Ireneusz Kida

A corpus-based dynamic approach to para-hypotaxis: Implications for diachronic corpus linguistic analysis

WYDAWNICTWO
UNIWERSYTETU ŚLĄSKIEGO
KATOWICE 2014

A corpus-based dynamic approach to para-hypotaxis: Implications for diachronic corpus linguistic analysis

NR 3167

Ireneusz Kida

A corpus-based dynamic approach to para-hypotaxis: Implications for diachronic corpus linguistic analysis

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego • Katowice 2014

Editor of the Series: Językoznawstwo Neofilologiczne
Maria Wysocka

Referee
Henryk Kardela

Contents

Chapter 3

Introduction

The purpose of the book

This book, consisting of six chapters, inscribes itself in the field of diachronic corpus linguistics and is the result of research focused on finding new corpus tools for solving the problem of clause ambivalence in Old English. The efforts resulted in the creation of an authored research methodology allowing for systematic classification, description, automatic search and analysis of ambivalent clauses, which form a separate syntactic category called para-hypotaxis, on the basis of a specific manually compiled corpus consisting of two manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: manuscript A and manuscript E. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was chosen because in the scientific literature it is considered to have a purely native character and to have been written in colloquial style. Thus the type of Old English used in it is more natural than that found in translated works. Not incidentally, the oldest manuscript (A), also referred to as the *Parker Chronicle* or the *Winchester Chronicle*, is compared with the youngest one (E), also referred to as the *Peterborough Chronicle* or the *Laud Manuscript*, because it was assumed that the comparison of these two manuscripts would allow for a more interesting confrontation.

The concept of para-hypotaxis is traditionally applied in Romance linguistics in relation to the Old Italian sequences of dependent clauses followed by main clauses introduced by certain coordinating conjunctions. However, in this book it receives a distinct meaning by being identified with ambivalence, which is the key issue here. In our view, para-hypotaxis is the phenomenon of ambivalent clauses which can be found in an intermediate stage of the transition of a language from parataxis to hypotaxis or vice versa. Since these clauses are ambivalent, we propose that they be analysed in two different ways, namely either as main clauses being in paratactic relation to the immediately preceding/following clauses, or as dependent ones being in hypotactic relation to the

clauses immediately preceding/following them; in this book, *main* is used also in the sense of *independent* or *coordinate*.

Apart from discovering, classifying, describing and comparing Old English ambivalent clauses, we aim at measuring the extent of the influence carried by their dual analysis on the overall picture of surface word order in both manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It has been demonstrated that the results of the analysis substantially differ depending on whether the ambivalent clauses are approached from the point of view of parataxis and treated as main or from the point of view of hypotaxis and treated as dependent. Therefore, it is significant how these clauses are approached.[1]

By writing this book, we also intend to encourage creation of innovative research tools and methods, as well as to promote corpus linguistics, in which there are still many unresolved problems and open questions.

In sum, we aim at fulfilling the following objectives:

a) creation of a research methodology for the phenomenon of para-hypotaxis,
b) creation of a typology of para-hypotactic clauses,
c) development and promotion of diachronic corpus linguistics.

Last but not least, we do not follow any established linguistic model but rather assume a theory-neutral eclectic approach and thus our book is directed to both model-oriented and not model-oriented readers.

The structure of the book

In Chapter 1 we discuss the state of the art. At the beginning we concentrate on some notions related to corpus linguistics such as corpus composition, annotation, corpus size and representativeness. Then the well-known and influential diachronic corpora of English, both annotated and unannotated, are discussed. Afterwards, we focus on the problem of parataxis and hypotaxis, which are syntactic phenomena that are defined in different ways by different

[1] In Kida (2007, 2010a, 2011b, 2011c) we already mentioned the problem of the para-hypotaxis in question (though we did not use the term para-hypotaxis then), but our views concerning it were very vague and far from being systematic or detailed. We briefly discussed this problem only theoretically without putting our ideas into practice. Although at that time we were aware of the existence of ambivalence in certain Old English clauses, so far in our analysis we have treated them not as ambivalent but as unambivalent, and analysed them like that. Nevertheless, we suggested that the problem might be treated in a more systematic way in the future; which we are doing now by isolating para-hypotaxis and dealing with it as a separate category. As regards other authors, to the best of our knowledge a similar classification, description, annotation and analysis of the para-hypotaxis we are dealing with here has not been proposed yet.

authors. The notion of para-hypotaxis is the next problem to be discussed and here we present the meanings that this notion is normally used to convey. In this chapter we also discuss the problems of modern punctuation in English mediaeval texts and of ambivalent Old English clauses. At the end of this chapter we discuss ambiguity, some ways of resolving it, and make an introduction to the following chapters.

In Chapter 2 we discuss how we ourselves see para-hypotaxis and suggest that it should be approached in a dynamic way. We distinguish two large subcategories of para-hypotaxis, namely *Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis* and *Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis*. We employ the following acronyms for the respective types of para-hypotaxis: *SIPH-taxis* (or *PH-siph*) and *MIPH-taxis* (or *PH-miph*). Within SIPH-taxis we distinguish *SIPH clauses* and *SIPH elements*, and analogically within MIPH-taxis *MIPH clauses* and *MIPH elements*. In order to comprise both types of para-hypotaxis in a more general way, we sometimes employ the terms *PH-taxis, PH clauses* and *PH elements*. Apart from making an introduction to these two kinds of para-hypotaxis, in this chapter we present the basics of our annotated corpus and the way we used it in the analysis.

In Chapter 3 we discuss in more detail the problem of Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis (SIPH-taxis). In SIPH-taxis we identify 24 types of SIPH clauses on the basis of different SIPH elements that introduce them. A SIPH element always belongs to its corresponding SIPH clause no matter if the clause in which it appears is approached from the point of view of parataxis or from the point of view of hypotaxis. Moreover, apart from providing a classification and a theoretical description of the different kinds of SIPH clauses, we provide numerous examples from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for illustration. Towards the end of this chapter we gather together all the data obtained for each kind of SIPH clauses and establish the maximum range of the corridor of ambivalence that the SIPH clauses offer together, both in the *Parker Chronicle* and in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

In Chapter 4 we discuss in more detail the phenomenon of Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis (MIPH-taxis). There are 24 different kinds of ambivalent clauses that belong to MIPH-taxis. There is a significant difference between SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis, namely a MIPH element does not always belong to its corresponding MIPH clause but it changes its position depending on whether the MIPH clause is approached from the point of view of parataxis or from the point of view of hypotaxis; it belongs to its corresponding MIPH clause only in hypotaxis. Moreover, as was the case with SIPH clauses, we provide a detailed classification and theoretical description of the different kinds of MIPH clauses. We also illustrate them by means of numerous examples from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, we discuss the corridor of ambivalence offered by each kind of the MIPH clauses, and finally we establish the maximum range of the corridor of

ambivalence offered by all the MIPH clauses taken together, both in the *Parker Chronicle* and in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

In Chapter 5 we discuss the phenomenon of Extended-Para-Hypotaxis (EPH-taxis). However, unlike was the case with SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis, we describe it in very general terms and leave the reader with some implications for further study. As a matter of fact, EPH-taxis is not true para-hypotaxis because EPH clauses are not intrinsically ambivalent, unlike SIPH clauses and MIPH clauses. What can be ambivalent in EPH-taxis, however, are EPH elements but only partly and this partial ambivalence has no influence upon the status of the clauses involved because they are always unambivalent. EPH-taxis always implies a mutual co-existence of at least two clauses, one of which is unambivalently main and the other is unambivalently dependent, no matter if their EPH elements are approached from the point of view of parataxis or hypotaxis. Moreover, we consider EPH-taxis as being of minor importance and that is why we discuss it very generally and do not establish the maximum range of the corridor of ambivalence offered by them. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to do an analogical analysis of EPH clauses to the one we did with respect to SIPH and MIPH clauses, and see what the final outcome of this analysis would be.

In Chapter 6 we measure the extent of the influence of the dual analysis of PH clauses and we arrive at some conclusions and implications. When we approach the PH clauses from the point of view of parataxis, they are treated as main and need to be added to the total number of unambivalent main clauses. On the other hand, when the same PH clauses are approached from the point of view of hypotaxis, they are treated as dependent and need to be added to the total number of unambivalent dependent clauses. Both procedures offer very interesting results and it can be observed how the picture of word order configurations changes in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* depending on the approach. We are basically concerned with calculating the percentages and with establishing the proportion of PH clauses treated as main to the unambivalent main clauses, and the proportion of PH clauses treated as dependent to the unambivalent dependent clauses in both manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. At the end of this chapter we arrive at further conclusions and discuss some problems and implications of our study.

Chapter 1

State of the art

1.1. Corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics is a relatively young branch of linguistics and Lindquist (2009: 1) defines it as "a methodology, comprising a large number of related methods which can be used by scholars of many different theoretical leanings." However, Aarts and McMahon (2006: 44) observe that "corpus linguistics may be viewed as a methodology, but the methodological practices adopted by corpus linguists are not uniform." McEnry et al. (2006: 3) note that "although the term corpus linguistics first appeared only in the early 1980s, corpus-based language study has a substantial history [and] the basic corpus methodology was widespread in linguistics in the early twentieth century." Moreover, the authors add that even though linguists at that time did not use computers as a means of data storage, their methodology was essentially corpus-based in the sense that it was empirical and based on observed data. However, in late 1950s the corpus methodology was severely criticised and it became marginalised, but with the developments in computer technology the exploitation of massive corpora became possible, and the marriage of corpora with computer technology revived the interest in the corpus methodology. McEnry and Wilson (2001: 24) also note that "although the methodology went through a period of relative neglect for two decades, it was far from abandoned. Indeed, during this time essential advances in the use of corpora were made. Most importantly of all, the linking of the corpus to the computer was completed during this era. Following these advances, corpus studies boomed from 1980s onwards, as corpora, techniques and new arguments in favour of the use of corpora became more apparent." This boom, they say, continues currently and corpus linguistics is becoming more and more mature methodologically, and moreover the range of languages that are addressed by corpus linguists is growing annually. Lindquist (2009) notes that the first electronic collection of English texts to be used for linguistic research

was compiled by the pioneers in corpus linguistics Nelson Francis and Henry Kučera in the early 1960s at Brown University, US, and this electronic collection of English texts is referred to as the Brown Corpus, which is regarded as the first non-diachronic computer corpus ever developed. Soon after, computers started becoming more and more powerful and the field was developing faster and faster, to gather momentum in the 2000s, and in recent years one can observe that it is more and more popular, not only among scholars.[1] As McEnry et al. (2006: 4) note, "nowadays, the corpus methodology enjoys widespread popularity. It has opened up or foregrounded many new areas of research [and] corpora have revolutionized nearly all branches of linguistics." Ezquerra and Hurtado (1996: 41; after Endres and Wagner 1992) mention the following disciplines in which corpora find their application:

- Theoretical linguistics: traditional linguistics disciplines such as syntax, morphology, phonetics, etc.
- Lexicology and lexicography.
- Computational linguistics and related fields: language processing, computer analysis, language recognition, speech synthesis, information sciences, knowledge acquisition, expert systems, automated translation, text processing, language statistics, etc.
- Theory and practice of communication, including publishing.
- Psycholinguistics and related fields: neuropsychology, language philosophy, discourse analysis, text linguistics, etc.
- Computer assisted teaching: learning, stylistics, orthography, etc.

Lindquist (2009) comments that compiling corpora can be very time-consuming and expensive, therefore there must be considerable gains for the linguists to justify the effort. He says that the major advantages of corpora are speed and reliability, as by using a corpus the linguist can investigate more material than in manual investigation, and within a shorter time too, and moreover, he can obtain more exact results. Lindquist (2009: 9) also presents a list of the advantages of corpus linguistis that can be found in Svartvik (1992: 8—10), one of the founding fathers of ICAME, the International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English, that was started in 1977 in Oslo. We will mention only some of the advantages given:

- Corpus data are more objective than data based on introspection.
- Researchers can share the same corpus data instead of always compiling their own.
- Corpora provide the possibility of total accountability of linguistic features.
- Computerised corpora give researchers all over the world access to the data.
- Corpus data are perfect for non-native speakers of the language.
- Corpus data are excellent for studies of language variation.

[1] See McEnry and Wilson (2001).

- Corpus data provide frequency of occurrence of linguistic items.
- Corpus data give essential information for a number of applied areas, like language teaching and language technology (machine translation, speech synthesis, etc.)

These advantages, and many other not mentioned here, of corpora over manual investigation are the reasons for the fact that corpora are constantly being developed and that there is a growing interest in corpus linguistics, which resulted in the construction of multiple diachronic (historical) and non-diachronic corpora for the analysis of various languages of the world.

