liuzza 63, etc.). Several instances like the examples above are found in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, among others: St. Matthew 18:19; St. Mark 6:15, 9:26; St. Luke 4:21, 4:43, 5:26; St. John 1:20, 10:7, 20:18, etc.

There are also cases of variation in subordination where the same sentence appears with and without the subordinator *that* among different manuscripts, as shown below:

(25) St. John 10:7

  amen dico uobis quia ego sum ostium ouium   (Lindisfarne)

    ic cuoeðo iuh Ꝥte ic am duru ðara scipa   (Aldred's Lind.)

soð is ic cæeðo iow Ꝥte ic   am   dura ðara scipa.   (Rushworth)

  Sóþ, ic eow secge,   ic   eom sccapa geat.   (A-S Gospels)

  truly I you   say   I   am sheepfold's gate

'I truly say to you (that) I am the door of the sheepfold.'

There is some variation in Example (25) as the Anglo-Saxon Gospels show a Ø-complementizer, while The Rushworth Gospels and Aldred MMS. show *that*. A similar case can be found in the next excerpt:

(26) St. Luke 9:54

drihten wilt ðu Ꝥte we coeda Ꝥte fyr ofduna astige of heofnum   (Aldred's Lind.)

drihten wiltu ðæt we cweðe Ꝥte fyrr ofdune astige of heofnum   (Rushworth)

Dríhten. wyltu we secgað Ꝥ fyr cume of heofene   (Corpus Chrsiti)

Drihten, wilt þu Ꝥ we seggen þæt fer cume of heofene   (Hatton)

Drihten, wylt ðú we secgaþ, ðæt fyr cume of heofone,   (A-S Gospels)

  lord, will you Ø we say Ø the fire comes of heven

'Lord, do you want we say the fire comes from heaven.'

As can be observed in the aforementioned example, there is variation among the different MMS. While the Anglo-Saxon Gospels and The Corpus Christi MSS. show Ø subordinator in the first clause, the Aldred's Lindisfarne, The Hatton MS. and The Rushworth Gospels show *that*.

Several examples similar to (26) are found among different manuscripts of the Gospels, among others:

a) St. Luke 13:2. While the Gospels, The Corpus Christi and The Hatton MSS. show (Ø), The Rushworth Gospels shows (*ðætte*).

b) St. John 1:20. Whereas the Gospels, The Corpus Christi and The Hatton MSS. show (Ø), The Rushworth Gospels shows (*forðon*).

c) St. John 1:50. While the Gospels, The Corpus Christi and The Hatton MSS. show (Ø), The Roshworth Gospels shows (*forðon*).

4. 1. 2. 2. Gained in translation

Unlike the instances presented in the previous section, the Anglo-Saxon Gospels also contain examples where the subordinator *that* was gained in renderings. Commenting on this instance and the following example, Mitchell (1985) says that "as Gorell points out, there are instances in which the conjunction appears in the OE but not in the Latin." (II:7). He illustrates this with the following example:

(27) St. Matthew 27:11

Dicit	ei	Jesus,	Tu dicis.		(Lindisfarne)
cueð	him ðe hælend		ðu cueðes		(Aldred's Lind.)
Ða cwæð se Hælend,		Ðæt ðu segst.			(Corpus Christi)
Ða cwæð se Hælend,		Ðæt þu segst.			(Hatton)
Ða cwæþ se Hælend,		Ðæt du segst.			(A-S Gospels)

then said the   lord   that you say

'Then the Lord said that you say.'

As we can observe in the structure above, The Corpus Christi, The Hatton and the Gospels MSS. include a *that* with a majuscule which actually does not appear in The Lindisfarne Gospels. Other examples that illustrate this instance are shown below:

(28) St. Matthew 27:64

    Et dicant   plebi   surrexit a mortuis   (Lindisfarne)

  7 cuoða ðæm folce   arise/aras from deadum,   (Aldred's Lind.)

and secgeon þam folce, þæt he aryse od deaþe;   (Corpus Christi)

 7   seggen þam folke þæt he arise of deaðe;   (Hatton)

and secgeon ðam folce, ðæt he áryse of deaþe;   (A-S Gospels)

and   say those people that he rose of the dead

'And they say to those people that he is risen from the dead.'

(29) St. Mark 6:49

  putauerunt   phantasma esse   (Lindisfarne)

 hia woendon   yfel wiht were   (Aldred's Lind.)

hiæ woendun   yfel wiht were   (Rushworth)

 hí wendon ðæt hit unfæle gást wære,   (A-S Gospels)

they supposed that it evil ghost were

'They supposed that it was a bad spirit.'

Several instances of *that* gained in translation are found in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, among others: St. Matthew 26:5, 26:29; St. Mark 12:18; St. Luke 18:14; St. John 12:29, etc.

4. 1. 2. 3. Replacement

The Anglo-Saxon Gospels also contain several instances where the Latin particle *quia* was not rendered with the normal corresponding English subordinator *that*, but instead it was replaced by an adverb. This in turn made a structure with Ø-complementizer emerge in subordination, as shown in Example (29):

(30) St. Mark 9:26

ita   ut   multi dicerent quia mortuus est   (Lindisfarne)

suæ ꝥte monige cuoedon ꝥte dead were/wæs   (Aldred's Lind.)

swa ꝥte monige cwedun ðætte deod is/were   (Rushworth)

Swa ꝥ manega cwædon sóðlíce he is dead;   (Corpus Christi)

Swa ꝥ manega cwæðen sóþlíce he is dead.   (Hatton)

swa ðæt manega cwædon, sóþlíce he is dead.   (A-S Gospels)

 so that many   said   truly he is dead

'So that many said he is truly dead.'

In the previous example, all the sub-clauses in the manuscripts including the replacement show an SVO word order. Several cases like this appear in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, among others: St. Mark 11:23, 12:6, 13:6; St. Luke 4:21, etc.

4. 1. 2. 3. Other variations
Different styles of translation also contributed to variation in subordination. These variations can be found not only by different writers or in different readings, but also within the same manuscript. Consider the following examples:

(31) St. Mark 6:15
Sume cwædon, He is Elias;
  some   said   he is elias
'Some said: "He is Elias."'

Now, compare the structure in (31) to Ælfric' rendering of the same sentence in (32):

(32) CH. I, 364.12
; sume secgað þæt ðu sy helias.
  some   said that you are elias
'Some said that you are Elias.'

It is clear in the contemporaneous sentences in (31) and (32) that the difference is not only in the choice to use the conjunction *that*, but also in the personal pronoun used in the sub-clause.

In different readings of the Gospels, there are cases where a particle present in The Lindisfarne Gospels is omitted (or appears) in just one of those readings, as shown below:

(33) St. Matthew 23:16 (The Corpus Christi MS.)
Wa eow, blindan latteowas, ge secgeað, Swa hwylc swa swereð on temple, Þ he ys naht;
woe you blind   guides   you say   whosoever swears on temple that he is nothiong
'Woe to you blind guides, you say whoever swears by the temple that he is nothing.'

Compare now this same sentence rendered in a different manuscript:

(34) St. Matthew 23:16 (The Hatton MS.)

Wa eow, blinde liceteras, ge seggeð, Swa hwylce swa swereð on temple, Þ ys naht;

woe you blind guides you say whosoever swears on temple Ø that is nothing

'Woe to you, blind guides, you say, whoever swears by the temple, that is nothing.'

We may discuss here the function of *that*: is it a complementizer or a demonstrative pronoun? If it were the former, the sentence would lack the formal subject in the sub-clause like in the previous example; if it were the latter, *that* would be a complementizer which became a demonstrative pronoun due to the absence of the formal subject. So, the antecedent was mistaken (cf. Harris 43).

The Anglo-Saxon Gospels also contain some structures which reveal a kind of idiomatic adaptation, among others:

a) Latin sentence initial *Quia* (*That*) was omitted in St. Matthew 18:17, etc. (also cf. Traugott 1972:102).

b) There are cases of clause redistribution, as in St. John 1:50; St. John 18:9, etc. (cf. Bright 120:169).

c) There are also instances where direct discourse was rendered as indirect discourse or viceversa, as in St. John 20:18, etc.

It is possible that discrepancy in translations that may appear to be mistakes probably were not regarded as such in the past, neither literarily nor linguistically. God's word has always been considered perfect the way it is;

in fact, updates have never been made to the texts, as that would be irreconcilable with the conception of God's word as divinely inspired. On the contrary, "the idea that the Gospels (or the Bible more generally) stands as the ultimate source of truth and authority was a powerful assumption in medieval England" (Baron 2000:49). This includes not only the text of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, but also Ælfric's religious writing. The Gospels represented the divinely inspired, perfect and timeless word of God, meant to be followed and not questioned, as no one was in a position to challenge God's word. In the end, regardless of the reason, the previous examples show that syntactic structures including variation in subordination started to appear within The Sacred Scriptures in a different way from the mainstream OE subordination. God's word gave to those structures a sort of literary and linguistic legitimization that no other writing could ever reach.

All of the examples of the external developments presented in this section constitute the syntactic evidence that the OE subordination system is to a certain extent connected to the

Latin one. In fact, The Lindisfarne Gospels show that almost the whole of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels are a literal gloss rendering from Latin. A basic and consequent assumption at this point may be that if Latin had some sort of alternation in complementation, English might sooner or later acquire it as well through literal or close translations due to strong linguistic influence, especially that of significant and influential religious writing.

In addition to this type of development, we will now see a slightly different one happening contemporaneously, this time more internally.

4. 2. Internal developments

4. 2. 1. Linguistic and literary elite

Generally, knowledge is associated with competence and power. This includes linguistic knowledge, which provides enough confidence and strength to introduce changes and novelties. In old times, with no formal schooling system, there was a big gap in the process of knowledge acquisition; it was mainly a personal matter and a privilege of the elite or intelligentsia. Most people in that elite, made up of writers, scribes, monks, bishops, aristocrats, linguists, etc., were bilingual and/or translators themselves.

The presence of a bilingual elite or intelligentsia with literary and linguistic competence has always played a crucial role throughout the history of English writing. After all, those people performed the translations, introduced borrowings and wrote the texts, extending their influence even beyond their own time, while transmitting the English heritage of the linguistic and literary legacy further. As each historical period has its own intelligentsia, the list of names is long, among others: Bede, Eadfrith, Alfred, Aldred, Ælfric, Laȝamon, Chaucer, Wycliffe, Tyndale, Shakespeare, etc. Because of their bilingual skills, most of the elite and/or competent Latinists were likely aware of the existence in both OE and in ME of most of these Latin structures examined previously, i.e., that there were other known ways of complementation beyond those used and/or allowed in English at the time.

The prolific abbot Ælfric of Eynsham, also known as Ælfric the Grammarian, was definitely an exclusive member of that elite. He was a leading scholar and one of the foremost prose stylists in OE, and also taught Latin to monks. Even though Ælfric did introduce literary and linguistic innovations through his translations and writing, he mostly used traditional OE syntactic structures as well. This is because he was not mainly preoccupied with syntax, but rather with liturgy and discourse, highlighting meaningful religious passages. Ælfric (c. AD 999) stated that "I know that words can be construed in many different ways, but to avoid

raising difficulties I follow the simplest meaning. If anyone is offended at it he can call it my construction" (The first English-Latin Grammar 49; also cf. Whitehouse 1983:3). Here, in a humble homage to Ælfricus, we will denominate such structures as he suggested.

4. 2. 2. Ælfric's constructions
Simultaneous to the external influences discussed in the previous section, internal English developments in subordination also occurred by the end of the tenth century AD.

a) Ælfric's first attempt
Ælfric also experienced the requirement of faithfulness regarding renderings from The Sacred Scriptures or Latin to a certain extent (cf. Waterhouse 1983:3). As we saw above, Ælfric's first attempt was a literal or word-for word rendering of some structures, as in the emblematic sentence found in Example (10): *Ic ðe secge, þæt þu eart stænen*. However, this Latin teacher was to try new approaches as well.

b) Ælfric's second attempt: breaking down discourse and paraphrasing
Ælfric The Homilist is also known for his three series of Catholic Homilies, The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. A homily is defined as a biblical commentary that normally follows the reading of The Scriptures. Sheltered by this literary license and style, which in religious writing allows the combination of personal commentaries alongside passages of The Scriptures, Ælfric introduced an interesting syntactic variation involving the alternation. He broke discourse down by deconstructing large and/or more complex structures into more direct and more vivid pieces of discourse. In addition to his first literal translation of this sentence, Ælfric's second attempt relied upon a paraphrasing of the same sentence. This version renders a somewhat more idiomatic or English-like expression in direct discourse, where he only quotes the final and most meaningful part of the original sentence:

(35) CH. I 368.11
drihten cwæð to petre. þu eart stænen;
  lord   said   to petre you are stone
'The Lord said to Peter: "You are stone."'