1.2. Definition of *corpus*

In the past, as Lindquist (2009) points out, the word *corpus* (Lat. 'body') was used to describe the total works written by an individual author or a certain mass of texts, as for example "The Shakespeare corpus." These were the so-called pre-electronic corpora. Nowadays, the term *corpus* is almost always associated with *electronic corpus*, which is a collection of texts stored on some kind of digital medium to be used by linguists with the purpose of retrieving linguistic items for research or by lexicographers in making dictionaries. According to Renouf (1987), the term *corpus* refers to a collection of written or spoken texts which is stored and processed on computer for the purposes of linguistic research. Sinclair (1991: 171) states that "a corpus is a collection of naturally-occurring language texts, chosen to characterize a state or variety of a language. In modern computational linguistics, a corpus typically contains many millions of words: this is because it is recognized that the creativity of natural language leads to such immense variety of expression that it is difficult to isolate the recurrent patterns that are the clues to the lexical structure of the language." Sinclair distinguishes two types of corpora, namely sample corpus and monitor corpus. The former is a finite collection of texts, often chosen with great care and studied carefully. On establishing a sample corpus, it cannot be added to or changed in any way. As for the latter, it is a continually-growing one and it re-uses language text which has been prepared in machine-readable form for other purposes, like for typesetters of newspapers, magazines, books and also word-processors; and the spoken language basically for legal and bureaucratic reasons. McEnery and Wilson (2001: 32) also distinguish two kinds of corpora, namely, unannotated and annotated.[2] Unannotated corpora are characterised by

[2] Curzan and Palmer (2006) use the terms unprincipled (or non-systematic) vs. principled corpora to mean unannotated and annotated corpora respectively.

being in their existing raw states of plain text, whereas annotated corpora are supplemented with various types of linguistic information and they are a very useful tool for a large-scale analysis of different aspects of language. Some of the most common types of corpus annotation are textual mark-up, part-of-speech (POS) tagging, syntactic annotation (parsing), semantic annotation, prosodic annotation, pragmatic annotation, discourse annotation, phonetic annotation and stylistic annotation (Leech 2004). Although corpus linguistics is a relatively young field of study and the methodologies applied in the process of text annotation vary and one cannot speak of any uniform and universal way of annotation of texts for electronic analyses, Leech (2004) acknowledges that more recently there has been a far-reaching trend to standardise the representation of all phenomena of a corpus, including annotations, by means of a standard mark-up language — usually one of the series of related languages: SGML, HTML, and XML. One of the advantages of using these languages for encoding features in a text is that they allow the interchange of documents, including corpora, between one user or research site and another. In this sense, Leech comments, SGML/HTML/XML have developed into a world-wide standard which can be applied to any language, both spoken and written, as well as to languages of different historical periods. Finally, Nesselhauf (2011) distinguishes the following kinds of corpora: general/reference corpora which aim at representing a language or a language variety as a whole and they contain both spoken and written language (e.g. the British National Corpus or the Bank of English), historical corpora (vs. corpora of present-day language) which aim at representing an earlier stage or earlier stages of a language (e.g. the Helsinki Corpus or the ARCHER), regional corpora which aim at representing one regional variety of a language (e.g. the Wellington Corpus of Written New Zealand English), learner corpora (vs. native speaker corpora) which aim at representing the language as produced by learners of this language (e.g. the International Corpus of Learner English), multilingual corpora (vs. one-language corpora) which aim at representing several, at least two, different languages, often with the same text types to enable contrastive analysis (e.g. the PROIEL Corpus, a parallel corpus of New Testament texts from different languages, like Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Church Slavonic and Classical Armenian), and spoken corpora (vs. written corpora) which aim at representing spoken language (e.g. the London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English).

1.3. Corpus composition, annotation, size and representativeness

Sinclair (2005) discusses some instructions that should be followed in the composition of a corpus and in the compilation of language samples. Below are the ten principles that he considers as fundamental:

4. The contents of a corpus should be selected without regard for the language it contains, but according to its communicative function in the community in which they arise.
5. Corpus compilers should strive to make their corpus as representative as possible of the language from which it is chosen.
6. Only those components of corpora which have been designed to be independently contrastive should be contrasted.
7. Criteria for determining the structure of a corpus should be small in number, clearly separate from one another, and efficient as a group in delineating a corpus that is representative of the language or variety under examination.
8. Any information about a text other than the alphanumeric string of its words and punctuation should be stored separately from the plain text and merged when required in applications.
9. Samples of language for a corpus should wherever possible consist of entire documents or transcriptions of complete speech events, or should get as close to this target as possible. This means that samples will differ substantially in size.
10. The design and composition of a corpus should be documented fully with information about the contents and arguments in justification of the decisions taken.
11. A corpus compiler should retain, as target notions, representativeness and balance. While these are not precisely definable and attainable goals, they must be used to guide the design of a corpus and the selection of its components.
12. Any control of subject matter in a corpus should be imposed by the use of external, and not internal, criteria.
13. A corpus should aim for homogeneity in its components while maintaining adequate coverage, and rogue texts should be avoided.

As far as annotation is concerned, McEnry et al. (2006: 33) say that "corpus annotation can be achieved fully automatically, by a semi-automatic interaction between human being and the machine, or entirely manually by human analysts." They also point out (McEnry et al. 2006: 33) that the annotation of a corpus may have many forms and it can be undertaken at different levels:

1. At the phonological level; where corpora can be annotated for syllable boundaries (phonetic/phonemic annotation) or prosodic features (prosodic annotation).
2. At the morphological level; where corpora can be annotated in terms of prefixes, stems and suffixes (morphological annotation).
3. At the lexical level; where corpora can be annotated for parts of speech (POS tagging), lemmas (lemmatisation), and semantic fields (semantic annotation).
4. At the syntactic level; where corpora can be annotated to show anaphoric relations (coreference annotation), pragmatic information like speech acts (pragmatic annotation) or stylistic features such as speech and thought presentation (stylistic annotation).

They observe that out of the different types of annotation POS tagging is the most widespread type of annotation, and that syntactic parsing is also developing quite fast. However, such types of annotation as discoursal annotation and pragmatic annotation are presently relatively underdeveloped. Květoň and Oliva (2002: 19) observe that "the quality of corpus annotation is certainly among the pressing problems in current corpus linguistics. This quality, however, is a many-faceted problem in itself, comprising both issues of a rather theoretical nature and also quite practical matters."[3] In the light of the lack of uniform annotated corpora and the different research needs that the researchers have with respect to language, Květoň and Oliva (2002: 255) encourage linguists to write their own computer programs for the construction of their own corpora. They say that there are several concrete advantages to writing one's own computer programs rather than relying on available concordancing software. Below we enumerate the arguments that they provide to support their claim:

1. Perhaps most importantly, writing programs allows one to conduct analyses that are not possible with concordances.
2. One can do many analyses more quickly and accurately.
3. One can tailor the output of the analysis to fit one's research needs.
4. When one writes one's own programs, there is no limit to the size of the corpus that can be analysed.

Generally speaking, writing one's own computer program for the construction of one's own corpus and its analysis "opens up a wider variety of options in the research questions that you can investigate" (Květoň and Oliva 2002: 256). We could also provide our own arguments in favour of the idea of creating one's own corpus that result from our experience[4] with diachronic annotated corpus linguistics:

[3] See also Sinclair (2004b).
[4] Cf. Kida (2007, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b and 2012).

1. One can freely choose texts to be annotated. This means that one can even analyse texts, or fragments of texts, that have not yet been annotated by anyone.
2. One can make the annotation simpler and more user-friendly.
3. One does not feel the limits and imperfections imposed on one by the existing annotated corpora.
4. One can find one's own solutions to the problems that might occur during the annotation process.
5. One can make use of simple and widely accessible computer programs for the construction of one's annotated corpora. For example, we used the Microsoft Word program.
6. One can construct one's own corpus the way that it can be modified and adapted to the needs of one's present and future research.
7. One can construct a corpus that will reflect one's own ideas about language.
8. One can construct a corpus that will allow one a dual/multiple approach to ambiguous/ambivalent structures in language instead of a rigid one-way approach.

Furthermore, McEnry and Wilson (2001: 32) observe that "unannotated corpora have been, and are, of considerable use in language study, but the utility of the corpus is considerably increased by the provision of annotation. The important point to grasp about an annotated corpus is that it is no longer simply a body of text in which the linguistic information is implicitly present. [Moreover,] a corpus, when annotated, may be considered to be a repository of linguistic information, because the information which was implicit in the plain text has been made explicit through concrete annotation." According to Leech (1993; after Dash 2005: 5), there are seven maxims that should be applied strictly in the annotation of texts:

> 1. It should always be easy to dispense with annotation, and revert to the raw corpus. The raw corpus should be recoverable.
> 2. The annotations should, correspondingly, be extractable from the raw corpus, to be stored independently, or stored in an interlinear format.
> 3. The scheme of analysis presupposed by the annotations — the annotation scheme — should be based on principles or guidelines accessible to the user.
> 4. It should be made clear beforehand about how and by whom all the annotations were applied.
> 5. The user must be made aware that the annotation applied in the corpus is not infallible, but simply a potentially useful tool.

6. Annotation schemes should preferably be based as far as possible on 'consensual', theory-neutral analyses of the corpus data.
7. No one annotation scheme can claim authority as a standard, although as a matter of fact interchange 'standards' may arise, through widening availability of annotated corpora, and perhaps should be encouraged.

Dash (2005) observes that in annotated corpus linguistics there are basically three important criteria that are usually considered as important in any kind of annotation. These criteria are: consistency, accuracy and speed. Firstly, as regards consistency, it concerns the uniformity in annotation throughout the whole text of a corpus. Secondly, accuracy is about the freedom from any kind of error in the tagging to adhere to the definitions and guidelines concerning the scheme of annotation. Thirdly, the automatic implementation of the scheme of annotation should be possible on a very large data quantity within a very short span of time.

Above we mentioned the problem of the lack of uniformity in annotated corpus linguistics. However, it is not the only problem that corpus linguists are facing. Among others, there is also the problem of how representative a given corpus is, and the problem of what size it should have in order to be representative. Kohnen (2007) notes that a first major difficulty in corpus linguistics is connected with corpus size as it is not known exactly how large corpora must be in order to qualify for valid linguistic research. Moreover, he states that on surveying the field one can get the impression that even in the age of so-called second-generation mega corpora, researchers seem to be less confident about the 'definite' size that corpora should have. Kohnen also notes that the problem of representativeness is another central concern in corpus linguistics and corpus linguists should aim at building such corpora that would be representative. However, he admits that when we are dealing with representativeness, many researchers are very reserved. According to Biber et al. (1998), a corpus is not a mere collection of texts. A corpus should rather seek to represent a language or some part of language. Therefore the appropriate design for a corpus is dependent upon what it is going to represent and the kinds of research questions that can be addressed, and the generalisability of the results of the research, in turn, is determined by the representativeness of the corpus. They conclude that "it is important to realize up front that representing a language — or even part of a language — is a problematic task. We do not know the full extent of variation in languages or all the contextual variables that need to be covered in order to capture all variation in texts" (p. 246). Mukherjee (2004) admits pessimistically that it is not possibile to attain absolute representativeness, whereas, according to Römer (2005: 41), "a large corpus can generally be regarded more representative of the type of language it consists of than

a small corpus which contains the same kind of language. Of course, any small corpus is better than no corpus at all, but if the choice is between a small and a large corpus of the same (or similar) kind of material, I would always go for the latter." This is confirmed by Leech (2007: 138), who observes that "there is one rule of thumb that few are likely to dissent from. It is that in general, the larger a corpus is, and the more diverse it is in terms of genres and other language varieties, the more balanced and representative it will be." Furthermore, according to Leech (1991: 27), we can say that a corpus is representative when "the findings based on its contents can be generalized to a larger hypothetical corpus." He also observes that the issue of corpus representativeness must be considered largely as an act of faith because at present there is no way of ensuring it or evaluating it in an objective way, although a great deal of research is carried out with respect to this issue.[5]

In the next section we will discuss most of the well-known and influential diachronic corpora of the English language, both annotated and unannotated. We will basically concentrate on the ones that we have made use of in our research and that take Old English into account, but we will also mention other corpora.

1.4. Diachronic corpora of English

As regards diachronic analyses of the English language, Facchinetti and Rissanen (2006: 7) state that "corpus-based studies of diachronic English have been thriving over the last three decades to such an extent that the validity of corpora in the enrichment of historical linguistic research is now undeniable. Bearing this in mind, scholars are now pondering how far diachronic corpus linguistics may be improved in order to further enhance our knowledge of the kaleidoscopic shifts and turns of the English language through the centuries." Curzan and Palmer (2006: 20) argue that studies in historical corpus linguistics should take into account the development and involvement of complementary methodologies and the engagement of current linguistic theories: "The key is to develop methodologies that exploit the historical corpora available appropriately, given the research goals and the nature of the corpus." Moreover, they claim that working with corpora in any period offers linguists the opportunity to rethink

[5] For more discussion concerning this issue, as well as the issue of size, authenticity, sampling, etc. see for example Tognini-Bonelli (2001), Sánchez et al. (1995), McEnry and Wilson (2001), Sinclair (2005), and Wynne (2005). Moreover, the VARIENG site of the University of Helsinki, available online at http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/ would be particularly useful here.

the theoretical assumptions they have about language instead of sticking to previous analytical schema and imposing them on the data.[6]

1.4.1. Unannotated diachronic corpora of English

The first corpus to be mentioned here is the Helsinki Corpus, which was the pioneering work in the construction of electronic diachronic corpora. As Kohnen (2007)[7] points out, it "broke new ground in historical corpus linguistics and set the scene for all following diachronic English corpora. If one wanted to understand historical corpus linguistics as a trip to past centuries, one could say that trips of this kind have started, as far as electronic diachronic corpora are concerned, from Helsinki."

The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal

Kytö (1996) notes that the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal, which is usually referred to as the Helsinki Corpus, is a project which began in 1984 and was directed by Matti Rissanen and Ossi Ihalainen at the University of Helsinki. It was released in 1991. The corpus is a computerised collection of extracts of continuous texts (around 450 of them) and it contains a diachronic part, which covers the period from c. 750 to c. 1700, and a dialect part, which is based on transcripts of interviews with speakers of British rural dialects from the 1970s. As regards the diachronic part of the Helsinki Corpus, it includes a basic selection of texts compiled from the Old, Middle and Early Modern (British) English periods, and a supplementary part focusing on regional varieties (Scots and early American English). The length of the extracts varies from 2,000 to 10,000 words and the shorter texts are given *in toto*. Kytö (1996) says that the Old English section of the corpus contains 413,300 words, the Middle English section 608,600 words and the British English section 551,000 words, a total of 1,572,800 words. These figures, however, exclude passages in foreign languages, the comments of the compilers of the corpus and of the editor. As to the supplementary part, the Scots section contains 870,000 words, whereas the early American English section contains 300,000 words. Furthermore, the individual large periods of English are further subdivided into different sub-periods, which are represented as shown in the following table:

[6] Cf. Sinclair (2004a: 4)

[7] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/02/kohnen/.

Table 1.1. Periods covered in the Helsinki Diachronic Corpus*

Period	Subperiod	Words	Per cent	Overall
Old English	I. —850	2,190	0.5	413,250 (26.27%)
	II. 850—950	92,050	22.3	
	III. 950—1050	251,630	60.9	
	IV. 1050—1150	67,380	16.3	
	total	413,250	100.0	
Middle English	I. 1150—1250	113,010	18.6	608,570 (38.70%)
	II. 1250—1350	97,480	16.0	
	III. 1350—1420	184,230	30.3	
	IV. 1420—1500	213,850	35.1	
	total	608,570	100.0	
Early Modern English	I. 1500—1570	190,160	34.5	551,000 (35.03%)
	II. 1570—1640	189,800	34.5	
	III. 1640—1710	171,040	31.0	
	total	551,000	100.0	
Total		1,572,820		100.00%

* Source: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298896.