By writing in his homiletic style, Ælfric has deconstructed his own previous sentence (*Ic ðe secge þæt þu eart stænen*) by paraphrasing the rendering using his own voice (*drihten cwæð*

to petre) and quoting only what he considered the most essential part of that sentence (*þu eart stænen*). Ælfric has now shortened the discourse, stressing thus the subordinate clause. The sentence is now conveyed with a structure that actually allows direct speech to surface in greater accordance to OE idiomatic correctness or parameters. In this process, he did not need the conjunction *that* anymore, so it was omitted.

c) Ælfric's third attempt: reformulation

In The Second Series of his Catholic Homilies, Ælfric made a third attempt at rendering the same sentence directly through a *that*-less clause. After breaking down the sentence, Ælfric realised that the Latin direct discourse (rendered as the typical English indirect discourse, i.e., with the conjunction *that*) should be rendered as English direct discourse, since the communicational situation in which the dialogue takes place is actually direct. The following example includes Ælfric's first and third attempts, the latter in two different MSS.:

(36)

Ic ðe secge þæt þu eart stænen.	(CH. I 364.17)
Ic secge ðe þu eart petrus,	(CH. II 390.1)
Ic secge þe, Þu eart Petrus	(CH. II, Thorpe 390)

 I   say you you are Peter

'I say to you (that) you are Peter.'

When it comes to Example (36), an interesting rhetorical question for Ælfric would be: what did Jesus actually say? Notice also that the word order in the first clause has now turned into an SVO word order. This matches all the clauses in all the other MSS., following the word order of the original Latin. Ælfric is thus giving the voice of Jesus more protagonism, creating thus an alternative syntactic structure to both that of the Gospels and that of his own first attempt. There is an interesting literary idea in Waterhouse's analysis of Ælfric's writing, referring to the use of direct or indirect discourse, highlighting or diminishing the importance of characters, etc. (cf. Waterhouse 1976:88).

A question at this stage could be: why did Ælfric render alternating subordination? Some idiomatic and literary aspects might explain this variation, among them:

a) Ælfric's translation style: he prioritised meaning over literality.

b) Ælfric's literary style: Ælfric had much experience in religious writing and knew well the power and the advantages of direct speech in liturgical literature such as focus, emphasis, vivid narration, etc. (cf. Schuelke 95). Ælfric's reformulations might then have been for

literary effect by highlighting vivid or dramatic impetus in the dialogues of the Lord, since direct discourse conveyed by historical present is the most powerful literary and rhetorical device used to (re)create the narration of past events more vividly.

c) Linguistic principles: Ælfric deconstructed the structure of Jesus' words conveyed first by direct speech with a *that*-clause, and although literal, it surfaced like indirect speech. He then clarified the sentence by rendering it in a more idiomatic or English-like structure of coveying direct discourse for that time, i.e., direct speech with a *that*-less clause.

Now we are able to understand all of Ælfric's three attempts more clearly. If we do not take into account all of the literary and linguistic aspects mentioned above, it would be almost impossible to understand why Ælfric is syntactically alternating the subordination within the same sentence. At this point, it is a bit strange that several studies in OE syntax (cf. Gorrell, Mitchell, etc.) do not consider this variation and, despite having all these sentences available, they do not compare them when analysing differences in OE subordination. We may suppose that it would require providing different idiomatic reasons to explain almost identical structures, which is not along their analytical lines.

4. 2. 2. 1. More variation
Ælfric's constructions also show variation in the following subordinate structures.

a) With verb of saying

(37) Lives of Saints, Sancti Basilii 72.372-3.
Þær he healice sæt mid his hel-cnihtum
there he exalted sat with his hell-servants
and cwæð he wolde wið-sacan his criste.
and said Ø he would renounce his christ
'There he exalted sat with his hell's servants
and said he would renounce his Christ.'

b) Within the same or similar sentence
In Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, for instance, similar sentences appear rendered with variation in subordination. Mitchell (1985) illustrates this instance by saying that "while Ælfric sometimes quotes without preamble from the Scriptures or the Works of the Fathers, he

frequently prefaces such quotations with the conj. *þæt*" (7). Notice the variation in complementation in the two following examples:

(38) CH. I 618.21

Se witega cwæð. ⟨þ⟩ se miccla godes dæig is swiþe gehende.

the wise man said that the great god's day is very   near

'The prophet said that the great day of God is very near.'

Mitchell immediately adds that "the same quotation appears in direct speech" (7):

(39) CH. I 618.10

þam dæge cwæð se witega sophonia. se miccla godes dæig is swiðe gehende.

That day said the wise man sophonia the great   god's day   is   very   near

'That day, the prophet Sophonia said: "The great day of God is very near."'

c) Differences with the Gospels

(40) CH. I, 340.16.

ic secge eow. mare bliss bið on heofonum be anum synfullan men,

I   say   you more joy is   on heaven   by one   sinful   man

'I say to you: "There is more joy in heaven over one sinful man."'

However, according to the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, Jesus said:

(41) St Luke 15:7

Ic secge eow, dæt swá byþ on heofone blis be ánum synfullum

I   say   you   that so   is   on heaven joy by   one   sinner

'I say to you that so joy shall be in heaven over one sinner.'

We have already seen the following example; now, the two versions are put together:

(42) St. Mark 6:15

Sume cwædon, He is Elias;   (A-S Gospels)

some   said   he is elias

'Some said: "He is Elias."'

; sume secgað þæt ðu sy helias.   (Ælfric's CH. I, 364.12)

some   said   that you are elias

'Some said that you are Elias.'

d) Within the structure *It is written (that)…*, as illustrated with the two examples below:

(43) CH. I 166.13

hit is awriten; Ne leofað se man na be hlafe anum;

 it is written   not   live the man   by bread alone

'It is written: 'Man shall not live by bread alone.''

(44) CH. I 166.17

hit is awriten; Ᵽ englum is beboden be ðe

 it is written that engels are commanded by you

'It is written that angels are commanded because of you,'

Both of the instances seen above are combined in the following example:

(45) Homilies of Ælfric 336

Se deofol cwæð, Nis na awriten þæt hí wrecan ne sceolon (...) Hit is awriten, Buc ge

the devol said not is not written that they take vengeance not shall it is written unless you

beon swa bilewite on unscæððignysse swa swa cild, næbbe ge infær to heofenan ríce.

 be   as   pure on   innocence   as child not will have you entrance to heaven's kingdom

'The devil said: "It is not written that they shall not take vengeance." (...) It is written: "Unless you are as meek in innocence as a child, you will not have entrance into the kingdom of heaven."'

e) Other than verb of saying

(46) CH. I 378.4.

Ic wene wyt synd oferswiþde;

I think Ø we both are overcome

'I think we both are overcome.'

(47) 249.136-9. f.47r. (CH., Cotton Cleopatra B. XIII)

7 mid hwylcum þingum we hi healdan sceolan us his georne

and with welcome things we them heal should us is eagerly

to witenne we hi sceolan healdan on micelre eadmodnysse/

to know Ø we them should heal on intense meekness

'And with welcome things we should hold them, to us is eagerly to know we should hold them.'

The example above appears in one of the latest of Ælfric's texts (cf. Swan 1993:249).

f) Identification

There are also some instances where the lack of formal punctuation could create ambiguity, as shown below:

(48) CH. I 306.18.

Ic secge eow. manega cweðað to me on ðam micclum dæge. drihten drihten,

 I   say   you Ø many   say   to me on that   great   day   lord   lord

'I say to you many will say to me on that great day Lord, Lord.'

In the example above, it is syntactically difficult to say if this structure represents either direct discourse or the use of a *that*-less clause to render indirect discourse (see also Example (185) on page 70).

Thus, as he admitted, Ælfric has organised his constructions in his own way in pursuing the simplest and most direct meaning. What examples like those above indicate is not only the fact that particular sentences could be paraphrased or deconstructed, but, more importantly, that some syntactic structures in subordination could alternate as well. Unlike those instances in the Gospels, based mostly on literality and/or discrepancies in renderings, Ælfric's rearrangements to Ø-complementizer show a kind of syntactic manipulation. As far as the development of the alternation is concerned, this idea might have been more practical than more examples since that process towards a *that*-less clause would expand.

4. 3. Subordination after external and internal developments

As a result of the external and internal developments seen above, identifiable subordinate structures are now increased from two to four constructions by around the year AD 1000. They are schematically illustrated in the following way:

(49)

a) Direct discourse + Ø + complement

b) Direct discourse + *that* + complement

c) Indirect discourse and other subordination + *that* + complement

d) Indirect discourse and other subordination + Ø + complement

Compare now the quadruple scheme in (49) to the dual one seen previously in (9). A point worth noticing is that the structure in (d) includes the alternation. As we can see, the structures in (b) and in (d) do not represent the mainstream English subordination of the time since they are the result of the rendering processes. Thus, even though the two 'new' structures in (b) and (d) are still restricted compared to the two traditional ones in (a) and (c), the English subordination map has now become more complex and more flexible at the same time.

As for the development of the structure in (b), that will not be explored here since it is not related to this study. Even though some examples are found in English writing (cf. Defensor's Liber Scintillarum 213.17, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle AD 1067; Vices and Virtues 47.21, etc.), it never became widely used. For the purpose of this analysis, what really matters is the emergence of the structure in (d), which creates the alternation. Regardless of the reasons for its appearance (most people in England spoke only English), the fact is that those syntactic structures in subordination were added into the language in different MSS. from significant and influential religious writings. This allowed them to remain available and/or visible through endless repetitions and quotations of those texts. After all, what The Sacred Scriptures and Ælfric's writing show is that some syntactic structures in subordination could now be represented in a different manner than that of previous OE writing.

At this stage, an important question could be: were the new syntactic structures meant to stay, and what kind of impact would those structures have in the language? First, the subordinate structure in (d) speaks for itself since it represents the alternation, so it was clearly meant to stay. Second, to observe its real impact and/or dissemination throughout the language will require evidence.

4. 3. 1. Paving the way for the alternation

At any given stage of language development, it is a fact that writing will influence further writing. From there stems the idea of writing as a palimpsest, where new writing in one way

or another almost always bears traces (layers) of previous writing. This is not only in the form of ideas, thoughts or references, but also in words, syntactic structures, arrangements, composition, etc.

The attested evidence presented above clearly proves that the arrival of both the Gospels and Ælfric's writing by the end of the tenth century AD implied the appearance of new syntactic ways to represent subordination than those that OE allowed. It is then around this time and through these two main influences that the simple and rigid OE subordinate system started to fall apart. Those influences also brought with them good news, since the truly influential Sacred Scriptures and Ælfric's writing were paving the way for invigorating the OE subordination system. Also worth noticing is the fact that the examples in the writings above actually show instances of Ø-complementation in three of the most common and frequent environments involving complement clauses (even in PDE), such as those following the verbs *say, think,* and *know*.

If the prominence of the *that*-clause represents the first side of the two-sided structure of the alternation, as seen above in the first section of Chapter III, so the *that*-less clause which appeared in the Gospels' and Ælfric's structures was, to a certain extent, to represent the other side of that coin. Since "language change is also a two-step process: innovation and propagation" (Croft 2000:31), it will be interesting to observe in which ways the replication and expansion of the syntactic construction of the *that*-less clause occurred in English writing. This is exactly what will be charted in the following sections, as the attested examples reveal how English subordination would be changed for good. It would gradually start alternating more systematically and in more environments, as it never had before.

Chapter V

Expansion of the alternation

5. 1. Beyond OE Part 2

As history has shown, most linguistic and grammatical changes need long periods of time, even centuries, to become internalised or fully established in language, especially in writing. The acquisition of new syntactic structures (whether it be by breaking, adding or changing pre-existing ones) is a time-demanding activity, where mistakes and error-decoding are a part of that gradual process, until new standards first become a part of a user's comprehension and part of their competence later. The further development of the alternation was no exception to that rule. In fact, there were both historical and linguistic aspects that actually delayed the appearance of the alternation, especially in the transition time from OE to ME. This situation might be accounted for by the following factors:

a) The role of register: still a strong influence from OE formal writing patterns.

In the same way that there were a few forces promoting innovation, there were also forces fighting to keep the traditional and classical syntactic patterns of OE subordination. Linguistically, writing has always been considered a more formal or conservative use of the language than speaking. Formality requires more classical or typical ways of expression, and the traditional method of subordination at the time was utilising the *that*-clause (cf. Rissanen 1999, Grimshaw 2009, etc.). The prominent use of the *that*-clause is, for instance, still observable in the King James Version of the Bible (written in 1611) and in a good deal of scientific and/or academic writing in PDE (cf. Grimshaw 1).

b) The transition from parataxis to hypotaxis.

This was a long lasting and complex development in English historical syntax, which in the case of the subordinator *that* involved its reassignment or reinterpretation from a demonstrative pronoun to a subordinate conjunction. This could also be referred to as the rise of subordination (cf. Stockwell & Minkova 1991:369, Fischer et al. 2000:56, Robinson 2002:172, etc.). Attested data reveals that by the eleventh century AD, the use of paratactic constructions "in which independent sentences follow one another in the text" rather than hypotaxis "in which some clauses are made syntactically dependent on others" (Robinson 171) was not yet resolved in English writing. Some known literature that had appeared by that time, such as Cynewulf, Beowulf, The Exeter Book of Anglo-Saxon poetic records, etc. are good examples of this type of writing; even a good deal of the historical and descriptive

entries in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle can be included in this category (cf. Andrew 1966:87). Poetry, the genre embraced by most English writers, was especially prone to a great deal of paratactic constructions through its particular literary style or license.

c) Slow diffusion of written material at the time.