Kytö (1996) notes that, generally speaking, the selectional criteria for including a text in the diachronic part of the corpus reflect the principles of analysis taking into account socio-historical variation. The texts were selected the way that the language written in a specific period could be covered representatively. Furthermore, what was of primary importance in the construction of the corpus was the periodisation, but important were also such criteria as geographical dialect, type and register of writing, and sociolinguistic variation.

The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form (DOEC)

Kohonen (2007) observes that the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (DOEC) is an impressive database with practically all Old English writings which we have inherited, and it comprises 3.5 million words. The DOEC, first released in 1981, is a pioneer work in the application of technology to lexicography. As Kytö (2010: 37) notes, it is "an early example of a period-specific corpus (c. 600—1150), which comprises all extant Old English texts (3,060 of them). […] This 3.5-million-word corpus is a rare example of a particularly exhaustive record of the textual basis preserved from a past period. It is very seldom possible for a corpus to claim exhaustive coverage owing to the wealth and length of texts that have come down to us from mediaeval times onwards." The project has been carried out under the direction of editors Angus

Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, and Antonette diPaolo Healey. As we can learn from the official web page of the dictionary,[8] it is based on a computerised corpus that comprises at least one copy of each text surviving in Old English. Moreover, the body of surviving Old English texts fall into several categories: prose, poetry, glosses to Latin texts and inscriptions. In the prose in particular, we can find a wide variety of texts like: the lives of saints, sermons, biblical translations, penitential writings, laws, charters, wills, medical texts, records (of manumissions, land grants, land sales, land surveys), chronicles, a set of tables for computing the moveable feasts of the Church calendar and for astrological calculations, prognostics (the Anglo-Saxon equivalent of the horoscope), charms (such as those for a toothache or for an easy labour), and even cryptograms.

The Newdigate Newsletters Corpus

The Newdigate Newsletters Corpus, released in 1994, was developed by Philip Hines, Jr. and Virginia Norfolk. This corpus is an electronic version of the first 2,100 manuscript newsletters (of a total of 3,950) in the Newdigate series and its size is 750,000 words. Most letters are addressed to Sir Richard Newdigate, Arbury, Warwickshire and they encompass the period from 13 January 1674 to 29 September 1715.[9]

The Corpus of Late Modern English Prose

The Corpus of Late Modern English Prose, released in 1994, consists of informal private letters by British writers, covering the period 1861 to 1919 and the total number of words that it contains is approximately 100,000. The corpus was developed under the leadership of David Denison at the University of Manchester.[10]

The Innsbruck Computer Archive of Machine-Readable English Texts (ICAMET)

The Innsbruck Computer Archive of Machine-Readable English Texts, released starting from 1992, contains complete Middle English texts and consists of three parts:[11]

[8] Source: http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/about.html.
[9] Source: http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/NEWDIGAT/INDEX.HTM.
[10] Source: http://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/david.denison/lmode_prose.html.
[11] Source: http://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/projects/icamet/.

— The Prose Corpus, which contains 129 texts written during 1100—1500. Its size amounts to 7.8 million words.
— The Letter Corpus, which contains 469 letters written during 1386—1698. Its size amounts to 182,000 words.
— The ICAMET Varia Corpus is a mixture of tagged, normalized, translated and otherwise manipulated or synopsized Middle English texts.

The ICAMET project was developed at the University of Innsbruck under the leadership of Manfred Markus.

The Corpus of Early English Correspondence (CEEC)

The Corpus of Early English Correspondence was developed by Terttu Nevalainen (leader) and her team at the University of Helsinki. The corpus currently is a cover term for a family of corpora:[12]

CEEC — Corpus of Early English Correspondence, released in 1998, contains 6,039 letters and they amount to 2.7 million words. The corpus covers the period from 1410 to 1681.

CEECS — Corpus of Early English Correspondence Sampler, released in 1998, contains 1,147 letters and they amount to 0.45 million words. The corpus covers the period from 1418 to 1680.

CEECE — Corpus of Early English Correspondence Extension, which is nearing complition, contains around 4,900 letters which amount to 2.2 million words. It covers the period from 1681 to 1800.

CEECSU — Corpus of Early English Correspondence Supplement, which is nearing completion, contains around 900 letters and they amount to 0.44 million words. The corpus covers the period from 1402 to 1663.

PCEEC — Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (discussed under the section below devoted to parsed corpora).

Works on the original Corpus of Early English Correspondence (CEEC) started in 1993 and were completed in 1998. The source material of the corpus consists of personal letters written in England during the periods specified above.

The Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts

The Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts, released in 1999, was developed by Josef Schmied, Claudia Claridge and Rainer Siemund at Chemnitz University's REAL Centre. In brief, the *Lampeter Corpus* is a collection of non-literary prose texts covering the 100-year period from 1640

[12] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/domains/CEEC.html.

to 1740. It contains 120 complete texts, comprising 1,193,385 words, and it is subdivided into 10 decades containing 12 texts each. Moreover, it is subdivided into the six domains, namely: religion, politics, economy, science, law and miscallaneous with 20 texts each. Although the corpus is not an annotated one, it contains textual mark-up, whose aim is to make the original layout features and background of the texts retrievable for the corpus user. In the textual mark-up tags take the form < > at the beginning of an element, and </ > at the end, e.g. <text>...</text>. Moreover, they can contain a number of attributes within the angle brackets, which specify additional characteristics of the element (Claridge 2003).

The Corpus of Late Eighteenth-Century Prose

The Corpus of Late Eighteenth-Century Prose, released in 2003, cosists of unpublished letters (1,827 in number) transcribed from originals, and amounts to around 300,000 words. The letters date from the period 1761—1790 and they all were written to Richard Orford, a steward of Peter Legh the Younger at Lyme Hall in Cheshire. The corpus was developed under the leadership of David Denison at the University of Manchester.[13]

The Zurich English Newspaper Corpus (ZEN)

The Zurich English Newspaper Corpus, released in 2004, is a collection of a wide variety of early English newspaper extracts (349 of them) and it contains 1.2 million words. The corpus was developed by Undo Fries, Peter Schneider, Hans Martin Lehmann, Beni Ruef and Patrick Studer. The period of time the corpus covers ranges from 1671 to 1791 (120 years) and it is divided into four 30-year periods in order to investigate language change.[14]

The Corpus of Early English Medical Writing (CEEM)

The Corpus of Early English Medical Writing consists of three diachronic subcorpora, namely Middle English Medical Texts (MEMT), Early Modern English Medical Texts (EMEMT), and Late Modern English Medical Texts (LMEMT). Each of the subcorpora presents a representative sampling of medical writing (surgical treaties, remedy books, specialized texts, etc.), ranging from

[13] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CLEP/index.html.
[14] Source: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298902.

the strata of highest learning to practical health guides that were written for the general public. The corpus allows an investigation of how medical writing was evolving. Below we characterize briefly each of the subcorpora:[15]

— The Corpus of Middle English Medical Texts (MEMT), released in 2005, contains 495,322 words from 86 medical texts/samples that were written between 1375 and 1500. Moreover, it contains an appendix of recipes from around 1330. The corpus was developed under the leadership of Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta at the University of Helsinki.
— The Corpus of Early Modern English Medical Texts (EMEMT), released in 2010, contains 2 million words from around 450 medical texts/samples that were written between 1500 and 1700. The corpus was developed under the leadership of Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta at the University of Helsinki.
— The Corpus of Late Modern English Medical Texts (LMEMT) is still in preparation. The corpus covers the period ranging from 1700 to 1800. Moreover, it is being developed under the leadership of Irma Taavitsainen at the University of Helsinki.

The Middle English Compendium

The Middle English Compendium, released in 2006, consists of four parts that can be searched or browsed online. The first part consists of an electronic Middle English Dictionary that contains 15,000 pages that can be searched for lexicon and usage for the period 1100—1500. In the second part one can find a Hyper Bibliography of Middle English including all the works that are cited in the Middle English Dictionary. As to the the third part, it consists of a Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse, which contains 146 texts which are fully searchable. The texts include works by Chaucer, Gower, Langland, Lydgate, Malory, and many minor figures, and a number of anonymous works. In the fourth part, called Related Resources there are links to "digitized manuscripts containing Middle English" and online catalogues of manuscripts. The Middle English Compendium covers the dates 1100—1500 and it was produced by Frances McSparran, Paul Schaffner, John Latta, Alan Pagliere, Christina Powell, and Matt Stoeffler at the University of Michigan.[16]

[15] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CEEM/index.html.
[16] Source: http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/cms/indexes/descriptions/mid_eng_comp.

The Corpus of English Dialogues (CED)

The Corpus of English Dialogues, released in 2006, is a computerised corpus of Early Modern English speech-related texts and was developed by Merja Kytö and Jonathan Culpeper, in collaboration with Terry Walker and Dawn Archer, at Uppsala and Lancaster universities. It contains 177 text files that yield almost 1.2 million words. The texts that the CED contains represent five text types plus miscellaneous texts, and they fall into two categories:

— Authentic dialogue, i.e. written records of real speech events (trial proceedings and witness depositions).
— Constructed dialogue, in which the dialogue is constructed by an author (drama comedy, didactic works, and prose fiction).

The CED covers a 200-year period which starts in 1560 and ends in 1760. This period is divided into five 40-year periods: 1560—1599, 1600—1639, 1640—1679, 1680—1719 and 1720—1760.[17]

In the following section we will discuss some of the well-known and influential annotated diachronic corpora of English. We will start with the ARCHER corpus of Historical English.

1.4.2. Annotated diachronic corpora of English

The ARCHER corpus

ARCHER, a Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers, is a multi-genre historical corpus of British and American English. It was originally developed by Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan in the early 1990s at the universities of Northern Arizona and Southern California, and now it is managed as an ongoing project by a consortium of participants at 14 universities in seven countries. Since 2008 David Denison and Nuria Yáñez-Bouza are the project leaders and the project has been coordinated from Manchester (UK). The corpus covers the period 1650—1999 and the texts it contains represent 11 genres, namely: advertising, diaries, drama, fiction, legal texts, letters, journals, medicine, news reportage, science, and sermons. Moreover, there are four versions of ARCHER, namely ARCHER 1 (1990—1993), ARCHER 2 (2004—2005), ARCHER 3.1 (2006), and ARCHER 3.2 (2012). As regards the latest version, ARCHER 3.2, it contains around 3.2 million words in 1,658 text

[17] Source: http://www.engelska.uu.se/Research/English_Language/Research_Areas/lectronic_Resource_Projects/A_Corpus_of_English_Dialogues/.

files, and it is an improved version of ARCHER 3.1, as it has a larger regional coverage, new mark-up and new POS-tagging.[18]

The Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English

The Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English (released in 2000), also referred to as the Brooklyn Corpus, contains a selection of texts from the Old English Section of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. It contains 106,210 words and the texts represent a range of dates of composition, authors, and genres. Moreover, the texts are syntactically and morphologically annotated, and each word is glossed. The Brooklyn Corpus was developed by Susan Pintzuk (University of York, UK), Eric Haeberli (University of Geneva, Switzerland, and University of Reading, UK), Ans van Kemenade (University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands), Willem Koopman (University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands), and Frank Beths (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and University of York, UK).[19]

The Penn Corpora of Historical English

The Penn Corpora of Historical English include the following corpora:

— The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, second edition (PPCME2).
— The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME).
— The Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English (PPCMBE).

The corpora contain texts and text samples of British English prose across its history — from the earliest Middle English documents up to the First World War. The texts have three forms, namely simple text, part-of-speech tagged text and syntactically annotated (parsed) text. Thanks to the syntactic annotation (parsing) it is possible to search for words, word sequences, and also for syntactic structures.[20] We will first discuss the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2).

[18] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/ARCHER/index.html.
[19] Source: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~sp20/corpus.html.
[20] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/.

The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2)

The second edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2), released in 2000, is an improved and extended version of an earlier corpus (PPCME1). The corpus was developed by Anthony Kroch and Ann Taylor in 2000 at the University of Pennsylvania. It contains prose text samples of Middle English. The text samples were annotated, which allows one to search for words, word sequences, as well as for syntactic structures. It is based on the Middle English section of the Helsinki corpus, but some additions and deletions have been performed in it. Moreover, it comprises 55 text samples amounting to 1.3 million words and, unlike the PPCME1, it uses a more advanced annotation scheme: POS tagging, indication of the internal structure of noun phrases, more detailed annotation of several complex sentences and phrase types.[21] Below we present examples of the annotation scheme used in this corpus. First we present some examples of POS tagging, in which the focus is on the complementizer (C) *that* (marked in bold):

> THAT, +TE, and variants introducing any kind of subordinate clause are tagged C.
> ---
> and_CONJ sei+t_VBP **+tat_C** it_PRO was_BED ano+ter_D+OTHER body_N
>
> and_CONJ was_BED i-schore_VAN monk_N in_P an_D abbay_N **+tat_C** he_PRO hym_PRO self_N bulde_VBD
>
> dohter_N he_PRO cleope+d_VBP hire_PRO ._, for-+ti_P+D **+tt_C** ha_PRO understonde_VBP ._, **+tt_C** he_PRO hire_PRO luueliche_ADJ liues_N$ luue_N leare+d_VBP ._, as_P feader_N ah_MD his_PRO$ dohter_N ._.[22]

As regards syntactic annotation, we provide an example of the annotation of a subordinate clause, and more specifically of an appositive *that*-clause (the complementiser *that* has been marked in bold):

> THAT clauses are often in apposition to a demonstrative or other NP. In this case, the NP is labelled as the argument of the verb and the THAT clause is labelled as an appositive/parenthetical.
> ---

[21] Source: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298937.
[22] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/annotation/index.html.

```
(IP-IMP (VBI Take)
        (NP-OB1 (N heed))
        (PP (P of)
          (NP (ONE oo) (N thynge)
            (, ,)
            (CP-THT-PRN (C that)
                  (IP-SUB (NP-SBJ (PRO thou))
                        (VBP slepe)
                        (NEG not)
                        (PP (P whan)
                          (CP-ADV (C 0)
                                (IP-SUB (NP-SBJ (PRO thou))
                                      (MD shuldest)
                                      (VB wake))))))))
      (. .))
(ID CMAELR4,6.167))
```

[23]

Moreover, the PPCME2 spans roughly 350 years, namely from the year 1150 to the year 1500.