We now know the approximate year in which many famous writings were composed. However, to identify their influence on subsequent writing, the real question is: when were those writings actually made well-known to the general public? If the diffusion of written materials was understandably slow at the time, we may then assume that further influence of such writing on other texts would be even slower.

d) Political and social instability around AD 1000.

Internal and external military events, Viking raids/warfare, etc.

e) Arrival of Norman French.

From the eleventh century AD, Latin and French started to dominate the linguistic and literary arena in England. The introduction of Norman French around AD 1066 would enrich the multilingual environment considerably.

f) Lethargic period for English writing production during the transition from OE to ME.

As for the period after the Norman Conquest, Bough & Cable (2002) say that "it is true that English was now an uncultivated tongue, the language of a socially inferior class" (117). They date the reestablishment of English between AD 1200 and 1500, when the linguistic situation started to experience some changing conditions. Regarding the use of English in writing, Bough & Cable point out that "the last step that the English language had to make in its gradual ascent was its employment in writing. For here it had to meet the competition of Latin as well as French" (127, 153). This historical view is also supported by van Gelderen (2006) when she sustains that "it is often said that only after 1300 does English reemerge as a language used for literature, the court, and the church...1349 is when English is first used at Oxford University...in the Early Middle English period, English is not seen as a prestigious language" (111-2). Moreover, the relatively scarce English literary production resulted in extra or reiterative attention paid to the same relatively small number of books available at the time, including the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, Ælfric's writing, etc.

However, and despite the factors mentioned above, attested data reveal slow but steady introduction and/or dissemination of the alternation throughout ME and EModE.

5. 2. Expansion of the alternation 1

As the production of English literature boomed through the time period of ME and EModE, the evidence of the examples below will show that the use of the alternation went through an exponential growth. Consistent with the syntactic environments seen in both the Gospels and Ælfric's writing, verbs of saying or discourse (such as *say, tell, speak*, etc.), along with those of mental activity (such as *know, think, believe,* etc.), will again be the first in being utilised to expand the use of the alternation. These types of verbs would provoke a sort of syntactic snowball effect on the use of the alternation in both quality (by affecting more and related syntactic environments) and quantity (by increasing its frequency) by percolating through more and more English subordinate structures.

Since the prominence of the *that*-clause was the mainstream idiomatic pattern in subordination, excluding that of direct discourse, the examples below will consequently show those syntactic environments involving Ø-complementizer only. The following list of works and examples is by no means an exhaustive one (the number of titles, and the instances within their texts, are beyond the scope of this section; in other cases, several LOE texts are still undated, while others differ in their composition and use dates, etc.). The following examples expressly aim to illustrate representative instances of the topic in question. As the use of the alternation increases over time, there will be more examples from the first period of the expansion process (LOE, ME). In order to observe a timeline for the expansion of the alternation, the examples will be presented chronologically, or as close to this as possible, given the uncertainty of many of the specific dates.

1072 The Later Genesis

(50) Genesis B. 8.385

Swa ic wat he minne hige cuðe;

 so I know Ø he my mind knows

'So, I know he understands my mind.'

(51) Genesis A. 14.551

Ic wat, inc waldend god abolgen wyrð,

I know Ø you ruling good angry happens

'I know the ruling good will get angry with you two.'

Compare the subordinate structures in (50) and (51) to Example (23) in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels: *ic wat ðu eart Godes hálga* ('I know you are God's holy man').

1100-1199 Old English Homilies of the Twelve Century

(52) 65.8

and gif hit is swo, meþingð ne brinð no synful man quemere loc;

and   if it   is so, I think Ø no brings no sinful man pleasing any more offering

'And if it is so, I think no sinful man brings any more pleasing offering.'

Compare the syntactic construction in (52) to Example (24) in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels: *Leof, dæs de me þincþ, dú eart wítega* ('Sir, because I think you are a prophet').

1150 Early English Homilies XII C.

(53) 5.30

Þeh he þe full god ne þyncce, he byþ ælces yfels ænde

though he the full god not thinks Ø he is each evil end

'Though he the full God doesn't think he is the end of each evil.'

(54) 27.1

Petrus þa him folgede, 7 þuhte him swylce hit swefen wære.

peter then him followed and thought Ø him such it sleep were

'Then Peter followed him, and thought he was dreaming it.'

Again, compare the complementation in (53) and (54) to Example (24) in the Gospels, and now also to the Example (52). There is also *Ø*-complementizer after the verbs *understand* (8.12), *written* (10.37), etc.

1170 A Moral Ode/ Poema Morale

(55) 161.5

Vnnet lif ich habbe ilad. and ȝiet me þinchð ilade.

useless life I have led and yet   I   think Ø I led

'Useless life I have led, and yet I think I led.'

Again, compare the complementation in (55) to Example (24) in the Gospels, and now also to Examples (52), (53), and (54).

1190 The Owl and the Nightingale
(56) 20.205
Ich wot he is nu suþe acoled.
 I know Ø he is now very cooled
'I know he is now very cool.'

Compare Example (56) to Example (23) in the Gospels, and now also to Examples (50) and (51).

(57) 80.975
Þu seyst ich fleo bihinde bure:
you say Ø I fly around bedchamber
Hit is riht, þe bur is ure:
it is right the bedchamber is our
'You say I fly around the bedchamber. It is true, the bedchamber is our.'

Compare the subordinate structure in (57) to Examples (30) in the Gospels and (37) in Ælfric's writing. Similar examples with Ø-complementizer like the one above are found after the verbs *know* (189-90), *think* (814, 1673), *say* (973, 1246), *hope* (989), *see* (1246), etc.

1200 Vices and Virtues
(58) 47.21
Ðas þe me þincþ þu wilt godes lore bliðeliche understonden and liernin;
the more I think Ø you will god's learning gladly understand   and learn
'The more I think you will gladly learn and understand God's learning.'

Again, compare Example (58) to Example (24) in the Gospels and now also to Examples (52), (53), (54), and (55), respectively.

1200 Brut or Chronicle of Britain

Compare the complementation in the two examples below from different MMS.:

(59) Cotton Caligula A.ix MS. 318.17690

& þe king wende þat hit weore soð;

and the king supposed that it was true

'And the king supposed that it was true.'

(60) Cotton Otho C. xiii. MS 318.17690

ac þe king wende hit were soð;

but the king supposed Ø it were true

'But the king supposed it was true.'

Several examples with Ø-complementizer are found in the text after the verbs *say* (32.10965, 226.15524), *answer* (133.13347), etc.

1200 Seinte Marherete

(61) 14.24

bimong hare benen ant aȝein unpreste þohtes þenchen hit is þurh me;

among their prayers and against unsuitable thoughts to think Ø it is through me

'Among their prayers and against unsuitable thoughts to think it is through me.'

1220 Sawles Warde

(62) 99.2

Ic cweðe ȝe beoð godes bern

I said Ø you are god's children

'I said you are God's children.'

(63) 213.19

uor ich wot to soðe hit wolde habben al be-swike me.

for I know truly Ø it would have all deceived me

'For I surely know it would have wholly deceived me.'

1225 The Ancren Riwle

(64) 236.21

þet is to siggen, ase ueole menken of mislice muruhðen he greiðeð þe.

that is to say Ø as many honours of various joy he prepares you

'That is to say, he prepares for you as many different joyful honors.'

(65) 382.27

And Iknowe we ure owune wocnesse edmodliche;

And I know Ø we our own weakness acknowledge

'And I know we acknowledge our own weakness.'

1225 King Horn

(66) 64.1124

For heo wende he were a glotoun.

 for she supposed Ø he was a glutton

'Because she supposed he was a glutton.'

(67) 68.1187

He seide he wolde agesse

he said Ø he would guess

'He said he would reckon.'

1230 Juliana

(68) 9.12

Þa he hefde þus idon. sende hire þus to seggen hire wil he hefde iwrath.

when he had thus done sent her thus to say Ø her will he had her worked

'When he had done thus, he sent thus to tell her he had executed her will.'

(69) 31.1

Þa eleusius seh þat ha þus feng on to festnin hire seoluen isoðe bileaue; þohte he walde don

when eleusius saw that he thus began on to fasten her self true belief thought Ø he would put

hire anan ut of dahene;

her at once out of day

'When Eleusius saw that he thus began to establish her in the true believe, he thought he would put her at once out of light of day.'

1230 Seyn Julian
(70) 87.222
he þoȝte it scende.
he thought Ø it shends
'He thought it shent.'

1250 Cristes Milde Moder
(71) 33.40
Sune, y wot y kan thee tellen
son I know Ø I can you tell
'Son, I know I can tell you.'

(72) 33.50
The time is cumen y fare to helle
 the time is come Ø I go to hell
'The time is come that I go to hell.'

1250 The Story of Genesis and Exodus
(73) 9.309
Get I wene I can a red,
 yet I ween Ø I can a advice
'Yet I think I know some advice.'

(74) 13.438
ðor he ðhogte he stonden agon.
there he thought Ø he stands again
'There he thought he stands again.'

(75) 44.1543
Ysaac wende it were esau.
isaac supposed Ø it was esau
'Isaac supposed it was Esau.'

1258 Proclamation of Henry III

(76) 104.12

God wot, ich ne lyӡe noӡt

god knows Ø I not lie not

'God knows I do not lie.'

1265 The Early South-English Legendary

(77) 30.38-40

So þat seint Iohan þe Baptist : to him a day com

 so that saint john the baptist to him a day came

And calangede him of is sunne : to ligge so in horedom,

and challenged him of his sin : to lie as in whoredom

And seide, it was a-ӡein heore lawe : and a-ӡein cristindom.

and said Ø it was contrary to their law and against christensom

'So, Saint John the Baptist came to him one day and challenged him about his sin, to lie as in whoredom, and said it was contrary to their law and against Christendom.'

(78) 89.93-95

Bi-fore heom al is dignete : he tok up atþen ende,

before them all his dignity he took up at the end

And seide Ø he wolde in-to an oþur lond: with þis maydenes wende.

 and said   he wished into another land with this maidens' wand.

Ðis Cardinales weren þare-a-ӡein : and seiden þat he gan reue

this   cardinals were there again   and   said that he goes

'Before them all his dignity, he took up at last and said he was willing to go into another land with this maidens' wand. These cardinals where there again and said that he goes…'

Notice the alternation functioning in (78) in the same sentence.

1275 An Old English Miscellany

(79) 41.129 **The Passion of Our Lord**

Ye seggeþ alle queþ vre louerd.

you say Ø all said our   lord

'You say all said our Lord.'

(80) 73.37 **Sinners Beware**

Hit seyþ in þe godspelle. Ne may no tunge telle. Þe blisse þat þer is euere.

  it said in the godspels Ø not may no tongue tell the bliss that there is heaven.

'It is said in the Gospels no tongue may tell the bliss that there is in heaven.'

The example in (80) can also be interpreted as direct speech.

(81) 152.3

Heo wenden hit sholde lesten.

he supposed Ø it should last

'He supposed it should last.'

(82) 195.29 **A song to the Virgin**

Wel he wot he is þi sone.

well he knows Ø he is your son

'Well, he knows he is your son.'

(83) 227.145-7 **The XI Pains of Hell**

Knoweþ ȝe þei seide. godus sone,

 know you Ø they said god's son

'Know you they said God's son.'

1280 Lay of Havelok the Dane

(84) 5.119

I wot ful wel ich haue mi mede.

I know full well Ø I have my reward

'I know full well I have my reward.'

(85) 45.1249

For she wende she were bi-swike

for she supposed Ø she were betrayed

'Because she supposed she was betrayed.'

(86) 49.1348

þou maght telle he aren quike

you may telle Ø they are quick

'You may telle they are quick.'

(87) 79.3637

He swor, he ne sholde neuer blinne

 he swor Ø he not should never cease

'He swor he should never cease.'

1285 The Proverbs of Hendyng

(88) 39.149

Hy telle he deþ wel by me,

he tells Ø he does well by me

'He tells he does well by me.'

1290 The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester

(89) 111.3

He þoȝte he wolde wite

he thought Ø he would know

'He thought he would know.'

(90) 544.5

Ich wene þer ne beþ in al þe world contreyes none

I suppose Ø there not be in all the world countries none

'I suppose there is none in all the countries of the world.'

1300 Specimen of Lyric Poetry

(91) 48.58

Ȝet he ȝyrnden more,

yet he yearned more

Ant saide he come wel ȝore.

and said Ø he came well formerly

'Yet, he yearned more and said he came well formerly.'

1300 Cursor Mundi

The re-emergence of English in literature began around the year AD 1300. The prologue of Cursor Mundi, for instance, encourages the use of English more in the following way:

(92) 22.248

Me thinks we do þam non outrage

I think Ø we do them non outrage

To laud and Inglis man I spell

to praise an inglish man I speak

þat understands þat I tell.

that understands that I tell.

'I think we do them no outrage. I speak to praise an English man who understands what I say.'

It is worth noticing in the example above that the encouragement is made by using a Ø-complementizer structure. Other examples in the same text are:

(93) 216.3652

þou sal sai þou ert esau

you shall say Ø you are esau

'You shall say you are Esau.'

(94) 306.5258

I hope he suld haue na talent.

I hope Ø he should have no talent

'I hope he had no talent.'

Several examples of Ø-complementation are found after the verbs *think* (225, 248), *hear* (1401), *tell* (4052), *pray* (3450, 10252), *command* (11543), *know* (17717), *say* (29134), etc.

1300 Alison

(95) 2.9

An hendy hap ichabbe y-hent, Ichot from hevene it is me sent,

a gracious hope I have received I know Ø from heaven it is me sent

'A gracious hope I have received, I know it is sent to me from heaven.'

1300 Harrowing of Hell

(96) 5.29

Ihesu crist arew hem sore ant seide he wolde vacche hem þore;

jesus christ pitied them sore and said Ø he would fetch them there

'Jesus Christ pitied those sore and said he would fetch them there.'

(97) 11.108

Wendest þou ich were ded for noht?

supposed you Ø I were dead for nothing?

'Did you consider I was dead for nothing?'

(98) 11.123

God wot y shal speke þe wyth

god knows Ø I shall speak the

'God knows I shall speak the with you.'

1303 Handlyng Synne

(99) 186.5725

Hym þoght he was yn heuene lyȝt,

him thought Ø he was in heaven light

'He thought he was in heaven's light,'

(100) 329.10596

For he went he had be hys broþer.

for he imagined Ø he had been his brother

'Because he considered he had been his brother.'

1327 De Septem Sacramentis

(101) 2.31

And ȝet me seiþ ydemyd we beþe In Adam and ine Eve Te helle

and yey one said deemed Ø we prayed in adam and ine eve to hell

'And yet one said deemed we prayed in Adam and in Eve to hell.'

(102) 9.234

Ich woȝt wel þrinne to cristnye Hit nere nefur þe betere, ac wonde

I know well Ø therein to christen it was not never the better but wound

'I know well therein to christen it was never the better, but wound.'

1340 Ayenbite of Inwyt

Notice the variation in the two following examples.

(103) 10.21

Þet is to zigge / þou ne sselt naȝt consenti /

that is to say you not shall nothing consent

'That is to say you shall consent nothing.'

(104) 12.8

Þet is to zigge / þet he is god.

that is to say   that he is god

'That is to say, that he is God.'

(105) 264.11

He ansuereþ. he ne may naȝt zigge:

 he answers Ø he not may nothing say

'He answers he may say nothing.'

1343 The Fire of Love

(106) 2.14

, in þis I consaued it was þe gyft of my maker.

 in this I conceived Ø it was the gift of my maker

'In this I conceived it was the gift of my maker.'

(107) 3.26

I trowe þis þinges (…) may noȝt be vnderstandyd.

I believe Ø these things (…) may not be understood

'I believe these things (…) may not be understood.'

(108) 9.35

Bot þat synner leghes, þat says he lufes god,

but that sinner lies that says Ø he loves god

'But that sinner lies who says he loves God.'

1350 Earliest English Prose Psalter

(109) Psalm 9.36

for he said in his hert, He ne shal nouȝt sechen.

 for he said in his heart Ø he not shall nothing say

'Because he said in his heart he shall say nothing.'

(110) Psalm 40.6

And ȝif myn enemy entred in-to my hous, þat he seiȝe me, he spak idel þynges;

and if my enemy entered in to my house, that he said me Ø he spoke idle things

'And if my enemy entered into my house, that he said to me he spoke idle things.'

1350 The Lyfe of Ioseph of Arimathie

(111) 39.84

I trowe he be gone

I think Ø he is lost

'I think he was lost.'

(112) 47.342

At last she thought she had sene Ioseph in pycture,

at last she thought Ø she had seen joseph in picture

'At last, she thought she had seen Joseph in picture.'

1360 The Vision of Piers Plowman

(113) II. 26.202

For-þy ich may say, as ich seyde · by syght of þe tixt,

therefore I may say   as I   said   by sight of the text

Whenne alle tresours ben tryed · treuth ys þe best;

Ø when all treasures are tried   thruth is the best

'Therefore, I say as I said by sight of the text, when all treasures are tried, truth is the best.'

(114) VII. 96.32

Me wilnynge þat men wende · ich were, in aueyr,

  I   desire that men suppose Ø I were in possessions

Riche, and resonable · and rightful and lyuynge,

  rich   and reasonable and rightful and living

'I desire that men suppose I was rich, reasonable, rightful and living in possessions.'

Several examples of Ø-complementation are found after the verbs: *say* (67, 298, 301, etc.); *tell* (158); *believe* (169); *know* (224), etc.

1360 The Testament of Love

(115) 52.104

; truly, he saith he com never of Japhetes childre.

  truly he says Ø he com never of japhet's children

'He truly says he never came from Japhet's children.'

1380 Sir Ferumbras

(116) 6.177

& swer he nolde et ene drynk;

and swears Ø he would neither eat nor drink

'And swear he would neither eat nor drink;'

(117) 18.468

Men wolde sayn y were to blame;

men would say Ø I were to blame

'People would say I were to blame.'

Several instances of Ø-complementizer are found after the verbs knew (3.78), think (19.502), etc.

1380 Pearl

(118) 138

I hope þe water were a deuyse

I hope Ø the water was a device

'I hope the water was a device.'

(119) 295

Þou say þou traweʒ me in þis dene.

you say Ø you trust me in this din

'You say you trust me in this noise.'

1389 The Holy Bible (Wycliffe)

(120) Joshua 2:4

I knowleche, thei camen to me,

 I   know Ø they came to me

'I know they came to me.'

(121) Leviticus 5:2

and he forʒetith and knowith afterward, he schal be suget to trespas.

and he forgets and   knows afterwards Ø he shall be subject to trespass

'And he forgets and knows afterwards he shall be object to trespass.'

(122) St. Mark 9:30

; he nolde ðæt it ænig man wiste.   (A-S Gospels)

; and he wolde no man wite.   (Wycliffe)

 and he wanted Ø no man knew

'And he wanted no man knew.'

Observe in (122) the difference in complementation within the same sentence between Wycliffe and the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

(123) St. Mark 15:9

Wolen ʒe I leeue to ʒou the kyng of Jewis?

will you Ø I release to you the king of jews?

'Do you desire I release to you the king of the Jews?'

1390 Sir Gawain and the Green Knight

(124) 98v.26

I þe telle hit arn aboute on þis bench bot berdlez chylder

I you tell Ø there are about on this bench but bearless children

'I tell you there are but beardless children about on this bench.'

(125) 99v.13

I be seche now wt saȝeȝ sene

I beseech now with words clear

þis melly mot be myne

Ø this affair must be mine

'I beseech now with clear saying this affair must be mine.'

1390 Canterbury Tales

(126) 20.54

I dorste swere they weyeden ten pound.

I dare swear Ø they weighted ten pounds

'I dare swear they weighted ten pounds.'

(127) 24.82

Hym thoughte he rood al of the newe iet,

  him thought Ø he rode all of the newest

'He thought he rode all of the newest.'

(128) 44.67

And if yow thynketh this is weel ysayd, seyeth youre auys.

and if you think Ø this is well said, say your opinion

'And if you think this is well said, say your opinion.'

(129) 252.76

ffor wel he knew he stood in swich array,

for well he knew Ø he stood in such array

'Because he knew well he stood in such array.'

(130) 393.93

I woot well ther is degree aboue degree,

I know well Ø there is degree above degree

'I know well there is degree above degree.'

1400 The Praise of Peace

(131) 206.25

Wherof, my lord, I wot wel thou art lerned.

whereof my lord I know well Ø you are learned

'Whereof, my Lord, I know well you are learned.'

1400 The Rule of St. Benet

(132) 5.20

I bad þai sulde it gete.

I prayed Ø they should get it

'I prayed they should get it.'

1400 Phlebotomy

Compare the two structures below:

(133) 36.10

It ys to wyt forsoþ yf the body be plectoryc oe replete, minucion owth to be done

it is to know truly Ø if the body is plethoric or replete minution ought to be done

'It is truly to know if the body is plethoric or replete, a minution ought to be done.'

(134) 36.3

Þerfor it is to wyt that some minision is made or done

therefore it is to know that some minution is made or done

'Therefore, it is to know that some minution is made or done.'

(135) 45.156

To weche we sei it is compotent for 2 causes;

to which we say Ø it is component for two causes

'To which we say it is a component of two causes.'

1420 Mandeville's travels

(136) 15.24

And he seyde he wolde ben hire lemman or paramour

 and he said Ø he would be her   lover   or paramour

'And he said he would be her lover or romance.'

(137) 21.23

But I thanke god I had no will to don it.

but I thank god Ø I had no will to do it

"But I thank God I had no will to do it.'

(138) 176.8

summe of hem trowed it were an jnpossible thing to be.

some of them thought Ø it was an impossible thing to be

'Some of them thought it was an impossible thing to be.'

1445 The Life of Saint Katherine

(139) 17.327

7 seggen he is godes sune,

and say Ø he is god's son

'And say he is God's son.'

(140) 50.1080

Þu seist he ne mihte nawt godd ba beon 7 mon.

you said Ø he not might not god both be and man

'You said he might not be both God and man.'

1450 Merlin or The Early History of King Arthur

(141) III 45-6

Quod the kynge, be well a-vised that ye knowe it is he. And thei seide, We knowe verely it is

 said the king be well-advised that you know Ø it is he and they said we know verely Ø it is

he.

he

'The king said: "Be well- advised that you know it is him." And they said: "We truly know it

is him."'

(142) 53.29

wher-fore the kynge thought he hadde be wroth,

therefore the king thought Ø he had been twisted

'Therefore, the king thought he had been writhed.'

1473 The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye

This is considered the first book printed in English.

(143) 122.1

How well me thinketh I am here for to resseyue absolucion.

 how well I   think Ø I am here for to receive absolution

'How well I think I am here to receive absolution.'

(144) 125.28

woll, ye wote ye sayd the olde woman

well, you know Ø you said the old woman

'Well, you know you said the old woman.'

(145) 126.2

I thinke well he is not comen

I think well Ø he has not come

'I think well he hasn't come.'

1526 The Holy Bible (Tyndale)

(146) St. Matthew 4:6

sóþlíce hit ys áwriten, Ðæt he his englum bebead be ðé,   (A-S Gospels)

for hit ys wrytten, He shall geve his angels charge over the,   (Tyndale)

for it is written   he shall give his angels change over you

'Because it is written he shall give his angels charge over you.'

Notice in Example (146) the variation in complementation within the same sentence between Tyndale and the Anlgo-Saxon Gospels.

(147) St. Matthew 5:22

I say to ʒou, that euereche that is wrothe to his brother, shal be gylty of dome   (Wycliffe)

I say vnto you, whosoever his angre with hys brother, shalbe in daunger off iudgement

                                                      (Tyndale)

I say unto you Ø whoever is anger with his brother shall be in danger of judgment

'I say to you whoever who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of judgment.'

The structure above can also be interpreted as direct discourse; however, compare the variation in complementation to Wycliffe's first line.

(148) St. Mark 6:49

they supposed yt had bene a sprete,

they supposed Ø it had been a ghost

'They supposed it had been a ghost.'

1551 Utopia

(149) 35.12

I think I haue suffycyentlye done my parte towardes them all readye.

I think Ø I have sufficiently done my part towards   them already

'I think I have sufficiently done my part towards them already.'

(150) 113.2

I suppose it wold be longe befor we wolde receaue any thing

I suppose Ø it would be long before we would receive any thing

'I suppose it would be long before we would receive anything.'

1597 Romeo & Juliet

In the iambic pentameter made famous by Shakespeare, only five feet (an unstressed followed by a stressed syllable) are allowed, i.e., only ten syllables per line, as shown below:

(151) Act 4, scene 5:

Line 76: And weep ye now, seeing she is advanc'd

and weep you know, seeing Ø she is advanced

'And weep you know, seeing she is advanced.'

…

Line 79: That you run mad, seeing that she is well.

that you run mad, seeing that she is well

'That you run mad, seeing that she is well.'

Shakespeare resolved this metrical peculiarity by playing with the alternation as a wildcard in a masterly way. In line 76 above, the only word omitted without altering the meaning of the

sentence is *that,* rendering exactly five feet. On the contrary, the second *that* in line 76 is only present in order to reach precisely ten syllables.

(152) Sonnet 14
And yet methinks I have astronomy.
 and yet I think Ø I have astronomy
'And yet I think I have astronomy.'

(153) The Comedy of Errors V.I
I knew he was not in his perfect wits
I knew Ø he was not in his perfect wits
'I knew he was not in this perfect wits.'

1611 The Holy Bible (King James Version, KJV)
(154) Deuterenomy 9:25
because the Lord had said, he would destroy you.
because the lord had said Ø he would destroy you
'Because the Lord had said he would destroy you.'

(155) St. Mark 6:49
they supposed it had bene a spirit,
they supposed Ø it had been a spirit
'They supposed it had been a spirit.'

(156) 1Samuel 1:13
therefore Eli thought she had beene drunken.
therefore eli thought Ø she had been drunken
'Therefore, Eli thought she had been drunken.'

Several examples such as these can be found in the KJV, among others: Hosea 2:21; St. Matthew 6:2, 27:64; St. Mark 6:1, St. Luke 20:13, etc.

1667 Paradise Lost
(157) Book X 243

Methinks I feel new strength within me rise,

 I think Ø I fell new strength within me rise

'I think I feel new strength rise within me.'

(158) Book VIII 103

That man may know he dwells not in his own,

that man mey know Ø he dwells not in his own

'That man may know he dwells not in his own.'