The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)

As to the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (released in 2004), it consists of 229 texts samples amounting to over 1.7 million words and it is part of an ongoing larger project carried out at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of York. The corpus was developed by Anthony Kroch, Beatrice Santorini, and Ariel Diertani and it aimed at producing syntactically annotated corpora for all stages of the history of the English language. In this corpus each text is available in parsed, POS-tagged, and unannotated form. Moreover, the corpus is divided into three groups:[24]

1. The Helsinki directories, which contain the Helsinki Corpus in parsed, POS-tagged, and unannotated form. This part consists of around 550,000 words.
2. The Penn1 directories, which contain a first supplement to the Helsinki Corpus and consist of around 600,000 words.
3. The Penn2 directories, which contain a second supplement to the Helsinki Corpus. This part consists of around 590,000 words.

As to the annotation scheme, both POS and syntactic, it is very similar to the one applied in the PPCME2. Moreover, the time-span covered by this corpus

[23] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/annotation/index.html.

[24] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/histcorpora/PPCEME-RELEASE-2/description.html.

is 210 years (1500—1710) and can be divided into three periods: 1500—1569, 1570—1639 and 1640—1710.[25]

The Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English (PPCMBE)

As far as the Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English (released in 2010) is concerned, it consists of 101 text samples amounting to only less than one million words, and is part of an ongoing larger project at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of York, which has the aim of producing syntactically annotated corpora for all stages of the history of English. The corpus was developed by Anthony Kroch, Beatrice Santorini and Ariel Diertani in 2010. As is the case with the PPCEME, the PPCMBE spans roughly 210 years (1700—1914) and can be divided into three 70-year time periods, namely 1700—1769, 1770—1839 and 1840—1914. Moreover, the annotation scheme, both POS and syntactic, is similar to the one applied in the PPCME2 and in PPCEME.[26]

York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry

The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry, often referred to as the York Poetry Corpus, was developed by Susan Pintzuk and Leendert Plug in 2002. It consists of a selection of poetic texts taken from the Old English section of the Helsinki Corpus. These texts have been annotated and it is possible to search them for lexical items and syntactic structure. The corpus contains 71,490 words of Old English text samples, which range from 4,000 to 17,000 words.[27] The scheme of the corpus is based on the one applied in PPCME2. In the York Poetry Corpus, the syntactic annotations make it possible for the user to stop and answer questions concerning the word order, constituent order, abstract structure, and syntactic, morphological and lexical characteristics of the texts that the corpus contains.[28] The annotations are general-purpose and as theory-neutral as possible, but still they incorporate the insights of modern linguistic theory, and they can be made use of by scholars whose research interests widely vary.[29] As an example of how sentences are annotated, we can use the sentence *He beot ne aleh*:

---

[25] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/histcorpora/PPCEME-RELEASE-2/description.html.
[26] Source: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCMBE-RELEASE-1/index.html.
[27] Source: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298937.
[28] Source: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.html.
[29] Source: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.annotations.html.

```
((IP-MAT (NP-NOM (PRO^N He))
        (NP-ACC (N^A beot))
        (NEG ne)
        (VBDI aleh)
        (. ,))
(ID cobeowul,5.80.62))
```

The syntactic annotations in the corpus mark both clausal and non-clausal constituents by means of labelled brackets, with some relations being marked by empty categories. However, the structure assigned to a sentence by the labelled bracketing can be much more complex than the one presented in the examples.[30]

The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE)

The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE) consists of all the major Old English prose works (100 of them), contains 1.5 million words, and it is syntactically annotated. It was developed by Ann Taylor, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Frank Beths in the year 2003 and it is based on the Toronto Dictionary of Old English Corpus. In the corpus each word is tagged for part of speech, and detailed clause structure is represented by labelled brackets. Although the system relates directly to generative models, it is adapted to the needs of searchers, and avoids unnecessary abstraction. It is possible to search the corpus automatically for syntactic structure, constituent order and lexical items by means of any search engine which will search Penn Treebank format.[31] Moreover, it is a sister corpus to the PPCME2 and it uses the same kind of annotation and is accessed by the same search engine, namely CorpusSearch.[32]

The Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC)

The Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC) was released in 2006 and is based on the original CEEC, that is Corpus of Early English Correspondence. However, it differs from it in two major ways:

- It contains somewhat less material, namely 4,979 letters, whereas the original CEEC contains 6,039 letters.
- It comes in files of three different kinds, namely plain text files, part-of-speech tagged files, and syntactically parsed files.

[30] Source: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.annotations.html.
[31] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/YCOE/index.html.
[32] Souce: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/YcoeHome.htm.

The corpus contains around 2.2 million words and the period covered by it is like that of the original CEEC, that is 1410—1681. As regards the annotation scheme, it is the same as the one used in by the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (second edition) and the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English. The corpus was developed by Ann Taylor, Arja Nurmi, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Terttu Nevalainen at the Universities of York and Helsinki.[33]

1.4.3. Other corpora

There are also a number of other corpora of English (British English, American English, Australian English, New Zealand English, East African English, Indian English, Philippine English, Singapore English, and of English as a lingua franca), which are not historical (diachronic) this time. However, for reasons of space, we are just going to enumerate some of those for British English and American English without further description:

Corpora of British English:
The Bank of English — A collection of written and spoken British, American and Australian English.
BNC — The British National Corpus.
COLT — The Corpus of London Teenage Language.
ICE-GB — The International Corpus of English, British Component.
LLC — The London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English.
LOB — The Lancaster/Oslo-Bergen Corpus.
FLOB — The Freiburg-LOB corpus of British English.
ICLE — The International Corpus of Learner English.
POW — Polytechnic of Wales Corpus.

Corpora of American English:
The Bank of English — A collection of written and spoken British, American and Australian English.
BROWN — The first modern corpus of English.
FROWN — The Freiburg BROWN Corpus of American English.
CPSAE — The Corpus of Spoken Professional American English.
COCA — The Corpus of Contemporary American English.
COHA — The Corpus of Historical American English.

[33] Source: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CEEC/pceec.html.

ANC — The American National Corpus.
MICASE — Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English.

The above list is far from being complete and information about these corpora, and about other existing corpora (both parsed and unparsed) not listed in this book, of Old English, Middle English and Modern English, and of other languages, as well as about corpus linguistics in general can be accessed in the literature devoted to this field (e.g. Kytö et al. 1994, Meyer 2002, Lindquist 2009, Haug et at. 2009, Nesselhauf 2011, McEnry and Hardie 2012, Aijmer and Altenberg 2013, Romero-Trillo 2013) and of course on the Internet.[34] The number of corpora is constantly increasing worldwide and discussing all of them here would be beyond the scope of this book.

1.5. Parataxis versus hypotaxis

At the beginning of this section it is useful to cite Bednarczuk (1971) who in his profound discussion of Indo-European parataxis observes that "It seems that opposition P[arataxis] — H[ypotaxis] has a strictly language character without reference to reality and to logic. There is no need therefore, to give one more definition of P[arataxis] and H[ypotaxis] but it would be useful to collect formal differences between both types of connections which may lay the background for further investigations." Bednarczuk's opinion is still valid today as the problem has not been resolved, and probably will never be, although there are more and more ideas about parataxis and hypotaxis. Below we present some of them.

As regards hypotaxis, Handford (1947: 24) suggests that it is a situation "when a subordinate clause is subjoined, with or without a 'subordinating' conjunction, to a main clause." According to Buning (1986), the phenomenon

[34] Under the following links: http://www.corpora4learning.net/resources/corpora.html#AE, http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/index.html, http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm, http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/0415286239/resources/corpa2.htm, https://sites.google.com/site/helontheweb/corpora, http://users.ox.ac.uk/~stuart/english/med/corp.htm, http://corpus.byu.edu/historical-syntax.asp, http://corplinguistics.wordpress.com/2012/03/11/hwaet-old-english/, http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/, http://corpora-engling.split.uni-bamberg.de/index.php?id=historical-corpora, http://robertjohnsonrogers.edublogs.org/2011/02/01/online-corpora-a-list/, http://www.uow.edu.au/~dlee/corpora.htm, http://courses.washington.edu/englhtml/engl560/corplingresources.htm.

of hypotaxis should be called subordination. Deutscher (2007) also seems to identify hypotaxis with subordination. He observes that some authors employ the terms hypotaxis and subordination for two distinct phenomena, but they draw the distinction along different lines and therefore he decides to avoid the term 'hypotaxis' altogether in his study. Instead, he uses the term 'subordination' in the traditional, purely hierarchical sense and as a synonym of the term 'embedding'. According to Quirk et al. (1985), the sentence and its subordinate clauses are in a hypotactic relationship when they form a hierarchy in which the subordinate clause is a constituent of the sentence as a whole.[35]

As to parataxis, in Mitchell and Robinson (2007: 100) this term is used to mean "a construction in which sentences are not formally subordinated one to the other. 'Asyndetic' and 'syndetic' mean respectively without and with conjunctions." According to Buning (1986), the phenomenon of parataxis should be called co-ordination. Moreover, Handford (1947: 24) claims that "the term parataxis is often used to mean simply juxtaposition of clauses without their being connected by conjunctions. […] We have parataxis, when co-ordinate and independent clauses, or rather sentences, are juxtaposed." According to Fawcett (2000: 26), "the types of relationship between units that 'parataxis' provides for are essentially the same as those covered by co-ordination, in a broad sense of the term that includes asyndetic co-ordination […] as well as coordination with overt markers such as *and*. I shall therefore normally use the term *co-ordination* rather than *parataxis*."

There are also other opinions concerning parataxis and hypotaxis. Alijev (1957) makes a distinction between a complex sentence that has one syntactic centre and a complex sentence with more syntactic centres. The former type of a complex sentence corresponds with hypotaxis where the meaning of constituents is not expressed in parallel, whereas the latter one corresponds with parataxis where, unlike in hypotaxis, the meaning of constituents is expressed in parallel. Halliday (1994: 218) claims that "hypotaxis is the relation between a dependent element and its dominant, the element on which it is dependent. Contrasting with this is parataxis, which is the relation between two alike elements of equal status, one initiating and the other continuing."[36] Therefore, according to Halliday, in parataxis both the initiating and the continuing element are free, in the sense that each of the elements could stand as a functioning whole, whereas in hypotaxis, which is the binding of elements of unequal status, the dominant element is free but the dependent one is not. McGregor (1997) observes that as regards the English language, it employs a number of conjunctions which mark the relationship between finite clauses as hypotactic. The conjunctions are as follows: *if*, *however*, *when*, *where*, *which*, *because*,

[35] Cf. Foley and Van Valin (1984), Hopper and Traugott (1993), Jespersen (1924a).
[36] Cf. Butler (2003: 260).

whereas, *while*, *besides*, etc. These conjunctions are different, by and large, from the ones that are employed to mark paratactic relationships. The conjunctions used in paratactic relationships are the following: *and*, *or*, *nor*, *but*, *then*, *still*, *yet*, *and then*, *and there*, *though*, and others.[37] He concludes that "whereas parataxis needs not necessarily be marked by a conjunction, hypotaxis always is (if the clauses are finite)" (p. 190). Bednarczuk (1971: 30) claims that "P[arataxis] differs from H[ypotaxis] by the occurrence or non-occurrence of certain words. To these belong: conjunctions, pronouns, and other accessory words which are not used for connotation. Conjunctions differ from one another in their scope and usage. The hypotactical ones do not join words and they do not generally occur in polysyndeton, whereas the paratactical ones allow for transposition of constituents while the verbs of joined clauses — except for adversative constructions — have to be in the same mood." Moreover, Bednarczuk (1971) observes that the opposition between parataxis and hypotaxis manifests itself mainly in form, accentuation and the use of the verb. For example, the imperative mood normally occurs in main clauses, whereas in subordinate clauses other "modal" moods are used. Moreover, the order of constituents in parataxis is not obligatory, which manifests itself by the possibility of transposition of joined members, whereas in hypotaxis it is not possible, as only certain types of subordinate clauses can be transposed together with the conjunction in front of the main clause or interposed into it. According to Verstraete (1976: 153), "most authors[38] seem to agree that equality and independence are the two most general features that distinguish coordinate structures from subordinate ones: the conjuncts in coordinate structures are equal in status, whereas the conjuncts in subordinate structures are unequal in status." Without denying the traditional distinction between coordination and subordination in English, he considers it to be incomplete and decides to approach the problem from the functional point of view. He proposes a functional description of complex sentences in terms of the parameters of interpersonal grammar and claims (p. 158) that a complex sentence construction can consist of:

> 1. Two separate speech acts — when both conjuncts have their own modal and speech functional values.

[37] Cf. Verstraete (1976), who provides an interesting discussion of conjunctions from the functional perspective. See also Adams (1907), Blühdorn (2008), Brill and Rebuschi (2006), Cristofaro (2005), Dik (1972), Gohl (2000), Haumann (1997), Kortmann (1997), Lehmann (1988, 2002), Lenker (2007), Molencki (2003, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012), Nagucka (1968), Rissanen (1989, 1998, 1999), Braunmüller (1978), Fabricius-Hansen and Wiebke (2008), Fischer (2007), Günthner (1996), Hengeveld (1998), Higashiizumi (2006), Jucker (1990), Schleppegrell (1991), Traugott (1996).

[38] Cf. Halliday (1994), Lyons (1968), Quirk et al. (1985).

2. One speech act encompassing the entire clause combination — when one conjunct falls within the scope of the modal and speech functional values of the other.
3. One speech act restricted to the main conjunct and accompanied by a conjunct that is not a full speech act — when one conjunct does not have a full interpersonal structure on its own but still does not fall within the scope of the modal and speech functional values of the other.