1739 A Treatise of Human Nature

(159) 3.10

I find I have carried away too far by the first appearance,

'I find Ø I have carried away too far by the first appearance.'

'I find I have carried away too far by the first appearance.'

1749 The History of Tom Jones

(160) 40.12

He said, he knew many held the same principles with the captain on this head,

he said Ø he knew Ø many held the same principles with the captain on this head

'He said he knew many held the same principles with the captain on this head.'

This particular example contains two concatenated Ø-complementation.

The examples may stop here; according to Rissanen (1999), "in the seventeenth century the use of zero in object clauses increases steadily and reaches a peak at the end of the century" (284). We have gone through the periods of ME and EModE, which show clear evidence of the expansion of the alternation. From the eighteenth century onward, its use in subordination appears to be much more spread out and internalised into the language. As we can observe in all of the previous examples, the use of the alternation has been expanded beyond religious topics or translations into most types of English writing, including "romances, beast epics, and histories" (Baron 2000:50).

The attested data reveals a noticeable increase in frequency in the use of the alternation in the same environments covered in Chapter III. These involve verbs of discourse or saying (such as *say, speak, tell,* etc*.,* also the form *written*), to which other closely related environments have now been added (such as *swear*, *answer*, etc.). On the other hand, the examples also

show an increase in frequency in the use of the alternation in the same environments, involving verbs of mental activity (such as *know, think*, etc.), to which other closely related environments have now been incorporated (such as *suppose, hope, show, understand, beseech, find, care, deem, consider*, *conceive*, *pray, forbid, send, command*, *learn, teach*, etc.), along with a few verbs of perception, such as *hear, see*, etc. This relatively gradual change and expansion of the alternation, affecting initially the same environments in which it first appeared to include then only related ones, does not seem to obey an evolution based on a principled account. It is clear that other types of verbs and other types of syntactic environments are practically excluded. That is, the rather particular syntactic behavior and development of the alternation might not appropriately correspond to what we may expect from a general syntactic principle, i.e., a sort of regulation that affects any environment in which the alternation is a part at any time. Since the conditions of the alternation change over time, we cannot be sure that it is or not following a single ruling principle. It is difficult to think of a single rule or system of rules for the use of the alternation that works at all different stages of the language.

By presenting unique examples, the present analysis reveals several features of the alternation, such as its external and internal developments, and its rather gradual and/or sectorial development through centuries in the most common environments, etc. This could account for its intrinsic untraceable character. The particular development of the alternation through time might suggest that these new structures would have been gradually introduced into the language, as though they were under syntactic (and maybe even semantic) scrutiny over decades, and possibly centuries. We may assume that the dissemination of the *that*-less clause into similar syntactic structures might then have occurred through a long process of linguistic osmosis, i.e., slowly permeating related and/or frequent complementation environments. For instance, it may have spread from the verb *say* to the verbs *tell, speak, ask*, *answer*, *swear*, *write* (*written*), etc., or from the verb *think* to the verbs *suppose, consider, believe*, *perceive*, *conceive*, etc., or from the verb *know* to the verbs *understand, see, learn*, *teach*, etc., due to their relatively close linguistic relationship.

Examples from EME would indicate a slow, though somewhat more systematic, development of the alternation. Conversely, it is worth noticing that other OE words that still today require *that* in their complementation, such as the verb *whisper* (*hwisprian*), were used only marginally in OE or ME, and hardly ever in relation to discourse, if we follow one of the analytical lines presented in Chapter III. A similar syntactic behavior appeared with the words *sad* (*sæd*, *sað*,) and *aware* (*gewær*), although they were used a bit more frequently. These

words were, for some reason, either scarcely used, or absent from complement clauses. On the few occasions that they did appear, they almost always received the prominence of the OE *that*-clause. We might assume that this peculiar syntactic behavior required them to keep that type of complementation, petrifying as a linguistic remnant, and they might even have developed some semantic features that evolved through the regular use over centuries of the same surface structures. This means that there has been an historically disproportionate use of the verb *think* (*thought*), *say* (*said*) or *know* (*knew*) compared to the verb *whisper* (*whispered*), a situation which extends to present day. This point might also reduce and/or block the idea of a principled account, as those particular environments were not a formal part of the alternation. Thus, it will be difficult to think of a principled account that regulates the general distribution of the alternation since its historical syntactic behavior shows not only that it has changed over time, but also that it has been affecting the environments which it is a part under different and/or imbalanced conditions (such as type of structure, frequency, etc.) through time. Both the development and the historical patterns of the alternation appear to be either too complex or too specific for a single ruling principle.

As a part of this expansion process, a similar characteristic proceeding of the development of the alternation described above can also be observed in the complementary process below.

5. 3. Expansion of the alternation 2

The structural expansion process of English subordination that began at the end of the tenth century AD was far from the only one influencing the development of the alternation. Slowly but surely, the alternation was again affected by external and internal influences over the centuries. These processes contributed not only to its increased usage in English writing, but more importantly, to making the alternation more common and more linguistically legitimate, as shown below.

5. 3. 1. Externally

The alternation was strengthened by renderings produced throughout LOE, ME and EModE. Approximately a century after Aldred's text, the Anglo-Saxon version of Defensor's Liber Scintillarum (The Book of Sparks, compiled by the monk Defensor, AD 1050) shows the following interlinear example (Latin text in italics):

(161) 13.14

et futura cogitat nescit trepidare ubi non est timor

7 towerde he þencð he ne can forhtigan þær þær nys ege.

and further he thinks Ø he not can to be afraid where there is not fear.'

'And he further thinks he does not know to be afraid where there is not fear.'

Compare the subordinate structure in (161) to Example (24) in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels. Several instances of Ø-complementation are found in the text, among others, after the verbs *see* (4.12), *consider* (22.2, 216.14), *bid* (24.18), *believe* (115.2), *swear* (136.15), *estimate* (150.9), *desire* (198.6), etc.

Consider now The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus, AD 1460:

(162) 251.21

Si talis potens est in humanitate, uere dico tibi omnipotens est in diuinitate,

If he be so myghti in manhod trewly I sey to the he is almyghti,

if he is so mighty in manhood I truly say to you Ø he is almighty

'If he is so mighty in manhood I truly say to you he is almighty.'

Tyndale's Bible (1526) also shows instances of variation in complementation, as illustrated below:

(163) St. Mark 6:49

hí wéndon dæt hit unfæle gást wære, and hí clypedon;   (A-S Gospels)

thei gessiden that it weren a fantum, and crieden out;   (Wycliffe)

they supposed yt had bene a sprete, and cryed oute;   (Tyndale)

they supposed Ø it had been a ghost and cried out

'They supposed it had been a ghost and cried out.'

The structure by Tyndale, this time working from Greek as source language, represents a change in complementation within the same sentence when compared to the structures in Wycliffe's and Anglo-Saxon Gospels' texts.

5. 3. 2. Internally

The Bible has a far-reaching influence as the most powerful, significant writing ever composed, and is still the most-read book of all time. The text of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels would remain the same for at least four hundred years, as the next version, a part of The New Testament, would not appear until the release of the long awaited first complete version of the English Bible (John Wycliffe 1389). Like the Gospels in OE, Wycliffe's Bible was the greatest literary achievement in ME. Other versions of the Bible appeared later on, among others: Tyndales' Bible, 1526; The Geneva Bible, 1560; The King James Version (KJV), 1611, etc. Although most of the Gospels' text was still identifiable in later versions, changes were also made. If we compare, for instance, the use of complement clauses in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels to the Gospels in Wycliffe's Bible, there are not only more Ø-complementation structures in the latter, but also instances of replacement and reinsertion of the subordinator *that*.

As the attested data includes variation in complementation in later versions of the Gospels, some approaches from diachronic syntax may help to provide reasoning behind such differences and/or similarities. The following excerpt will provide examples of these instances introduced by English writers due to writing or translation styles, original revisions, modern adaptations, etc.

(164) St. Matthew 6:16

Sóþlíce ic secge eow, ðæt hig onféngon hyra méde.	(A-S Gospels)
; trewly Y say to ȝou, thei han resseyed her meede.	(Wycliffe)

'I truly say to you (that) they have received their reward.'

As we have seen before, the sentence in (164) found in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels represents a literal translation, so the sentence by Wycliffe constitutes an internal development, since it is not a revision of the original text.

(165) St. Mark 15:9

Wylle ge ðæt ic eow forgyfe Iudea cyning?	(A-S Gospels)
Wolen ȝe I leeue to ȝou the kyng of Jewis?	(Wycliffe)

 will you I release to you the king of jews

'Do you desire (that) I release to you the King of the Jews?'

(166) St. Luke 3:8

Ic secge eow, ðæt God is swa mihte   (A-S Gospels)

I seie to gou, God is mygti.   (Wycliffe)

I say to you god is mighty

'I say to you (that) God is mighty.'

In this example, the Anglo-Saxon Gospels show a *that*-clause, while the same sentence appears rendered by a *that*-less clause in Wycliffe's Bible. Several examples like these can be found in Wycliffe's Bible (St. Mark 2:15, etc.).

When comparing the A-S Gospels and Tyndale's Bible, variation also occurs:

(167) St. Matthew 4:6

sóþlice hit ys áwriten, Ðæt he his englum bebead be ðé,   (A-S Gospels)

for hit ys wrytten, He shall geve his angels charge over the,   (Tyndale)

'Because it is written (that) he shall give his angels charge over you.'

(168) St. Mark 6:49

hí wéndon ðæt hit unfæle gást wære,   (A-S Gospels)

they supposed yt had bene a sprete,   (Tyndale)

'They supposed (that) it had been a ghost.'

(169) St. Luke 4:4

Hit is áwriten, Ðæt se man ne lyfaþ be hláfe ánum.   (A-S Gospels)

It ys written, Man shall nott live by breed only,   (Tyndale)

'It is written (that) man shall not live on bread only.'

A similar variation is found in St. Matthew 5:22.

Interesting variation in comparative instances also show opposing examples, in which *that* is present in Tyndale's version, but not in earlier renderings, as shown below:

(170) St. John 10:7

Sóþ, ic eow secge, ic eom sccapa geat.   (A-S Gospels)

Verely, I saye vnto you, that I am the dore of the shepe.   (Tyndale)

  truly   I say unto you that I am the door of the sheepfold

'I truly say to you (that) I am the door of the sheepfold.'

Several instances like the one above are found, among others: St. Matthew 18:19; St. Luke 7:11, 24:23; St. John 12:34; etc. (see also below (d) Reinsertion).

When comparing the A-S Gospels with The King James Version, the following examples show variation:

(171) St. Matthew 27:64

and secgeon ðam folce, ðæt he áryse of deaþe;   (A-S Gospels)
, and say vnto the people, he is risen from the dead;   (KJV)
'And say to the people (that) he is risen from the dead.'

(172) St. Mark 11:17

Nis hit áwriten, Ðæt min hús fram eallum þeodum biþ genemned gebed-hús: (A-S Gospels)
Is it not written, My house shalbe called of all nations the house of prayer: (KJV)
'Is it not written (that) my house shal be called of all nations the house of prayer?'

Several examples like these can be found in the KJV Bible, among others: Hosea 2:21; St. Matthew 6:2; St. Mark 6:11; St. Mark 6:49; St. Luke 20:13, etc.

Ælfric's Treatise on the Old Testament and Wycliffe's Bible also show variation in complementation:

(173) Genesis 13:8

Ic bedde þæt nan sacu ne sy betwux me 7 ðe,   (Ælfric' Heptateuch)
I biseche, be there not strijf bitwix thee and me,   (Wycliffe's Bible)
I beseech be there not strife between you and me
'I beseech (that) there will be no strife between you and me.'

Consider now the two following examples:
(174) Genesis 20:5

He sylf cwæð to me þæt heo hys swustor wære 7 þæt wif eac sæde ðæt he wære hyre broðor;
                                                                    (Ælfric's Heptateuch)
 he self said to me that she his   sister were and that lady also said that he were her brother
'He himself said to me that she was his sister, and that lady also said that he was her brother.'

(175) Genesis 20:5

Seide he not to me, my sistir she is, and she seith, my brother he is?   (Wycliffe's Bible)
 said he not to me my sister she is and she said   my brother he is
'Did he not say to me: "She is my sister," and she said: "He is my brother?"'

While the same biblical entry was rendered as an indirect statement with *that*-clauses by Ælfric in (173), it was translated as an interrogative with direct discourse and *that*-less clauses by Wycliffe in (174). Several instances of variation in subordination between Ælfric or the Anglo-Saxon Gospels and Wycliffe are found in the Gospels and in The Heptateuch, among others: Genesis 21:16; Genesis 27:12, etc.

Other types of variation in subordination through different texts show:

(176) St. Matthew 6:16
sóþlíce ic secge eow, ðæt hig onféngon hyra méde   (A-S Gospels)
   truly Y say to ʒou, thei han resseyued her meede.   (Wycliffe)
verely Y say vnto you, they have there rewarde.   (Tyndale)
Verily I say vunto you, that they haue their rewarde,   (Geneva Bible)
Verily I say vnto you, they have their reward.   (KJV)
'I truly say to you (that) they have their reward.'