Moreover, he says that the last category can further be subdivided into two subcategories, namely a subcategory that is closer to the two-speech act category and a subcategory that is closer to the one-speech act category.

There are also a number of other definitions and classifications of parataxis and hypotaxis in the literature.[39] Although very often they differ from one another, they also have a lot in common. Bednarczuk (1971: 26) observes that there are varying opinions about parataxis and hypotaxis but the following regular differences between the two can be distinguished: auto/syn-semantia, homo/heterogeneity, (in)dependence, (non)equivalence, (in)completeness, degree of complexity, (un)determination, and (a)symmetry.

In this book, we use the term 'parataxis' to refer to the situation in which main clauses are conjoined with one another with or without a co-ordinating conjunction, whereas the term 'hypotaxis' is used with reference to the situation in which main clauses are conjoined with dependent ones with or without a subordinating conjunction; therefore, in parataxis we are dealing with non-dependency/non-subordination, and in hypotaxis we are dealing with dependency/subordination. In other words, if there are two clauses, in which one is main and the other is dependent, they are in hypotactic relation to each other, but if neither of the clauses is dependent, they are in paratactic relation to each other. We will discuss the problem in more detail soon, in Chapter 2.

1.6. What developed first in Indo-European: parataxis or hypotaxis?

The Proto-Indo-European language (i.e. PIE), according to Kiparsky (1995), was a paratactic language in which finite subordinate clauses were not embedded but adjoined, and this is confirmed by Sanskrit, Hittite, Old Latin

[39] For further information see for example Bednarczuk (1966, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1980), Kuryłowicz (1948), Witkowski (1936), Jespersen (1937b), Peterson (1923), Dik (1968), Karolak (1972), Klemensiewicz (1937, 1957), Meillet (1958), Pisarkowa (1974), Polański (1966, 1968), Tokarz (1977).

and Classical Greek. When PIE split into different languages, most daughter languages, including Germanic, introduced an innovation in their syntax and departed a little from the original pattern.[40] As a result, dependent clauses became syntactically embedded in those languages and were taking up modifier or argument positions within the main clause. Lehmann (1974) also claims that PIE was paratactic. He maintains the view that it was an OV language and that the paratactic arrangement that is assumed for this language is typical of OV languages.[41] According to Delbrück (1900: 411—413; after Meier-Brügger et al. 2003: 245), "originally all sentences were coordinated alongside one another. […] The historical view, as it is generally accepted today, must have as its point of departure the hypothesis that there was a time at which there were only main clauses. […] The assertion that hypotaxis developed from parataxis has become the common heritage of the field." Quiles (2007: 237) notes that "the oldest surviving texts consist largely of paratactic sentences, often with no connecting particles. New sentences may be introduced with particles, or relationship may be indicated with pronominal elements; but these are fewer than in subsequent texts." Furthermore, according to Meier-Brügger (2003), "along with parataxis (coordination), there is also evidence of hypotaxis (subordination) in Proto-Indo-European. […] The formal characteristics of subordinate clauses vary among the individual IE languages. In Proto-Indo-European, the accentuation of the finite verb is accepted as a formal characteristic of the subordinate clause as opposed to the main clause, in which the finite verb is not accentuated, except when it establishes the theme at the beginning of the sentence." The development of hypotaxis from parataxis seems to be not only typical of the Indo-European languages. Jucker (1991: 203) suggests that "it is generally recognized that languages move from parataxis to hypotaxis. They do this on two levels. On the one hand, the proportion of hypotaxis versus parataxis tends to increase in the course of time, and, on the other hand, hypotactic constructions usually have paratactic origins."

According to Harris and Campbell (1995: 283—284), "the claim that hypotaxis develops from parataxis has often been made with reference to the first appearance of hypotaxis in a language, not to its repeated renewal. We use the term origin […] strictly to refer to the first appearance of a construction in a language; renewal refers to the continuing process of replacing or otherwise revising existing construction types." Moreover, they claim that when some authors write that hypotaxis developed out of parataxis, they "seem to have in mind conjunctionless joining, others loose joining, and still others discourse. Thus, even if, for the time being, we limit our inquiry to renewal, in approaching

[40] For more information on this issue see for example Friedrich (1975), Fortson (2004), Grace (1971), Greenberg (1963), Smith (1971).

[41] See also Lehmann (1972a, 1972b, 1973, 1992).

the question of whether hypotaxis develops out of parataxis we encounter the problem that different linguists have in mind different ideas of parataxis, and that at least some of them are vague." Harris and Campbell further point out that there are basically two types of arguments that some authors use to support the view that it is parataxis that provides the source or prototype for hypotaxis. Namely, the first one relates to the ultimate origins of hypotaxis and "it is based on the claim that parataxis is more common in the early stage of a written language than is embedding." As regards the other type of argument, it "is based on the origin of the subordinator. Since subordinators in many languages originate as markers of questions — either yes/no or content questions — it is sometimes assumed that the subordinate clauses they mark must have originated as actual questions. Many languages have subordinators that originated as demonstrative pronouns and some investigators see this as an evidence that those pronouns were 'pointing to' a loosely adjoined clause." However, they draw our attention to the fact that it does not necessarily have to be so because "it is by no means necessary to assume that the clause in which a particular innovative grammatical element is found developed out of the clause in which that grammatical element originated. It is logically possible that one *word* simply developed from another, with little reference to context. It is also possible that structural marking that developed in one context was later *extended* to another." The authors then conclude that as a matter of fact the view that hypotaxis develops from parataxis and not vice versa is not supported by the evidence that comes from attested examples of the rise of the use of subordinators. According to Roberts (2007), the traditional and often repeated view that clausal subordination, or hypotaxis, is a relatively recent reanalysis of parataxis, or clause-chaining, should be abandoned although this view has a long history. He says that "the claim that earlier stages of certain languages may have lacked subordination altogether violates the uniformitarian hypothesis, the idea that all languages at all times reflect the same basic UG […] so I conclude that the traditional parataxis-to-hypotaxis idea should be abandoned, as it is conceptually problematic and in practice unrevealing" (p. 174).

Bednarczuk (1980: 145) observes that "the relation between parataxis and hypotaxis has not been precisely defined […] in spite of long discussions on the subject, which on the other hand allowed us to discover certain formal differences between them." Moreover, he claims that it is impossible to state empirically whether parataxis is older than hypotaxis or vice versa, or which of the two constructions has arisen from which. However, he notes that "The most widespread theory which says that hypotaxis has arisen from parataxis is based on the fact that it is less frequent in colloquial language and in children's speech, while in the historical development of different languages it expands at the cost of parataxis. [However,] in some languages, on the contrary, we can observe the expansion of parataxis at the cost of hypotaxis, e.g. in Modern Greek, Late

Latin, in contemporary French, Danish, Polish, etc." Bednarczuk (1971: 32) also notes that "The conception that H[ypotaxis] has arisen from P[arataxis] is theoretically imprecise both the notions being mutually conditioned: if it were not for H[ypotaxis], P[arataxis] could not exist. Both the types of connection seem to have arisen independently from loose syntactic sets which formally may resemble asyndetic parataxis."[42]

1.7. What is para-hypotaxis?

It seems that the term 'para-hypotaxis' is not used very frequently in the literature devoted to linguistics, and whenever it is used, it usually means something different from what we mean by it. However, for the time being we will not discuss how we see para-hypotaxis and what it means to us, as this will be discussed in Chapter 2 onwards, where we approach this problem in a detailed and systematic way on the basis of two manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It will be seen that we present the problem from a considerably different angle, since our vision of para-hypotaxis differs considerably from the ideas presented in this section, in which we concentrate on what it normally entails when it appears in the linguistic literature.

As Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) observe, the term para-hypotaxis (P-H) was first introduced by Sorrento (1929; 1950) and is still commonly used by Romance linguists. It designates sentences that contain a proleptic dependent clause, with the main clause preceded by a coordinator, as in the following pattern:

SUB + dependent-clause + COORD + main-clause

Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) further claim that the proposal of para-hypotaxis can be viewed as one of the first attempts to overcome the dychotomic concept of the contrast between parataxis and hypotaxis. It should not be surprising that the observation was made with reference to Old Romance texts, because this kind of structures have a relatively high frequency in all literary genres until the fifteenth century, with a slightly different timing in the individual languages, like Old French, Old Occitan, Old Portuguese, Old Spanish and Old Italian. Para-hypotaxis was fairly common in Late Latin, but the first examples date from much earlier times, which is noteworthy because it discards the diachronic hypothesis that it was Hebrew that influenced Late Latin via Bible translations.

[42] For further discussion see Suárez-Gómez (2006).

However, it so happens that this syntactic structure is not only very old, but it tends to arise in completely unrelated languages. On the other hand, the influence of Late Latin on the early Romance languages is quite probable, just as it is an established fact that Biblical Hebrew presented frequent examples of para-hypotaxis. In the past, para-hypotaxis was considered, probably only implicitly, to be an areal and fairly archaic feature. However, recent research has demonstrated that para-hypotaxis exists in modern languages, such as in Swahili (see Rebuschi 2001), probably in Basque (see Rotaetxe 2006) and widely in the Zamucoan languages (Bertinetto and Ciucci 2011). Therefore, it appears that para-hypotaxis is neither geographically nor diachronically restricted, although its presence has admittedly not been shown to be widespread. Nevertheless, it is important to observe that it can independently develop in unrelated languages. For this reason, even though its diffusion seems not to be very large, it should be regarded as a universally available and autonomously arising syntactic device. Moreover, as a matter of fact para-hypotaxis latently exists in Modern Italian, contrary to the received opinion. Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) note further that the frequency of occurrence of para-hypotactic constructions is a point worth of further study.

Scaglione (1972) notes that the term para-hypotaxis means a situation in which one is dealing with subordinate clause syntax with only a coordinate interpretation possible, or in which the writer treats as coordinate clauses which would appear to require subordination. According to Mazzoleni (2002), the term 'parahypotaxis' is the name traditionally assigned to Old Italian sequences of dependent clauses with following main clauses introduced by *e* 'and', *sì* 'thus'. However, he claims that since *sì* is not a coordinating conjunction like *e* but an adverbial element, the relevant examples should be taken away from the category. Instead, he suggests also taking into account para-hypotactic structures with main clauses introduced by the adversative coordinating conjunction *ma* 'but', a kind of combination which in his opinion was underestimated in the traditional literature. Van Valin (2005: 187) discusses the problem of switch-reference constructions in Amele, Kewa and Chuave that are examples of neither subordination nor simple coordination. He says that "these constructions are therefore a kind of dependent coordination, in which units of equivalent size are joined together in a coordinate-like manner relation but share some grammatical category, e.g. tense or mood." However, such syntactic phenomena are not discussed in terms of para-hypotaxis this time, but, as Van Valin observes, this linkage or nexus relation was termed 'cosubordination' in Olson (1981).

Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) further observe that the structural configuration corresponding to para-hypotaxis is not mentioned in the elaborate syntactic model proposed by Foley and Van Valin (1984), who use the notion of co-subordination after Olson (1981). Despite formal equivalence, the co-subordination should not be confused with para-hypotaxis, because, according

to Foley and Van Valin, co-subordination can be found at three structural levels, namely, nucleus, core and periphery. However, the only meaningful comparison with para-hypotaxis could be done at the level of periphery, but even on this level it immediately appears that para-hypotaxis and co-subordination do not coincide. Moreover, the notion of co-subordination was applied, for instance, to the so-called clause chaining, which can be found in the narratives of many languages of New Guinea and Australia, an ostensibly different type of syntactic construction. Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) also observe that similarly Rebuschi (2001) introduced the seemingly equivalent notion of 'co-junction', but although he did mention para-hypotaxis, the new term rather defines a specific kind of structural configuration, and in practice it turns out to be a hyperonym of para-hypotaxis. Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011) further observe that para-hypotaxis is also completely absent from the elaborate parataxis/hypotaxis continuum proposed by Lehmann (1988) and also from the multivariate approach developed by Bickel (2011), which finely articulates the contrast between coordination and subordination along a number of variables, such as illocutionary scope, tense scope, tense marking, finiteness, focus marking, and other. Bertinetto and Ciucci (2011: 92—93) conclude that "This shows the marginal status of P-H within typological syntax: a good reason to carefully consider the case. Two hypotheses suggest themselves: either P-H is a universally available but very sparsely attested phenomenon, or its diffusion is larger than so far supposed, except that not enough attention has been devoted to it [...]."

1.8. The problem of modern punctuation in mediaeval texts

As we have already mentioned, owing to the popularity of corpus linguistics in recent years there has been an increase in the construction of both unannotated and annotated corpora for the analysis of mediaeval texts. However, together with the development of unannotated corpora there arose the problem of modern punctuation, employed by the editors in the modern editions of the texts, and of content interpretation. According to Mitchell (1988: 172), "it is clear that modern *readers* cannot always grasp the exact nuance an Anglo-Saxon author, reader, or reciter, conveyed to his *hearers*. Even if we assume that there is only one such nuance and that the modern editor has grasped it, he cannot always convey it to others by modern punctuation, which is concerned with modern English as a written rather than as a spoken language, whereas in Old English (one ventures to think) we may sometimes have to do with the rhythms and clause terminals of something closer to speech than to writing."

The problem of punctuation is particularly important in distinguishing the status of certain clauses and then in their classification, and how the clauses should be classified is usually suggested by the modern editor's punctuation.[43] However, in Old English there are certain clauses which are ambiguous, and it is often difficult to establish whether a given clause is main or dependent, although the modern punctuation seems to be telling us clearly that this one is a main clause and that one is a dependent clause. As a result of the ambiguous status of certain Old English clauses, one often finds it difficult to classify them in the proper way, and one hesitates whether to classify them as main or as dependent. As a matter of fact, one faces the problem of establishing whether a given clause stands in paratactic or in hypotactic relation to the preceding/following clause. In other words, one faces the problem of choosing between parataxis and hypotaxis.