(177) St. Mark 6:49
 hí wéndon ðæt hit unfæle gást wære, and hí clypedon;   (A-S Gospels)
thei gessiden that it weren a fantum, and crieden out;   (Wycliffe)
they supposed it had bene a spirit, and cried out.   (KJV)
'They supposed (that) it had been a spirit, and cried out.'

In (177), the subordinate structure in the King James Bible represent a change in complementation with respect to those in Wycliffe's and the Anglo Saxon Gospels. Compared to the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, and even to Wycliffe's Bible, Tyndale's Bible also shows more variation in subordination, increasing thus the amount of *that*-less clauses in complementation, as shown below:

(178) St. Luke 12:37
Sóþlíce ic eow secge, ðæt he begirt hine   (A-S Gospels)

Treuli I seie to ȝou, that he schal bifore girde him,   (Wycliffe)

Verely I saye vnto you, he will gerdde hym silfe about,   (Tyndale)

'I truly say to you (that) he will gird himself.'

Tyndale's Bible includes several examples like this (St. Mark 6:11, etc.).

Other developments show that the progressive disappearance of the complementizer *that* from the subordination line was not only due to the activation of the alternation, but also through indirect means such as its replacement by other elements or particles, as shown below:

a) Replacement by other conjunction

(179) St. Matthew 16:18

And ic secge ðe, ðæt ðu eart Petrus,   (A-S Gospels)

And Y seye to thee, for thou art Petre,   (Wycliffe)

'And I say to you that/for you are Peter.'

Several examples where the subordinator *that* in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels was replaced by another conjunction or particle appear in later renderings of the Gospels, among others: St. John 1:34. Wycliffe replaced *that* by *for*; by another particle, *and* (St. Matthew 26:53), etc. Other examples: St. Matthew 3:9, 4:6, 25:27; St. Luke 4:4 etc.

b) Replacement by the infinitive

(180) St. Matthew 28:20

And læreþ ðæt hig healdon ealle ða þing ðe ic eow bebead,   (Gospels)

and teach that they hold   all the things I you commanded

'And teach that they hold all the things I commanded you.'

Techinge hem for to kepe alle thingis, what euere thingis I haue comaundid to ȝou; (Wycliffe)

teaching them for to keep all things what ever things I have commanded to you

'Teaching them to keep all things whatsoever I have commanded you.'

Teachinge them to observe all thynges, whatsoever I commanded you;   (Tyndale)

Teaching them to obserue all things, whatsoeuer I have commanded you;   (KJV)

c) Replacement by paraphrasing

(181) St. Matthew 28:16

ge secgeað, Swa hwylc swa swereð on temple, Þ he ys naht;   (A-S Gospels)

ȝou… that seien, Who euere shal swere by the temple of God, no thing is;   (Wycliffe)

for ye saye, Whosoever sweare by the temple, yt ys nothinge;   (Tyndale)

'You say whoever swears by the temple (that) he is nothing/nothing is/it is nothing.'

As seen in this example, the three versions of the text each use different complement clauses in the same sentence.

d) Reinsertion

Wycliffe also made some reinsertions of the subordinator *that*, as shown below:

(182) St. Mark 9:26

ita   ut   multi dicerent quia mortuus est   (Lindisfarne)

suæ Þte monige cuoedon Þte dead were/wæs   (Aldred's Lind.)

swa ðæt manega cwædon, sóþlíce he is dead.   (A-S Gospels)

so that manye seiden, that he was deed.   (Wycliffe)

'So, that many said that/truly he is dead.'

Interestingly enough, about four hundred years later, Wycliffe and later versions of the Bible also reinserted the complementizer *that* in some key instances seen in the Gospels involving omissions, as shown below:

(183) St. Mark 1:24

ic wát ðú eart Godes hálga.   (A-S Gospels)

Y woot that thou art the holy of God.   (Wycliffe)

'I know (that) you are God's holy man.'

Several instances of reinsertion appear in the biblical versions of the Gospels compared to the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, among others: St. Matthew 18:19, St. John 4:19, etc. Consider now the differences in complementation through time within the same sentence:

(184) St. Mark 6:15

Sume cwædon, He is Elias; sume cwædon, He is witega,   (A-S Gospels)

sume secgað þæt ðu sy helias. sume hieremias. oððe sum oþer witega;   (Ælfric CH I 364)

Sothely othere seyden, For it is Ely; but othere seyden, For it is a prophete, (Wycliffe)

Wother sayd, It is Helyas; and some sayde, It is a prophet   (Tyndale)

Others said, That it is Elias. And others said That it is a prophet,   (KJV)

While the origins of these texts span over six centuries, there is no agreement on subordination to be found. The sentence above contains several of the elements we have already seen: alternation, paraphrasing, replacement, omission and reinsertion. Several similar cases went through the same process (St. Luke 7:16, etc.).

As the examples show, subordination with complement clauses is handled in various ways within the same sentences among the texts in the Gospels, Wycliffe, Tyndale and the KJV. This variation shows syntactic evidence that God's word in the English sacred texts was not always the same, at least as far as subordination is concerned.

In any case, and as we have observed through the chronological data above, by the time Wycliffe and the other versions of the Bible did reinsertions, the alternation had not only been around for centuries, but it was also facing unstoppable development.

5. 4. Alternation, discourse and punctuation

The arrival of several types of subordinate structures by the end of the tenth century AD as well as the lack of formal English punctuation for marking direct discourse were to create some ambiguity in complementation, provoked by the distinction between the alternation and discourse marking, as illustrated below:

(185) *Piers Plowman*, 1360. 155.308

And ȝut ich sey, by my saule · ich haue no salt bacon;

 and yet I   say by my soul Ø I have no salt bacon

'And yet I say, by my soul, I have no salt bacon.'

Considering that the alternation was already operative by the time this example was printed (1360), and that there was no syntactic punctuation at the time, it is syntactically difficult to distinguish if the structure above represents direct discourse, which would idiomatically allow

or require the absence of *that*, or indirect discourse with a *that*-less clause, which would indicate the use of the alternation (see also Example 48 on page 34). As we have seen in the time of the prominence of the *that*-clause, that type of structure could only represent direct discourse in OE. Of course, this ambiguity was mostly restricted to verbs of saying or discourse. Also worth noticing is the fact that this duality still happens to a certain extent in spoken PDE.

The haphazard character of English punctuation which lasted until the seventeenth century AD (cf. Parkes 27) resulted in no special punctuation for marking or differentiating direct discourse from the rest of the text; on the other hand, the use of a majuscule (capitalization) was not always reliable either. This would in turn make the identification even more difficult, since what was probably obvious to a writer might not have been obvious to the general public. This was likely one of the main reasons that English eventually adopted the use of single or double quotation marks (apostrophes) to clearly identify both the beginning and the end of direct discourse in writing. "Even the good old comma continues to evolve: it was flipped upside down and turned into the quotation mark circa 1714" (Baker 1997:73). The first treatises regarding syntactic punctuation in English were written in the eighteenth century AD (R. Monteith, 1704, J. Robertson, 1785, etc.).

Chapter VI

Some linguistic developments

In connection with the external and internal developments seen above, there are some additional linguistic aspects in English history that might have contributed to the facilitation and/or increase in the expansion rate of the alternation in the language through time.

6. 1. Word order

The English linguistic transition from a synthetic to an analytic language during ME implied several internal changes, including a good deal of inflectional loss, the standardization of the SVO word order, etc. It is known, for instance, that "the underlying SOV order changed to SVO. This change was completed around 1200" (van Kemenade 1987:177; cf. Kroch & Taylor 2000, van Gelderen 2006, etc.). This change might also have had some implications for subordination, since the new linguistic environment of simplification could then have suggested and/or even required newer and simpler ways of complementation due to a more stable word order (cf. Stockwell and Minkova 381, 399).

Referring to the stabilization of the SVO word order and the development of the alternation, Rissanen (1999) sustains that "it is possible that the change in the basic structure of English which tends to restrict the variety in the order of sentence elements diminishes the risks of ambiguity with zero." Rissanen further explains this idea by suggesting that "the use of zero seems to be related to the cohesion and clarity of the sentence: it is favoured when the subject of the subordinate clause is a personal pronoun, which by its subject form, clearly marks the clause boundary; it is avoided when the matrix clause verb and the object clause are separated or when the matrix clause verb is in a non-finite form" (284). It has been said that the SVO word order possibly contains an inherent communicative strategy: the clearer the complementation, the better; in fact, the change from SOV to SVO was also assigned additional communicative practical features such as *focussing* (cf. Lightfoot 1982:154), *information value* (cf. Heggelund 2009), etc. For her part, Fischer (2007) states that "this loss" –the *that*-loss- "was greatly helped by the fact that in this same period" –by the end of ME- "the typical subordinate clause word order (SOV) disappeared" (304).

Syntactically speaking, direct speech would for instance represent O (the object) in the new canonical English word order SVO. If we think of the *that*-less clause structure in subordination, it either represents or resembles a historical direct speech structure. The use of the *that*-less clause or direct discourse structure would seemingly convey some extra

linguistic gains or benefits. Gorrell (1895) specifies, for instance, that "in Anglo-Saxon this transition to direct discourse is by no means infrequent; it is due to a great extent to the requirements of style; the advantages to be derived from its use are obvious: it is less cumbersome, more accurate, and lends a greater degree of vivacity to the narrative" (477). Its use in poetry is also profuse; Kellner explains this tendency by saying that "the indirect speech, though it may be traced back to the oldest periods, is something artificial, and was always felt as such. In poetry and popular writings we notice a certain struggle against the constraint; hence the many examples of sudden transition from the indirect to the more natural direct speech" (60; also cf. Spieker 221). In environments related to discourse, the alternation in its Ø-complementation version may represent or bring to the surface an old direct discourse structure within an indirect discourse context.

In any case, it is reasonable to think that the standardization of the SVO word order from EME stabilised a syntactic structure that might have contributed to the expansion of the alternation by allowing further omission of the complementizer *that*, since there was less need for marking clause boundaries. As a matter of fact, a great deal of examples of the omission shown before (OE, ME, EModE) involve structures with an SVO word order.

6. 2. The semantic factor

In any language, the correlation between syntax and semantics has never been simple, as grammaticality and acceptability do not always represent the same value. The distinction between factive and non-factive statements is, for instance, based on semantic constraints. Regarding the formation of complex sentences in OE, Traugott (1972) sustains, for instance, that "as far as subjectivization of factive and nonfactive complements is concerned, the most important thing to note is that no complement of the form *þæt + Sentence* occurs in subject position" (102, 181-2; also cf. Visser II: 25; Mitchell II:1; Traugott 1992:234, etc.). Indeed, there are several cases where semantic features can become structural constraints (cf. Chomsky & Lasnik, 428; Roberst & Roussou 2003, Ch. 3; Dayal & Grimshaw 2009; etc.). Grimshaw (2009) points out that "it is often said that the English complementizer *that* is optional, but in fact its distribution is quite complex, and can be understood only if it is seen as the result of interaction among several factors" (1).

If we assume that a good deal of lexical items have corresponding semantic features, then we may wonder what happens to the semantic aspects of borrowings. The history of English borrowing might then present a sort of challenge for the alternation, since those completely new borrowed words had neither a semantic nor a morphological attachment to English. ME

is a period identified by the massive borrowing of verbs, nouns and adjectives; words such as *afraid, perceive, affirm, realise, suppose, sustain, assume, command, remember, decide, agree, suggest*, etc., and hundreds more would require English complementation. So, would that then be *that* or Ø in subordination? And how would this be decided, especially considering that there was (and remains today) no simple syntactic principle to follow? Indeed, in the borrowing processes, hundreds of words were incorporated into English without a concrete context or reference. However, borrowings with no particular English linguistic attachments might have provided more flexibility for both syntactic and semantic readjustments; it is then no wonder that most borrowed words during ME, a key period for the expansion of the alternation, either appeared or received Ø-complementation in subordination relatively quickly. This linguistic belonging might somehow explain why some OE words such as *whisper, sad, aware,* etc. have been syntactically and semantically fossilised by keeping the OE prominence of the *that*-clause in their complements, since both their denotation (literal meaning) and connotation (cultural or emotional association) were linguistically different from the new English rootless borrowings.

It is possible that semantic features or constraints might have developed some sort of attachment to particular environments involving complement clauses which were usually represented in the same syntactic surface structures, being thus involved in the distribution of the alternation by a long-lasting interaction. The examples below show two structures with syntactically equivalent predicates where *that* and Ø are neither syntactically nor semantically equivalent.

(186)

1a. * I am sad he left.   1b. I am sad that he left.

2a.   I am glad he left.   2b. I am glad that he left.

(187)

3a. * I am aware he left   3b. I am aware that he left.

4a.   I am afraid he left.   4b. I am afraid that he left.

After looking at these examples, we may first wonder: what other elements aside from the respective adjectives in these almost identical syntactic adjectival constructions might be involved in either the requirement or the omission of the complementizer *that*? And, secondly, what else aside from semantic features or constraints in these adjectives might be involved in either the requirement or omission of *that*?

Examples in (186) and (187) also reveal that trying to reduce or circumscribe the functioning of the alternation to particular environments in order to determine a principled account for a sectorial or restricted distribution alone will not work, at least as far as adjectival constructions are concerned. This point might also reduce, if not block, the chances to acquire a single ruling principle for the alternation. It is in cases like this where the "comprehensive account for the distribution of the null C in English." (Boscovic and Lasnik 2003:43) would be difficult to apply since their PF/Morphological Merger does not account for adjectival constructions. On the other hand, it does not seem that phonological affixation regulates the general syntactic distribution of the alternation, and in order to account for particular environments "Boscovic and Lasnik have to make additional stipulations, such that the host must specifically be a + [V], with a further special exception for copulas" (cf. Richards 2006:169).

6. 3. The historical alternation

"Innumerable and recondite are the causes which are at work in creating and destroying syntactical formations (…) but from the many facts, which are furnished by historical and comparative grammar, we are able to deduce at least a few leading principles."
[Kellner 1892:14]

It is clear that one of the main challenges from the point of view of linguistic and grammatical change is trying to explain why linguistic elements or syntactic structures change in the way that they do. By applying focus to those environments that have really changed, the historical perspective of the alternation has actually revealed some aspects of its evolutionary nature. We now know, for instance, that the only structural change in complement clauses occurred when the complementizer *that* actually began to syntactically alternate within the prominence of the *that*-clause, and not where it remained the same. Indeed, at first approach, we may think that explaining environments that do not alternate (i.e., where the subordinator *that* is still mandatory) would be a difficult task; however, the history of English syntax shows that those environments are actually simpler to explain, since their structures have remained largely unchanged. We now know that there are some structures that represent historical remnants of the prominence of the *that*-clause, which were obeying idiomatic principles of early English. In fact, the history of English shows that several structures have remained almost unaffected, despite long and deep contemporaneous linguistic transformations (such as

the present tense third person conjugation –*s*, inversion structures after initial negative adverbials or certain conditionals, the use of the subjunctive in particular environments, etc.). Something like this also happened in the case of the peculiar syntactic behaviour of words such as *whisper, sad* and *aware*; they represent old structures that were either not directly related to the main ongoing changes or little used due to their relatively low linguistic activity within complement clauses.

This analysis also shows that the progressive disappearance of the subordinator *that* from the complementation line was due not only to the development of the alternation, but also to other factors such as replacement, paraphrasing, etc.

By revealing the evolutionary process of the alternation, the historical perspective shows diverse linguistic elements in their respective contexts (such as language contact, influence, mistakes/omissions, activation, the expansion process, etc.) that due to their intricate or complex nature tend normally to escape and/or resist reductionism, reducing or blocking chances for formulations. After examining the results of this study, we can now better understand why the alternation is in fact at its present unsolved status. It will be difficult to understand the evolution of the alternation if we do not take into account this kind of analysis. The historical perspective on the combined external and internal developments of the alternation, along with the historical behaviour of particular syntactic environments, may for instance explain not only why previous attempts to formulate a principled syntactic account for the alternation have failed so far, but also why future attempts might as well, as purely synchronic accounts of most previous research have not been able to handle all of the data. In that sense, these important aspects involving the development of the alternation exposed by an historical review make up a substantial difference and represent an advantage with respect to either previous or other types of studies. Moreover, the historical approach has already given us useful information about the peculiar syntactic behavior of the alternation through time, which in turn can bring research closer to a possible satisfactory general or principled account. The historical approach had undoubtedly provided us with a better knowledge of what has become a highly frequent syntactic phenomenon in the English language.

Chapter VII

Conclusion

The present study has in fact shed new light on the English alternation *that/Ø*. This thesis initially proposed to examine English historical syntax in the context of the alternation and look for evidence connected to its development. The attested data presented here shows that this original proposal resulted in fruitful discoveries. Thus, this study has managed to chart the previously untraceable character of the alternation.

As to the main objectives of this thesis, this study concludes with the following:

1. In a time when the prominence of the *that*-clause was the idiomatic pattern in English subordination, the arrival of different subordinate structures (including the alternation) in significant and influential English writing appeared by the second half of the tenth century AD. This evidence supports the first objective determined for this thesis.

2. In Chapter IV, we analysed the different ways in which the aforementioned process occurred. Attested data from a combination of external and internal linguistic developments show that new ways of subordination started to appear in complementation, expanding and providing more syntactic flexibility to the formerly simple and rigid OE subordination.

3. As seen in Chaper V, attested data shows that ME is the period of expansion in which the alternation became linguistically more operative, due to higher rates of writing production and more frequent use of the alternation.

4. Additional factors of English linguistic developments, as seen in Chapter VI, might also have contributed to the further facilitation and/or acceleration of both the introduction and the development process of the alternation, especially in the case of borrowings.

The evidence reiterated in points 2, 3 and 4 also supports the first objective determined for this thesis. Finally, the evidence in all four of the points in turn supports the second objective determined for this thesis.

As for the selected working hypothesis, the analysis above shows evidence that supports its central proposition, indicating an abstract distribution of the alternation rather than obeying any syntactic principled account. This abstract distribution may account for the present situation of the alternation, where the specific usage of the corresponding grammatical *that* or *Ø* in subordination has to be memorised for each specific verb or adjective (*say* vs. *whisper*; *sad* vs. *glad*, etc.).

a) Since the first attested data regarding the alternation are circumscribed to only a few specific or sectorial environments, the evidence reveals that it does not seem to respond to any principled account that could operate in any and all environments.

b) The kinds of environments affected in the starting phase of the alternation (mostly verbs of saying or discourse and a few of mental activity), the way in which they were affected (literal translations, variation in renderings, breaking down discourse, structural rearrangement, paraphrasing, etc.), and the manner in which those environments developed (gradually from common environments to related ones through centuries) also do not seem to obey any kind of principled account. Otherwise, the alternation would equally affect any environment and be noticeable at any time.

c) The presence of external and internal factors (Chapter IV), along with additional factors of English linguistic development and features or constraints from the syntax-semantics interface (Chapter VI), also make it difficult to formulate a single ruling principle or a principled account within syntax only.

If the analysis carried out in this thesis reveals itself to be plausible, the presence of one or more factors mentioned above might somehow be blocking, reducing or still resisting the formulation of a syntactic principled account for the distribution of the alternation within English syntax. So the idea that such a principle might be regulating the distribution of the alternation has thus become reduced and/or weakened.

Therefore, as long as the alternation still remains unaccounted for, it will support the idea presented here that one or more of the factors mentioned above might be involved in both the development and the distribution of the alternation. And, as long as no syntactic principled account appears, the initial proposition of this investigation will still stand.

References

Andrew, Samuel. *Syntax and Style in Old English*. New York: Russell and Russell Publishers, 1966. Print.

Ælfric. *Catholic Homilies.* The First Series and The Second Series. Peter Clemoes. Oxford: The Early English Text Society, 1997. Print.

Baker, Nicholson. *The Size of Thoughts: Essays and Other Lumber*. Reading: Cox & Wyman Publishing, 1997. Print.

Baron, Naomi. *Alphabet to Email: How English Evolved and Where It's Heading*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Baugh, Albert, and Thomas Cable. *A History of the English Language*. Bodmin: MPG Books Lt, 2002. Print.

Belfour, A. O. *Twelfth-Century Homilies, in MS. Bodley 343*. Oxford: The Early English Text Society, 1909. Print.

Boskovic, Zeljko, and Howard Lasnik. "On the distribution of null complementizers." *Linguistic Inquiry 34*(4), 2003: 527-546.

Brown, William. *A Syntax of King Alfred's Pastoral Care*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1970.

Caxton, William. *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*. Lefevre, Raoul, Caxton, W. Sommer, O. London: David Nutt, 1894. Print.

Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. "Filters and Control", *Linguistic Inquiry 11*, Dordretch: Kluwer, 1977: 425-504. Print.

Chomsky, Noam. *Lectures on Binding and Government: The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 1981. Print.

Crawford, S. J. *Byrhtferth's Manual*. (Byrhtferth, MS. Ashmole 328). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966. Print.

Croft, William. *Explaining Language Change: An evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2000.

Dayal, Veneeta, and Jane Grimshaw. "Subordination at the Interface: the Quasi-Subordination Hypothesis." Department of Linguistics Rutgers University, 2009: 1-16.

Fischer, Olga, Koopman, Willem Koopman and Ans van Kemenade. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.

Fischer, Olga. *Morphosyntactic change: functional and formal perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.

Godden, Malcolm & Irvine, Susan. *The Old English Boethius*. Suffolk: Oxford University Press, 2009. Print.

Gorrell, J. Hendren. "Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon." *Modern Language Association 10*, 1895: 342-385.

Grimshaw, Jane. "That's nothing: the grammar of complementizer omission." Rutgers University, 2009.

Hock, Hans Henrich, and Brian D. Joseph. Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.

Holthausen, Ferdinand. *Vices and Virtues: being a soul's confession* (The Stowe MS. 240). London: Oxford University Press, 1888-1921. Print.

Hæberli, Eric. "Speculations on the syntax of subordinate clauses in Old English." School of Linguistics & Applied Language Studies. The Univ. of Reading, 2001: 201-229.

Kellner, Leon. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*. London: MacMillan and Company, 1892. Print.

Kroch, Anthony & Taylor, Ann. "Verb-Object Order in Early Middle English." University of Pennsylvania, 2000: 1-35.

Liuzza, Roy. *The Old English Version of the Gospels*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, Oxford University Press, 1994.

Mitchell, Bruce. *Old English Syntax*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985. Print.

---. "The Origin of Old English Conjunctions: Some Problems." In *Historical Syntax*, Ed. Fisiak, J. Berlin: Mouton, 1981: 271-299.

---. Subordinate Clauses in Old English Poetry. D. Phil. Thesis. University of Oxford, 1959.

Parkes, M.B. *Pause and Effect: an introduction to the history of punctuation in the West*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992. Print.

Perlmutter, David. *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Holt. Rinehart and Winston, 1971. Print.

Pesetsky, David & Torrego, Esther. "T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences." In *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*. Kentowicz, Michael. (Ed.) MIT Press, 2000: 355-426.

Richards, Mark. "Weak pronouns, object shift, and multiple spell-out: Evidence for phrases at the PF-interface." In *Minimalist Essays*. Boeckx, C. (Ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing CO., 2006: 160-181.

Rissanen, Matti. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Lass, R. (Ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Vol. III, Chapter 4, 1999: 187-331.

---. "Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom: "To Wit." *Inside Old English*. J. Walmsley (Ed.). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2006: 222-241.

Rizzi, Luigi. "The fine structure of the left periphery." In *Elements of Grammar, Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Haegeman, L. (Ed.). Kluwer: Dordrecht, 1997: 281-337.

Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press, 2003. Print.

Schuelke, Gertrude. "'Slipping' in Indirect Discourse". In *American Speech, Vol. 33*. Standford University, 1958: 90-98.

Skeat, Walter. *Joseph of Arimathie*. Oxford: Early English Text Society by N. Trübner Publishers, 1987. Print.

Spieker, Edward H. "On direct speech introduced by a conjunction." *American Journal of Philology 5*, 1884: 221-7.

Stockwell, Robert & Donka, Minkova. "Subordination and word order change in the history of English. In *Historical English Syntax*. Kastovsky, D. (Ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991: 367-408.

Stowell, Tim. "Complemetizers and the Empty Category Principle." NELS Origins of Phrase Structures. Cambridge. MA: Massachussetes Institute of Technology, 1981: 345-363.

Sweet, Henry. *King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. New York: The Early English Text Society, 1978. Print.

Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. *On the NIC, vacuous application and the that-trace filter*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Linguistics Club, 1979. Print.

Thorpe, Benjamin. *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church.* The Sermones Catholici or Homilies of Ælfric. 2 Vols. London: Richard & John E. Taylor, 1844. Print.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. *A History of English Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. Print.
---. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Hogg, R. (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Vol. I, 1992: 168-289.

Van Gelderen, Elly. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006. Print.

Van Kemenade, Ans. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordretcht: Foris Publications, 1987. Print.

Visser, Frederic. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: E. J. Brill Academic Publishers, 1973. Print.

Waterhouse, Ruth. "Ælfric's use of discourse in some saint's lives." In *Anglo-Saxon England*, P. Clemoes (Ed.). Cambridge: University Printing House, 1976: 83-103.
---. *The Triangular Clause Relantionship in Ælfric's Lives of Saints and in Other Works*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers Inc, 1983. Print.

Web Publications: digitalization of originals and electronic sources

Atkins, John. *The Owl and the Nightingale*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
    Web. 28 Jun. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/owlandnightingal00atkiuoft >.

Ælfric. *The first English-Latin Grammar*. Transl. Arthur F. Leach. *Educational charters and
    documents 598 to 1909*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
    Web. 18 Jan. 2014. < htpp://www.archive.org/details/educationalchart00leacuoft >.

Bosworth, Joseph. *The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels with the version of Wycliffe
    and Tyndale*. London: Reeves & Turner, 1888.
    Web. 10 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/gothicanglosax00ulfi >.

Bright, James Wilson. *The Gospel of Saint John*. (MS. CXL Cambr.). Boston: Heath, 1906.
    Web. 8 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/euangeliumsecund00brig >.

Bülbring, Karl. *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter*. London: Trübner & CO., 1891.
    Web. 16 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/earliestcomplet00unkngoog >.

Caxton, William. *Blanchardyn and Englantine*. London: Early English Text Society, 1890.
    Web. 2 Mar. 2014. < http://www.archive.org/details/caxtonsblancha5800caxtuoft>.