Baugh and Cable (1993: 66) observe that "earlier editors tended to read a high degree of parataxis in Old English and to punctuate their editions accordingly. This reading fitted in with the idea that English subordinating conjunctions had their origins in adverbs. However, one can accept the adverbial origin of conjunctions and still argue […] that Old English style had attained a high degree of subordination." The authors claim that it is important to keep in mind the fact that both parataxis and hypotaxis are stylistic options and not syntactic necessities, as Old English clearly had the means to produce a highly subordinated style. They also observe that according to recent syntactic investigations there is now generally more hypotaxis than earlier editors suggested, but the investigators direct their efforts toward discovering specific structural cues before they make generalisations, and the most evident cues "are in the word order of the clause as a whole, which includes familiar historical patterns of subject and verb such as S … V, VS, and SV. These patterns have been intensively analysed for the principles operating in the placement of the finite verb, which typically occurs in second position in main clauses, and in final position in subordinate clauses" (p. 66). They also add that more subtle cues can be found in the patterning of auxiliaries, contractions, as well as in other clauses.

1.9. Main or dependent Old English clauses?

When hypotaxis develops from parataxis, or hypotaxis gives rise to parataxis, it is logical to think that the development is not an abrupt one and

[43] Cf. Andrew (1940), who discusses inconsistencies in the editorial punctuation in Old English texts.

that there is always a transition stage. Jucker (1991: 203) argues that "there must be one or possibly several intermediate stages between true parataxis and true hypotaxis and that there are constructions that are neither clearly paratactic nor clearly hypotactic but somewhere in-between. In most cases this development will have been not so much a matter of discrete steps, but rather a gradual movement, which makes it difficult to ascertain the exact status of a construction at any one time."

Although Old English achieved quite an advanced stage of hypotaxis, we can often have problems with the classification of some clauses. As Baugh and Cable (1993: 66—67) point out, "there are clear differences in our modern perceptions of Old English written in […] paratactic style and Old English written with many embedded clauses. The problem is in determining whether a particular clause is independent or subordinate, because the words that do the subordinating are often ambiguous [and homophonous with their counterparts, from which they originate, that do not do the subordinating]. The Old English *þa* at the beginning of a clause can be either an adverb translated 'then' and indicating an independent clause, or a subordinating conjunction translated 'when' and introducing a dependent clause. Similarly, *þær* can be translated as 'there' or 'where', *þonne* as 'then' or 'when', *swa* as 'so' or 'as', *ær* as 'formerly' or 'ere', *siððan* as 'afterward' or 'since', *nu* as 'now' or 'now that', *þeah* as 'nevertheless' or 'though' and *forðam* as 'therefore' or 'because'." Baugh and Cable (1993: 67) add that "in each pair the first word is an adverb, and the style that results from choosing it is a choppier style with shorter sentences, whereas the choice of the second word results in longer sentences with more embedded clauses." Moreover, they note that "current research in Old English syntax aims to understand the use of these ambiguous subordinators and adverbs. The conclusions that emerge will affect our modern perception of the sophistication of Old English writing in verse and prose." Similarly, Lenker (2011, after Mitchel 1985) observes that most of the connectors in Old English are polyfunctional, namely some of them are circumstance adverbs (time/space adverbs) such as *þa* 'then, there' or *þonne* 'then' etc. or epistemic adverbs such as *eornostlice* 'earnestly', *soþlice/witodlice* 'truly' etc. with a context-dependent connector force. Moreover, the greater part of connectors, in particular those connectors that are used most frequently, are so-called ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions, and they may be used as adverbial connectors or subordinators. Lenken also provides the following list of connectors:

> *eall-swa*: adverb 'also, moreover' expressing addition vs. conjunction 'as, so'
> *eac (swylce)/swylce eac*: adverb 'also, moreover' expressing addition vs. conjunction 'all such…, as'

forþæm (forþon, forþy): adverb 'for; therefore' expressing cause/result vs. conjunction 'because'
nu: adverb 'now' expressing transition vs. conjunction 'now that…'
swa: adverb 'so' expressing cause/result vs. conjunction 'so that…; as…'
þa: adverb 'then' expressing transition vs. conjunction 'then … when'
þonne: adverb 'then' expressing transition, cause vs. conjunction 'then… when'

Lenker says that while the inventory of the coordinating conjunctions working on the sentence or discourse level has remained fairly stable (contemporary English *and*, *but* and *or*), there have been drastic changes in the categories of both subordinators and adverbial connectors throughout the history of English. Moreover, since the distinction of adverbial vs. conjunction is not regularly indicated by different word order patterns, such as for example a distinction of V2 for the main clause vs. V-final for the subordinate clause, or morphological features, these items are indeed ambiguous. Because of the fact that there was a great number of ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions in Old English, the general line of development was at first to some extent parallel for adverbial connectors and subordinators. However, in the course of an increased form-to-function mapping after the Old English period, most of the Old English 'ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions' were discarded, and in consequence we can observe a corresponding decrease in syntactic and semantic polyfunctionality in both of the classes of adverbial connectors and subordinators, which are now separate.

Finally, Baugh and Cable (1993: 66—67) note that "we should be especially cautious about imposing modern notions that equate hypotaxis with sophistication and parataxis with primitiveness until we know more about the full range of syntactic possibilities in Old English. Ongoing research in this subject promises to revise our ideas of the grammatical, semantic, and rhythmic relationships in Old English verse and prose."[44] Also Mitchell (1985: §1879; after Baugh and Cable 1993: 67) warns us that it may be anachronistic to impose modern categories resulting from our translations into words like 'then' and 'when', "implying that the choice was simply between a subordinate clause and an independent clause in the modern sense of the words." Baker (2003: 29) observes that some linguists claim that Old English literature is generally characterised by parataxis, but it is not so, because it is only some

[44] For more information on this issue see Mitchell (1985, 1988), Mitchell and Robinson (2007), Blake (1992), Denison (1993), Fischer, Kemenade, Koopman, and Wurff (2000), Hogg (1992), Kohonen (1978), Molencki (1997, 2012), Visser (1963—1973), Pintzuk (1993, 1995, 2004, 2008), Lenker and Mauermann-Solin (2007), Lenker (2010). Meuerman-Solin (2004), Meurman-Solin and Pahta (2006), Meurman-Solin and Lenker (2011).

Old English works, such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for example, that tend to be paratactic, whereas other works, like King Alfred's Preface to his translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* for example, are characterised by hypotaxis. He further says that in Old English it can be difficult to tell independent clauses from subordinate clauses, and because of that it is a matter of some controversy how paratactic or hypotactic Old English was in fact[45].

1.10. Ambiguity and some techniques of resolving it

Dash (2005: 24—25) notes that ambiguity is very common especially at the lexical level in natural languages because a single lexical item may convey more than one sense, idea or event, depending on the context in which it is used. Moreover, he says that two types of ambiguity are found in a tagged corpus, namely, structural ambiguity and sequential ambiguity. The former kind of ambiguity "is caused mostly for the non-inflected words where a root, due to its homographic structure, may belong to different lexical categories. It is also noted in case of some inflected words because root and suffix of these words are identical, although they belong to different lexical categories" (Dash 2005: 24—25). As far as the latter kind of ambiguity is concerned, Dash claims that "it is mostly caused due to the presence of immediately following words, which when parsed together with the word under investigation, produces a meaning, which differs from their respective independent meanings." Therefore, the prevalent existence of ambiguity in language poses a serious problem for the constructors of annotated corpora.

Desai and Zhang (1991) maintain that the two most common types of ambiguities are of a syntactic and semantic nature. Syntactic ambiguity can have a more detailed classification, namely lexical, structural and referential. As regards lexical ambiguity, it can be resolved by listing all the possible lexical interpretations and using the grammar rules to check which interpretation is correct syntactically. In structural and referential ambiguities, not much syntactic and semantic information can be made use of, and therefore in order to resolve these kinds of ambiguities it is necessary to make reference to the world knowledge related to the application domain, or consult users in order to obtain more instructions. Structural and referential ambiguities can also be resolved by adopting the principles of Right Association, Minimal Attachment and Lexical Preferences. For resolving syntactic and semantic ambiguities, Desai and Zhang (1991: 128) suggest that "different knowledge is required. From the

[45] For further discussion concerning ambiguous Old English clauses see Blockley (2001).

viewpoint of system portability, it is desirable to divide this knowledge into two separate parts. One part is domain independent, and the other, domain dependent. As a result of this separation, the syntactic and semantic analyzers which access the syntactic and semantic knowledge are able to be independent of the application domain. Therefore, the portability of the system can be enhanced." According to Franz (1996), it is syntactic factors that clearly play a large role in the resolution of ambiguity and it seems that over 50.00 per cent of cases of structural ambiguity is resolved in agreement with the principle of Right Association. However, the syntactic principles for disambiguation, such as the principle of Right Association and the principle of Minimal Attachment suffer from a variety of problems. The most serious problem is that the effect of these two principles is dependent on the exact rules that are assumed in the grammar. However, it is widely acknowledged that a great number of cases of structural ambiguity cannot be resolved on the basis of structural properties of a given sentence alone and therefore semantic and pragmatic information is also necessary. Although semantic and pragmatic principles can account for additional factors that are ignored by purely syntactic approaches, such an approach also suffers from a variety of shortcomings. For example, semantic and pragmatic information is not always available, especially when we are dealing with extinct languages with no native speakers. Moreover, wrong predictions on the basis of semantic and pragmatic principles with respect to certain ambiguous units are not uncommon. Franz also observes that previous work on corpus-based approaches to modeling the resolution of ambiguity has stopped short of constructing sound statistical models of the phenomena under study and thus it is necessary to construct such models, and he proposes so-called loglinear model for ambiguity resolution which fulfils the four main requirements for an effective procedure of ambiguity resolution which should be taken into account in corpus construction:

1. Automatic training — an approach should be based on statistical models whose parameters are estimated automatically via an iterative procedure from text corpora.
2. Handling multiple features — effective ambiguity resolution can be achieved by combining multiple disambiguating features.
3. Modeling feature dependencies — natural languages are complicated and ill-understood phenomena and it is certain that various aspects of a language are interdependent, and therefore it is important to choose a modeling technique that allows interactions to be modeled explicitly.
4. Robustness — an effective ambiguity resolution should be robust in two senses. First, it must not be limited to a specific domain but should have wide applicability. Second, the procedure should lend itself to integration with other components that might compensate for some of its inadequacies.

Field (2004) notes that syntactic ambiguity falls in two types, namely local ambiguity and standing ambiguity. In local ambiguity the word class or syntactic function of a word is unclear at the moment the word occurs, but is made clear by subsequent context, whereas in standing ambiguity a sentence remains ambiguous even after it is complete. Local ambiguity provides insights into syntactic parsing as it makes it possible for the researcher to investigate how a subject reacts both at the point where the ambiguity appears and at the point where disambiguation takes place. Tabossi et al. (1994) observe that syntactic ambiguity occurs when a word sequence can be structured in alternative ways that are consistent with the syntax of the language. They maintain that it is often the case that in Modern English it is hard to say whether a given clause is a main one or a relative one. They also say that syntactic ambiguity often depends on lexical ambiguity because words like *that*, for example, can function as complementisers or as relative pronouns. The most influential modular accounts of syntactic ambiguity resolution, the authors also claim, have assumed that an autonomous syntactic processor computes a single structure for the local input. For example, in the garden path model which was developed by Frazier and Rayner (1982), the syntactic processor attaches each word or phrase into the constituent structure that it is building. This model incorporates a simplicity-based decision principle and when the input is locally ambiguous, what is chosen is the simplest attachment, where simplicity is defined in terms of the number of nodes that need to be added to the constituent structure. Moreover, constraints that might be relevant to the resolution of the local ambiguity are ignored by the module responsible for making initial attachments. These constraints include semantic and syntactic information associated with given lexical items, plausibility, and information coming from the discourse context. As to the information that is not used in making these attachmens, it is then used to evaluate and, if need be, revise the initial structure. Tabossi et al. (1994) observe that constraint-based approaches treat resolution of syntactic ambiguity similarly to lexical ambiguity resolution and the available alternatives are constantly evaluated with respect to other relevant constraints. Constraint-based models, as in lexical ambiguity, predict an interaction between strength of context and availability of alternatives, the latter being dependent on the temporal relationship between the contextual cues and the ambiguity, namely, whether the relevant cues precede or follow the point of ambiguity. Furthermore, even relatively subtle constrains can have an influence on the speed with which alternative analyses are computed and ambiguity is resolved, and especially when a highly active alternative occurs to be inconsistent with subsequent input.

The problems mentioned above by Tablossi et al. (1994), namely the problem of the possibility of alternative structuring of word sequences and the problem of syntactic ambiguity being dependent on lexical ambiguity, is very common in Old English and the older stages of other Germanic languages,

in which it is difficult to determine the status of certain elements and, what goes with it, to identify and establish clause boundaries in complex utterances. Höder (2012: 269) proposes that in order to ensure a consistent annotation in such ambiguous cases, and more specifically in dealing with diachronic ambiguities that arise in relative clauses, it is necessary to follow the principle: "Whenever it cannot be excluded that a pronoun is a relativiser, it *is* analysed as a relativiser, and the clause boundary is placed to the left of such pronouns." Such an operationalisation is, apart from other reasons, primarily motivated by annotation consistency, he claims.

Further, Baker et al. (2006: 10) note that "in corpus annotation, in cases where there is a choice of two potential tags at one point in the text, it is not always possible to make a clear-cut decision. […] In some cases a portmanteau tag can be given in order to address the ambiguity. In other words, examining more of the surrounding context may help to solve the problem. However, in extremely ambiguous cases, the corpus compiler may have to make a decision one way or the other. If this approach is taken then the decision would need at least to be applied with consistency throughout the corpus. In general, decisions regarding ambiguous cases should be covered in the documentation that comes with the corpus." Franz (1996) notes that decision theory is concerned with choosing the "best" action from a number of alternatives and the outcomes of the possible actions are dependent on a future event, about which the decision-maker is uncertain. In decision making the following procedure can be followed. After an action is chosen by the decision-maker, and one of the possible uncertain events has occurred, a "payoff" is obtained. There is a maximum payoff for each of the possible events and all other actions incur a conditional opportunity loss, which is the loss on the payoff, given that one of the events occurred. Moreover, the loss for the actions that lead to the maximum payoff is zero and for all the other actions the loss is the maximum payoff for the event, minus the payoff for the action taken. Afterwards, the decision-maker's uncertainty about the event is encoded in a probability distribution over the possible events, which allows to calculate the *expected loss* for each possible action. If the decision-maker cares only for payoffs, he chooses the action that minimises the expected loss. However, if considerations other than the payoff are important, then the decision-maker tries to maximize a subjective *utility function* which depends both on the payoff and on other considerations, for example such as the degree of uncertainty associated with the payoffs.

Pala et al. (1997: 523) say that the most reasonable way of building large annotated corpora is via an automatic tagging of the texts by means of computer programs. However, they add that "natural languages display rather complex clause and therefore it is no surprise that the attempts to process them by the simple deterministic algorithms do not always yield satisfactory results. The result is that the present tagging programs are not able to give fully reliable

results and there are many ambiguities in their output." Höder (2012) observes that the annotation of historical corpora faces specific problems. One of the problems is that standardised tagging conventions for older linguistic stages are often lacking, and tagsets that are developed for the contemporary descendants of older languages usually do not apply because of language change that has occurred in the meantime. Another problem is that older linguistic stages are notoriously variable and, unlike in modern written languages, written texts from the Middle Ages exhibit (ortho-)graphic and grammatical variation to an extent that is not found in later standardised variations. He says that it is partly caused by dialectal features typical of the individual authors or scribes but a more frequent reason is language change observed both in diachrony and synchrony. Höder (2012: 246) says further that "as a result, an objective and unequivocal assignment of tags is in many cases difficult to achieve. A fortiori, a consistent annotation scheme is difficult to design if the analysis is supposed to go beyond a simple morphological tagging […]. For results of corpus-based analyses to be valid, it is, therefore, crucial not only to implement an appropriate annotation scheme and to apply it consistently and transparently, but also to develop strategies to effectively address ambiguity at all stages of the corpus development and analysis. Finally, Höder (2012: 269) notes that "a syntactic ambiguity inevitably is a major problem for any type of investigation based on historical corpora, [and that] a consistent annotation, especially of ambiguous structures, is crucial in order to avoid haphazard tag assignments that will lead to fallacious or at least misleading results." According to Dietzel (2006), most parsing systems are not yet able to cope with the huge number of individual words and their multiple meanings that are context-dependent, and that the development of techniques which could enable machines to understand syntactic ambiguity is a serious problem. In natural language there is a huge number of words and many of them can have different meanings in different contexts and humans have the ability to differentiate between the meanings in a given text. This process of identifying the meanings is referred to as WSD, that is, *word-sense disambiguation.* It is useful to observe how humans deal with ambiguities in order to understand the processing principles in language comprehension, as these principles could later on be projected on machines. Dietzel uses the example of the parser ROBIE (developed at the University of Edinburgh) to demonstrate how lexical ambiguity can be handled. The method of this parser is that each word is stored in a dictionary and then the syntactic characteristics are defined. The parser has to decide for the correct part of speech from an ordered list of features, as one word can have several features for all possible parts of speech. Dietzel admits that although the parser successfully disambiguates the lexical items, there are still many cases in which it is difficult to resolve ambiguities. Navigli (2012: 117) states that there are three mainstream approaches to WSD:

— Supervised WSD: these approaches use machine learning method to learn a classifier for the target word from labelled training sets, i.e. sets of examples encoded as vectors whose elements represent features, with a special element representing the appropriate sense label (or class).
— Knowledge-based WSD: these methods exploit knowledge resources (such as dictionaries, thesauri, ontologies, etc.) to determine the senses of words in context. They have the advantage of a wider coverage, thanks to the use of large amounts of structural knowledge.
— Unsupervised WSD: these are Word Sense Induction techniques aimed at discovering senses automatically based on unlabelled corpora. They do not exploit any manually sense-tagged corpus to provide a sense choice for a word in context.

Navigli adds that the question of which of the approaches is best in general, and in which application, is still very much open. As a matter of fact, recent results demonstrate that in the presence of enough knowledge, knowledge-rich systems are better because they provide much wider coverage. However, until recently it was generally believed that supervised WSD performed better than knowledge-based WSD. Navigli also observes that performance is a well-known issue in WSD and that in recent years progress has been made that has led to a significant improvement in disambiguation performance, namely from 65% (still in the year 2004) to 82—83% accuracy. Apart from performance, knowledge is another key factor in WSD, as it has been demonstrated that the higher the amount of high-quality knowledge, the higher the performance. Further, Field (2004: 9) suggests that in principle the language user/corpus compiler could react to ambiguity in the following ways:

a) Adopt a single analysis, even at the risk of later having to abandon it.
b) Hold alternative analyses in parallel, but provisionally make use of the one that best fits the context and add it to the meaning representation.
c) Hold alternative analyses in parallel, where they compare with each other until one becomes so highly activated on the basis of new evidence that it is accepted (a constraint-based approach).
d) Delay commitment until the ambiguity is resolved.

Field also observes that evidence suggests that one preferred interpretation is chosen and revised later if necessary. He concludes that “Eye-movement experiments show that readers experience processing difficulty not so much at the point where an ambiguity arises, but at the point where disambiguation

occurs. This might appear to support a 'single analysis' view, but might equally reflect processes b and c" (p. 9).

Finally, Meuerman-Solin (2004) presents a variationist[46] typology of clausal connectives, on the basis of early Scottish correspondence representing the period from 1542 to 1708. She claims that "as yet only a relatively low degree of integration has taken place between the corpus-based variationist approach and synchronic and diachronic descriptive work towards the reconstruction of grammatical systems in terms of typologies. In recent literature on the typology of clause-combining devices in English as well as other European languages […] inventories have been constructed chiefly by using secondary sources such as dictionaries and grammars. Data sources of this kind tend to lead to the marginalization of diatopic and diastratic variation in particular" (Meuerman-Solin 2004: 172). She says that central concepts, as for example 'subordination' and 'subordinating conjunction' have been defined in grammars and dictionaries too loosely to depict the enormous degree of variation. She suggests that in corpus compilation, when we are dealing with the same elements such as connectives, that have different functions and meaning in different contexts, it is necessary to tag them adequately on the basis of a corpus-based analysis. Accordingly, on the basis of the text corpus of early Scottish correspondence she proposes a system of lexico-grammatical tags containing information about the structural and semantic features of particular connective devices as well as their properties at the level of discourse and text structure. For example, the connective 'since' can express both cause and time, and in order to reduce or abolish semantic ambiguity it is necessary to introduce a comment as part of the lexeme. Therefore, when 'since' means 'cause', it will be assigned the tag 'since{cause}/cj', whereas when it means 'time', it will be assigned the tag 'since{time}/cj' to distinguish it from the former meaning. Similarly, when the connective 'and' has an adverbial role, the semantically disambiguating comment will have the form 'and{condition}/cj', whereas when it has the role of a co-ordinator, it will be considered a default use and have the tag 'and/cj'.

[46] Generally speaking, the variationist approach should be seen as a methodology that investigates the patterns of a given language which are variable in different language users and in different contexts. This methodology is normally used in sociolinguistics and language acquisition but it can also be used in historical linguistics in the investigation of language change (cf. Pintzuk 2004, Meuerman-Solin 2004, Rissanen 2011, 2012a, 2012b), as well as in other fields. In the investigation of language change, the variationist approach takes into account extralinguistic factors (e.g. sociolinguistic, regional and genre-based) and language internal factors (e.g. grammaticalisation). Moreover, it is William Labov who is considered as the pioneer of the variationist approach (Labov 1969). As regards approaches to syntactic change, Pintzuk (2004) says that here the term 'variationist' is best understood as referring to methodology, whereby systematic syntactic variation during periods of change is analysed quantitatively and the emerging generalisations enable us to describe the time course of syntactic change and therefore to begin to understand and explain how change starts and then how it progresses.

Meuerman-Solin also claims that her tagging system aims at indicating item-specific or collocate-specific structural features which have semantic potential to indicate relations between clauses.

1.11. Introduction to the following chapters

The kind of ambiguity that we are concerned with in the book has much to do with lexical ambiguity, but nevertheless, since it involves entire syntactic structures, we can also speak of syntactic ambiguity because the status of certain clauses (referred to as PH clauses here), which are difficult to be classified either as main or dependent only, is determined by the way we treat certain ambiguous lexical items, namely þa, *þær*, þonne, *swa*, *forðam* þæt and a number of others, which we refer to as PH elements in general.[47] Moreover, the kind of ambiguity that we are dealing with rather concerns the surface structures than the deep ones, because the deep structures stay the same no matter what the analysis.[48] In this situation from now on we will refer to such superficially ambiguous structures (i.e. PH clauses) and their connectors (i.e. PH elements) as ambivalent and not as ambiguous, and treat ambivalence as a subcategory of ambiguity.

On the basis of our observations and experience with diachronic corpus linguistics, as well as on the basis of the literature that we have had access to, we can say that the problems of classification, description, disambiguation, annotation, and subsequent electronic analysis of ambivalent Old English clauses and their connectors, as well as the problem of resolution of ambiguity are still open to discussion.

As regards disambiguation and annotation, it can be noticed that there is a clear tendency among scholars to disambiguate certain items at all costs, the way that they could be annotated and then analysed accordingly in one way only, once disambiguated. We think that this rigid approach, which is commonly followed by compilers of annotated corpora, may not always be the right one in the case of ambivalent clauses and their connectors, because one-way clear-cut disambiguation is not always possible.

As regards classification and description of the ambivalent clauses in question and of their connectors, it is necessary to admit an alternative corpus-based approach whereby the ambivalent clauses with their connectors could be treated as a distinct category involving a distinct classificatory and descriptive

[47] We will discuss the problem in more detail in the subsequent chapters of this book.

[48] Ambiguity is explained in Chomsky (1957) as a situation in which there can be two different deep structures for one surface structure.

apparatus. By a corpus-based approach it is meant that classification and description of certain phenomena should be done not only on the basis of the traditional descriptive and classificatory means, but also on the basis of corpora because they provide the context and inform about important features of the language, language users, register, etc. This is in line with what Meuerman-Solin (2004: 172), one of the contemporary experts in corpus linguists, has in mind when she says that "as yet a relatively low degree of integration has taken place between the corpus-based variationist approach and synchronic and diachronic descriptive work towards the reconstruction of grammatical systems in terms of typologies. In recent literature on the typology of clause-combining devices in English as well as other European languages […], inventories have been constructed chiefly by using secondary sources such as dictionaries and grammars. Data sources of this kind tend to lead to the marginalisation of diatopic and diastratic variation in particular." Such corpus-based approaches should allow for addressing certain problems in a more systematic and comprehensive way than has been done so far, as well as offer alternative solutions to them.

Chapter 2

Para-hypotaxis

2.1. The way we see para-hypotaxis

Corpus linguistics is a very challenging field of study and corpus linguists struggle with multiple problems. In the compilation of unannotated corpora, among other things, there arise the issues of size and representativeness, whereas in the case of annotated corpora there also appear the problems of consistency and accuracy in the application of the annotation scheme, which should be as efficient as possible and allow the user to perform the searches quickly and comfortably. In the compilation of an annotated corpus the degree of challenge increases enormously when one has to deal with a phenomenon that has not been treated systematically and uniformly before. An example of such a phenomenon is para-hypotaxis.

In the previous chapter we discussed some issues related to the problems of parataxis and hypotaxis, which are normally treated as two separate and opposing phenomena finding themselves at two different extremes. Generally speaking, in parataxis we deal with non-dependency/non-subordination, whereas in hypotaxis with dependency/subordination. We also discussed the notion of para-hypotaxis and the way it is normally applied in the literature devoted to linguistics. It occurs that the term para-hypotaxis traditionally refers to sequences of dependent clauses followed by main clauses introduced by certain connectives. It is sometimes also referred to as co-subordination. Starting from this chapter onwards, we will deal with the problem of para-hypotaxis from a considerably different perspective, as it will receive a different meaning and value here.

In our view, para-hypotaxis (PH-taxis) is the phenomenon of ambivalent clauses which is to be found in the intermediate stage in the transition of a language from parataxis to hypotaxis, or vice versa. Such a phenomenon exists in certain Old English clauses, whose status is ambivalent, and we refer

to them as *ambivalent para-hypotactic clauses* or *ambivalent PH clauses*. They are ambivalent because on the one hand they can be considered from the point of view of parataxis and interpreted as main clauses and on the other hand from the point of view of hypotaxis and interpreted as dependent ones. When analysed as main, they are in paratactic relation to the immediately preceding/following clauses, whereas when analysed as dependent, they are in hypotactic relation to the clauses immediately preceding/following them. Generally speaking, by the term 'main clauses' we mean the ones that syntactically are independent and can stand alone. So 'main' is synonymous with 'independent' or 'coordinate' and the terms can basically be used interchangeably here; however, we generally use the term 'main' for convenience reasons. Within the para-hypotaxis in question treated as a separate category, the term 'main' also implies paratactic relations between the clauses involved. On the other hand, by using the term 'dependent clauses', we generally mean clauses that syntactically are dependent on main clauses, and thus cannot stand alone. It also implies hypotactic relations between the clauses involved.

The status of the PH clauses is determined by the way their *PH elements* are treated and vice versa. A PH element is an intrinsically ambivalent para-hypotactic element which can be represented by an explicit/implicit pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, pronominal indirect object, or pronominal adverbial[1] that in hypotaxis will be treated as dependent clause connectors and in parataxis as ordinary elements, namely as a pronominal subject, a pronominal direct object, a pronominal indirect object or a pronominal adverbial respectively. Some of the Old English intrinsically ambivalent para-hypotactic elements are for example þa, *þær,* þonne, *swa*, *forðam* þæt, and a number of others.

Generally speaking, we distinguish two large subcategories of para-hypotaxis, namely *Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis* and *Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis*. We employ the following acronyms for the respective types of para-hypotaxis: *SIPH-taxis* (or *PH-siph*) and *MIPH-taxis* (or *PH-miph*). Moreover, within SIPH-taxis we distinguish *SIPH clauses* and *SIPH elements*, and analogically within MIPH-taxis *MIPH clauses* and *MIPH elements*. Sometimes in order to be more general we also employ the terms *PH-taxis*, *PH clauses* and *PH elements* which cover both types of para-hypotaxis, their clauses and their elements respectively.. The whole phenomenon of para-hypotaxis understood in this way forms a separate category in our investigation and we propose our own classificatory and descriptive apparatus for approaching it, which is accordingly reflected in the annotation scheme and subsequent analysis. This apparatus at the same time fills in the gaps in the existing nomenclature and constitutes the methodology employed.