Chaucer, Gregory. *Canterbury Tales*. (The Ellesmere MS.). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1915.
    Web. 20 Dec. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/geoffreychaucers00chauuoft >.
---. "The Persouns Tale." *Canterbury Tales*. (Ellesmere MS.). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1915.
    Web. 19 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/geoffreychaucers00chauuoft >.

Cockayne, Oswald. *Seinte Marherete The Meiden ant Martyr*. London: Trübner & CO., 1866.
    Web. 29 Oct. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/seintemarherete00cockgoog >.
---. "Juliana." *The Life of St. Juliana*. Trans. O. Cockayne and E. Brock. London: Trübner &
    CO., 1872. Web. 31 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/elifladeofstjuli00cock >.
---. "Seyn Julian." *The Life of St. Juliana*. Trans. O. Cockayne and E. Brock. London: Trübner
    & CO., 1872. Web. 31 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/elifladeofstjuli00cock >.

De Shoreham, William. *De Septem Sacramentis*. London: Trübner & CO., 1902.
    Web. 28 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/poemswilliamsho00konrgoog >.

Earle, John. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles parallel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865.

    Web. 20 Nov. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/twoofsaxonchroni00angluoft >.

---. *English Prose: Its Elements, History and Usage*. London: Schmidt & CO, 1890.

    Web. 14 Jul. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924031749835 >.

Einenkel, Eugen. *The Life of Saint Katherine* (Royal MS.17). London: Trübner & CO., 1884.

    Web. 23 Dec. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/lifesaintkather00einegoog >.

Ellis, Alexander. *The Only English Proclamation of Henry III*. London: Asher & CO., 1868.

    Web. 17 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/onlyenglishprocl00ellirich >.

Fielding, Henry. *The History of Tom Jones*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1908.

    Web. 30 Jan. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/historyoftomjone1908fiel >.

Fox, Samuel. *King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of Boethius De Consolatione*

    Philosophiae. (Cotton MS.). London: H. G. Bohn, 1864.

    Web. 1 Jun. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/kingalfredsanglo00boet >.

Foxe, John. *The Gospels of the fower Euangelistes translated in the olde Saxons tyme out of*

    Latin into the vulgare toung of the Saxons. London: Iohn Daye, 1571.

    Web. 4 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/gospelsoffowereu00foxe >.

Gloucester, R. The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester. London: Spottiswoode, 1887.

    Web. 29 Jan. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/metricalchronicl01robe >.

        < https://archive.org/details/metricalchronicl02robe. >

Hall, Joseph. *King Horn*. *A Middle-English Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

    Web. 15 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/kinghornmiddleen00hall >.

Hamelius, P. *Mandeville's travels*. The Cotton Titus MS. London: Trübner & CO., 1919.

    Web. 3 Sep. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/mandevillestrave00mand >.

Hammond, Eleanor P. "On the Order of the Canterbury Tales: Caxton's Two Editions."

    Modern Philology, Vol. 3, Early Journal Content, JSTOR, 1905.

    Web. 28 Feb. 2014. < http://archive.org/stream/jstor-432513/432513 >.

Hardwick, Charles. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1858.
Web. 1 Mar. 2014. < http://www.archive.org/details/gospelaccordingt00camb >.

Harris, Lancelot Minor. *Studies in the Anglo-Saxon Version of the Gospels (The form of the Latin original and mistaken renderings)*. Baltimore: John Murphy CO., 1901.
Web. 3 Sep. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/studiesinanglosa00harrrich >.

Henshaw, Alonzo Norton. *The Syntax of the Indicative and Subjunctive Moods in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.* Leipzig: Oswald Schmidt, 1894.
Web. 5 Sep. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924027324114 >.

Herrtage, Sydney. *Sir Ferumbras* (Ashmole MS. 33). London: Trübner & CO., 1879.
Web. 19 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/sirferumbras01herrgoog >.

Hogg, Richard. "Phonology and Morphology." *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Hogg, R. (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992: 67-167.
Web. 21 Aug. 2013. < http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521264747.004 >.

Horstman, Carl. *The Early South-English Legendary.* London: Early English Text Soc., 1887.
Web. 28 Jun. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/earlysouthengli01librgoog >.

Hulme, William. *Harrowing of Hell* (Harley MS.). London: Trübner & CO., 1907.
Web. 18 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/middleenglishha01hulmgoog >.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature.* Oxford: Clrendon Press, 1888.
Web. 31 Mar. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/treatiseonhuman00humegoog >.

Jespersen, Otto. *Growth and Structure of The English Language*. Leipzig: B. Teubner, 1912.
Web. 6 Jul. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/growthstructureoesp00jrich >.

Jewett, Sophie. *Pearl*. New York: T. Y. Crowell & CO., 1908.
Web. 27 Apr. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/pearlamiddleeng04jewegoog >.
(Stanton) Web. 27 Apr. 2014. < http://www.billstanton.co.uk/pearl/pearl_old.htm#51>.

Klaeber, Friedrich. *The Later Genesis (A.B)* (MS. Junius XI). Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1913.
Web. 4 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/latergenesisando00caeduoft >.

Kock, Ernst. *The Rule of St. Benet* (Lansdowne 378 MS.). London: Trübner, 1902.

    Web. 20 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/threemiddleengl00kockgoog >.

Langland, William. *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. London: N. Trübner & CO., 1867.

    Web. 1 Nov. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/visionwilliamco02skeagoog >.

Layamon. *Brut or Chronicle of Britain*. Trans. F. Madden. London: R & J. Taylor, 1847.

    Web. 29 Nov. 2013 < https://archive.org/stream/layamonsbrutorch02layauoft >.

Marx, C. W. "The Gospel of Nicodemus in Old English and Middle English." *The Medival*

    Gospel of Nicodemus. Izydorczyk, Z. (Ed.), Arizona State University, 1997: 207-259.

    Web. 27 Oct. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/medievalgospelof00izyduoft >.

More, Thomas. *The Utopia*. Transl. R. Robinson, 1551. Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1895.

    Web. 22 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/utopiasirthomas00robigoog >.

MacRory, Joseph. *The Gospel of St. John*. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1914.

    Web. 30 Jan. 2014. < http://www.archive.org/details/thegospelofstjoh00macruoft >.

Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte d' Arthur*. Oskar Sommer. London: David Nutt, 1889.

    Web. 27 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/lemortedarthuror00malouoft >.

Mannyng, Robert. *Handlyng Synne*. Harley MS. London: Early English Text Society, 1901.

    Web. 12 Mar 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/robertofbrunnesh12mannuoft >.

Melville Bell, Alexander. *Principles of Speech and Dictionary of Sounds*. Washington, 1863.

    Web. 29 Nov. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/principlesofspee00bell >.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Robert Vaughan (Ed.). New York: Collier. 1860.

    Web. Mar. 03 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/miltonsparadisel00miltuoft >.

Morris, Richard. *The Blicking Homilies*. Lothian's MS. London: Early English Text S., 1880.

    Web: 21 Mar. 2014. < http://www.archive.org/details/blicklinghomili00morrgoog >.

---. *Cursor Mundi*. (Cotton Vespasian MS.) London: N. Trübner & CO., 1874.

    Web. 10 Dec. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/cursormundithecu5759unse >.

---. *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century* (MS. B 14.52). London: Trübner CO., 1873.

    Web. 24 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/oldenglishhomil01morrgoog >.

---. *An Old English Miscellany*. London: N. Trübner & CO., 1872.

 Web. 12 Mar. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/anoldenglishmis00sullgoog >.

---. "Sawles Warde." In *Old English Homilies*. London: N. Trübner & CO., 1868.

 Web. 30 Oct. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/oldenglishhomil00morr >.

---. "The Proverbs of Hendyng." *Specimens of Early English*.Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

 Web. 5 Jan. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/specimensofearly02fryeuoft >.

---. *The Story of Genesis and Exodus*. London: Trübner & CO., 1865.

 Web. 24 Feb. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/storygenesisand00librgoog >.

---. A Moral Ode/Poema Morale. In *Old English Homilies and Homiletic treatises.* (Lambeth

 MS. 487). London: N. Trübner & CO., 1868.

 Web. 25 Jan. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/oldenglishhomili00morruoft >.

Morton, James. *The Ancren Riwle*. London: The Camden Society, 1853.

 Web. 31 Oct. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/ancrenriwleatre00mortgoog >.

Northgate, Michel. *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt*. London: N. Trünber & CO., 1866.

 Web. 17 Feb. 2014. < http://www.archive.org/details/DanMichelsAyenbiteOfInwyt >.

Quiller-Couch, Arthur. *Alison* (The Oxford Book of Verse). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

 Web. 30 Nov. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/cihm_65179#page/n19/mode/2up >.

Oxford English Dictionary. < http://www.oed.com >.

Rhodes, Ernest. *Liber Scintillarum* (Royal MS. 7 C iv.) London: Trübner & CO., 1889.

 Web. 25 Jan. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/defensorslibersc00deferich >.

Rolle, Richard. *The Fire of Love*. Richard Misyn. London: Early English Text Society, 1896.

 Web. 28 May 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/fireloveandmend00rollgoog >.

Ross, Arthur. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." (Cotton Nero) Toronto Univ. Press, 1987.

 Web. 1 Jul. 2013. < www.yorku.ca/inpar/sggk_replica.pdf >.

Saupe, Karen. "Cristes Milde Moder." In *Middle English Marian Lyrics*, 1997.

 Web. 24 Mar. 2014. < http://d.lib.rochester.edu/teams/text/saupe-middle-english-

 marian-lyrics-mary-at-the-foot-of-the-cross#two >.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. London: Shakespeare Soc., Trünber & CO., 1874.

      Web. 27 July 2013. < https://archive.org/details/romeojulietparal00shakuoft >.

---. *Sonnets*. Rolfe W. (Ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883.

      Web. 20 Apr. 2014. < https://archive.org/details/Shakespearessonn01shak_201303 >.

 ---. "The Comedy of Errors." Web. 2 May 2014. < http://shakespeare.mit.edu >

Skeat, Walter. *Lay of Havelok the Dane*. Laud Misc 108 MS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.

      Web. 9 Jun. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/layofhavelokdane00skearich >.

---. "The Testament of Love." *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.

      Web. 30 Jun. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/chaucerianandoth00chauuoft >.

---. "The Praise of Peace." *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.

      Web. 31 Jan. 2014. < https://archive.org/stream/chaucerianandoth00chauuoft >.

---. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1858.

      Web. 4 Jul. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/gospelaccordingt00camb >.

---. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871.

      Web. 18. Jul. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/gospelaccordingt00skearich >.

---. *The Gospel according to Saint Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1874.

      Web. 27 Jul. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/gospelaccording01unkngoog >.

---. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1878.

      Web. 6 Jul. 2013. < https://archive.org/details/gospelaccording01skeagoog >.

---. *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. (Cottonian Julius E. VII). Early English Text Society, 1881.

      Web. 8 Dec. 2013. < http://www.archive.org/details/aelfricslivessa00gunngoog >.

      Web. 30 Nov. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/aelfricslivesof01aelf >.

Stuart, J., and D. Nash. *Merlin or The Early History of King Arthur*. London, Trübner, 1889.

      OED. Web. Feb. 16. 2014.

      < http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/Merlin/1:3?rgn=div1;view=fulltext >.

Swan, Mary. *Ælfric as source: the exploitation of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies from the late*

      tenth century to twelfth centuries. PhD dissertation, University of Leeds, 1993.

      Web. 21 Apr. 2014. < http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/1949/ >.

Sweet, Henry. *King Alfred's Orosius*. London: Early English Text Society, 1883.

      Web. 27 May 2013. < htpp://www.archive.org/details/kingalfredsorosi79oros >.

Tennyson, Alfred. *The Two Voices*. New York: Clark & Maynard Publishers, 1882.

> Web. 5 Dec. 2013. < htpp://www.archive.org/details/twovoicesanddrea00tenn >.

The *Geneva Bible* 1560. London: Robert Barker Printer, 1606.

> Web. 02 Aug. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/ost-english-bible00lond/bible00lond >.

The King James Version. *The Bible*. *The Authorized Version* 1611.

> Web. 25 Jul. 2013. < http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org >.

The Lindisfarne Gospels or Aldred's Lindisfarne, see W. Skeat, *The Gospel according to St.*

> *Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke*, and *St. John*, respectively.

Thorpe, Benjamin. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London: Longman, Green, & Roberts, 1861.

> Web. 19 Dec. 2013. < https://archive.org/stream/anglosaxonchroni01thor >.

Tyndale, William. *The Bible* 1526 (see Bosworth, J.).

Voigts, Linda, and Michael McVaugh. *Phlebotomy*. Vol. 74, Part 2, 1984

> Web. 8 Mar. 2014 < http://www.jstor.org/stable/1006388 >.

Warner, Rubie. *Early English Homilies (XII Century)*. London: Trübner & CO., 1917.

> Web. 25 May 2014. < https://archive.org/details/earlyenglishhomi00aelf >.

Wycliffe, John. *The Holy Bible (1389)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850.

> Web. 28 Nov. 2013. (see Bosworth, J.).
> < https://archive.org/stream/holybiblecontain01wycluoft#page/n5/mode/2up >.
> < https://archive.org/stream/holybiblecontain04wycluoft#page/22/mode/2up >.