[1] For reasons of unity, we refer to 'short' adverbials as pronominal, just as we do with respect to 'short' subjects and objects.

Since we are not concerned with clear parataxis or clear hypotaxis, both of which would rather imply that one deals with unambivalent main or dependent clauses that allow classification by means of the well-established nomenclature, but rather we are concerned with something which is both parataxis and hypotaxis, we avoid applying this kind of nomenclature in our investigation and propose our own classificatory and descriptive apparatus restricted exclusively to para-hypotaxis. For example, it would not be correct to say that a given PH clause is 'a subordinate adverbial clause of result', neither would it be so to say that it is 'a main clause', because it is both a subordinate adverbial clause of result and a main clause, but only can be analysed either as a subordinate adverbial clause of result or as a main clause. The specific kind of para-hypotaxis in question thus escapes being comprehended by the well-established nomenclature whose application would lead to confusion.

PH clauses may create problems for corpus linguists not only dealing with their classification and description but also with their disambiguation, annotation, and subsequent automatic analysis. In the annotation process one faces the problem of decision-making.[2] To the best of our knowledge, in the existing annotated corpora of Old English, and of other languages, the common trend is to annotate clauses, including ambivalent ones, only as main or only as dependent. Therefore, the annotated corpora for the analysis of surface word order are not flexible enough and do not reflect the ambivalent nature of certain clauses, referred to as PH clauses here. In the light of this, we propose a corpus-based dynamic approach to the PH clauses, which involves treating them dynamically and not statically, as they, being in a transition phase, refuse to be perceived in one way or another only. In order to reflect the ambivalent state of PH clauses in the annotation scheme, we suggest that it is necessary to annotate and analyse them in a dual way, compare the results and then incorporate them into the results obtained from the analysis of unambivalent clauses, both main and dependent, in order to see how the whole picture of word order in a given text changes. Such a dual approach to PH clauses is at the same time a way of disambiguating them, where disambiguation should not be understood as opting for one possibility and disregarding the other, but as opting for one possibility first and then comparing it with the other in order to see how they differ. Speaking in more general terms, our approach involves such an annotation scheme which reflects the dynamic and changeable nature of language.

The principal aim of our corpus-based dynamic approach to para-hypotaxis is to investigate, on the basis of two entire manuscripts (A and E) of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the influence of a dual analysis of ambivalent PH clauses upon the general state of word order configurations in the two manuscripts,

[2] Cf. Baker et al. (2006).

investigated independently from each other, in order to demonstrate that the results of the analysis substantially differ depending on whether these clauses are approached from the point of view of parataxis and treated as main or from the point of view of hypotaxis and treated as dependent. Before this dual analysis was performed, however, it was necessary to classify, describe, and annotate the PH clauses, and these were other aims of our investigation. In this chapter we will make a preliminary classification and description of these clauses and we will also say how we annotated and then analysed them, whereas in the subsequent chapters we will discuss them in more detail, providing examples wherever possible.

2.2. Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis

In Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis we distinguish different kinds of SIPH clauses. A SIPH clause is the one that is introduced by an intrinsically ambivalent para-hypotactic element which we call SIPH element. This SIPH element can be represented by an explicit/implicit pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, pronominal indirect object, or pronominal adverbial that in hypotaxis will be treated as dependent clause connectives and in parataxis as ordinary elements, namely as a pronominal subject, a pronominal direct object, a pronominal indirect object or a pronominal adverbial respectively. A SIPH element always belongs to its corresponding SIPH clause, both when it is looked at from the point of view of parataxis and when it is looked at from the point of view of hypotaxis.[3] While in parataxis SIPH elements are treated as ordinary pronominal subjects, pronominal direct objects, pronominal indirect objects and pronominal adverbials at the beginning of main clauses standing in paratactic relation to the main clauses immediately preceding or following them, in hypotaxis they are treated as dependent clause connectives introducing different types of dependent clauses that stand in hypotactic relation to the immediately preceding or following main clauses. Additionally, there is a mutual interaction between SIPH elements and the SIPH clauses in which they appear, as on the one hand we can say that SIPH elements, depending on the perspective they are approached from, determine the status of the SIPH clauses in which they appear, and on the other hand the SIPH clauses, depending on the perspective they are approached from, determine the status of the SIPH elements introducing them.

Below we present the different types of clauses in Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis that we distinguish. It needs to be noted that we employ our own

[3] Hence the term ‘static’. The term ‘intrinsic’, on the other hand, means that SIPH elements, and SIPH clauses together with them, are intrinsically ambivalent.

symbols and thus they should not be understood as universal in any way. We invented our own symbols for the purposes of the construction of our corpus created in Microsoft Word and we use them to refer to the different kinds of PH clauses throughout the book. They are meant to facilitate the searches for given types of clauses in our corpus; for example on entering one of the symbols in the search engine and pressing 'find all' option we are able to localise all the structures of this type within no time at all; it is also possible to use the option 'find next', in which case only the next structure of this type will appear. Also owing to the use of these symbols, we avoided unnecessary, and often longish, repetitions of the definitions of the individual clauses. For example, it is easier and faster to write *PH-siph}[=s/[con** than 'a Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotactic clause introduced by an explicit Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotactic element *s*, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.' Moreover, the symbols allowed us to organise the list of contents in a better way, although it might seem quite complicated and obscure at first glance. Of course different corpus compilers can invent their own symbols according to the way they perceive the problem, but what is important is that they be consistent throughout the whole corpus.

Group 1a — with an explicit *x/con** SIPH element

*PH-siph}[=x/[con** — a SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 1b — with an implicit *x/con** SIPH element

PH-siph}[=0/[0 from x* — a SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0 from x* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which

becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0 from x* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 2a — with an explicit *s/con** SIPH element

*PH-siph}[=s/[con** — a SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 2b — with an implicit *s/con** SIPH element

PH-siph}[=0/[0 from s* — a SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0 from s* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0 from s* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 3a — with an explicit *io/con** SIPH element

*PH-siph}[=io/[con** — a SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-siph}[cj=io/[cj=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-siph}[0=io/[0=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 3b — with an implicit *io/con** SIPH element

PH-siph}[=0/[0 from io* — a SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0 from io* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0 from io* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 4a — with an explicit *do/con** SIPH element

*PH-siph}[=do/[con** — a SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con** — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an explicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 4b — with an implicit *do/con** SIPH element

PH-siph}[=0/[0 from do* — a SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0 from do* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0 from do* — a sequence SIPH clause introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit SIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

We will discuss the different types of SIPH clauses in more detail later on. In the meantime, we will briefly describe MIPH clauses.

2.3. Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis

In Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis we distinguish different MIPH clauses. A MIPH clause is the one that is introduced/preceded by an intrinsically ambivalent para-hypotactic element which we call MIPH element. This MIPH element can be represented by an explicit/implicit pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, pronominal indirect object, or pronominal adverbial that in hypotaxis will be treated as dependent clause connectives and in parataxis as ordinary elements, namely as a pronominal subject, a pronominal direct object, a pronominal indirect object or a pronominal adverbial, respectively. Unlike a SIPH element in Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis, a MIPH element in Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis does not always belong to its corresponding MIPH clause when it is analysed from two different perspectives. Namely, when it is analysed from the point of view of parataxis, it occupies the final position in the immediately preceding main clause[4] and it functions in it as an ordinary pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, pronominal indirect object or pronominal adverbial. In this situation the main clause stands in paratactic relation to the MIPH clause immediately following it, and the MIPH clause itself is treated as a main

[4] It can also be a PH clause in the situation when the MIPH clause finds itself in a PH sequence. We discuss the problem in more detail later on.

clause. On the other hand, when a MIPH element is analysed from the point of view of hypotaxis, it occupies the initial position in the immediately following MIPH clause, which is then treated as dependent, and functions in it as a dependent clause connective. In other words, in the same linguistic context a MIPH element moves abstractly from one position to another.[5] Additionally, there is a mutual interaction between MIPH elements and the MIPH clauses in which they appear, as on the one hand, it can be said that MIPH elements, depending on the perspective they are approached from, determine the status of the MIPH clauses in which they appear and, on the other hand, the MIPH clauses, depending on the perspective they are approached from, determine the status of the MIPH elements introducing/preceding them.

We distinguish the following types of clauses in Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis:

Group 1a — with an explicit *x/con** MIPH element

*PH-miph}=x]/[con** — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded[6] by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

[5] Hence the term 'mobile'. The term 'intrinsic', on the other hand, means that MIPH elements, and MIPH clauses together with them, are intrinsically ambivalent.

[6] On the one hand, an explicit pronominal adverbial which is a MIPH element introduces a MIPH clause when it is approached from the point of view of hypotaxis; in this case the MIPH element is an integral part of the MIPH clause. On the other hand, an explicit pronominal adverbial which is a MIPH element precedes a MIPH clause when it is approached from the point of view of parataxis; in this case the MIPH element is an integral part of the clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause. The same applies to the rest of the MIPH elements.

Group 1b — with an implicit *x/con** MIPH element

PH-miph}=0]/[0 from x* — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0 from x* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0 from x* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal adverbial in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 2a — with an explicit *s/con** MIPH element

*PH-miph}=s]/[con** — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 2b — with an implicit *s/con** MIPH element

PH-miph}=0]/[0 from s* — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0 from s* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0 from s* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal subject in parataxis

which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 3a — with an explicit *io/con** MIPH element

*PH-miph}=io]/[con** — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-miph}0=io]/[0=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 3b — with an implicit *io/con** MIPH element

PH-miph}=0]/[0 from io* — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0 from io* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0 from io* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal indirect object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 4a — with an explicit *do/con** MIPH element

*PH-miph}=do]/[con** — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

*PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis

which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

*PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an explicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This explicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

Group 4b — with an implicit *do/con** MIPH element

PH-miph}=0]/[0 from do* — a MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis.

PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0 from do* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0 from do* — a sequence MIPH clause introduced/preceded by an implicit MIPH element, namely by a pronominal direct object in parataxis which becomes a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. This implicit MIPH element is preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction.

We are going to discuss the various types of MIPH clauses in more detail afterwards.

If we gather all the clause symbols employed by us in both SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis, we will obtain the following matrix:[7]

[7] It needs to be noted that in the arrangement of the symbols, and thus of the clauses represented by them, we did not stick to the traditional division of dependent clauses (i.e. subject, adjective, adverb clauses, etc.) but rather admitted a mixed approach. However, they can be rearranged as one wishes to, but even though they were rearranged in a different way, the final data obtained from their analysis would stay the same, no matter what the arrangement.

The matrix of PH-clause symbols

Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis

PH-siph}[=x/[con*	PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con*
	PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con*
PH-siph}[=s/[con*	PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con*
	PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con*
PH-siph}[=io/[con*	PH-siph}[cj=io/[cj=con*
	PH-siph}[0=io/[0=con*
PH-siph}[=do/[con*	PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con*
	PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con*
PH-siph}[=0/[0*	PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0*
from x	*from x*
from s	*from s*
from io	*from io*
from do	*from do*

PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0*
from x
from s
from io
from do

Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis

PH-miph}=x]/[con*	PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con*
	PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con*
PH-miph}=s]/[con*	PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con*
	PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con*
PH-miph}=io]/[con*	PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con*
	PH-miph}0=io]/[0=con*
PH-miph}=do]/[con*	PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con*
	PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con*
PH-miph}=0]/[0*	PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0*
from x	*from x*
from s	*from s*
from io	*from io*
from do	*from do*

PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0*
from x
from s
from io
from do

Now that we have presented a brief discussion of SIPH and MIPH clauses, we will move to the discussion of the basics lying behind our annotated corpus, which takes PH clauses into account.

2.4. Our annotated corpus taking PH clauses into account

In an annotated corpus that does not take into account PH clauses, all the clauses are treated as unambivalent and they are therefore given unambivalent tags. In such a corpus there are a fixed number of unambivalent main clauses and a fixed number of unambivalent dependent clauses, and the number of both kinds of clauses does not change once the corresponding tags have been added. For example, in such a corpus the Modern English main clause *Paul plays football* will be tagged as a main clause:

Paul plays football.
+=+S+V+DO+,[8]

On the other hand, the clause *Paul plays football* in the utterance *They think that Paul plays football* will be treated as a dependent clause and will be tagged in the following way:

They think that Paul plays football.
+=+s+V+,+con*+S+V+DO+[9],

However, in our annotated corpus, which takes PH clauses into account, and which we constructed for the purposes of this book, apart from the fact that there are a fixed number of unambivalent main and dependent clauses, there are also a certain number of PH clauses whose status is ambivalent, and therefore they are annotated in two ways. Let us take the following example from the ASC E for illustration:

[000500 (0.10)E]
We witan oþer egland her be easton ***þer*** *ge magon eardian gif ge willað ...*

[8] The sign = stands for a main clause, *S* stands for a nominal subject, *V* stands for a finite verb, and *DO* stands for a nominal direct object. Moreover, every sign is separated by a + sign.

[9] The sign * stands for a dependent clause, *con* stands for a dependent clause connective, and *s* stands for a pronominal subject. Moreover, every sign is separated by a +. More information concerning the creation of annotated corpora can be found in Kida (2007, 2011b, 2011c).

H-siph+(**con***)+s+V+inf+,
+=+s+V+DO+X+,**PH-siph}[=x/[con***,+con*+s+V+…
P-siph+(=)+**x**+s+V+inf+,
H-siph ‘We know another island here to the east **where** you may dwell, if you will.’[10]
P-siph ‘We know another island here to the east; **there** you may dwell, if you will.’

It can be noticed that in this utterance there is one unambivalent main clause (*We witan oþer egland her be easton*), one unambivalent dependent clause (*gif ge willað*), as well as one ambivalent PH clause (more specifically a SIPH clause), namely *þer ge magon eardian*. Since the PH element (more specifically the SIPH element) *þer* is ambivalent (because, on the one hand, it can be translated as ‘there’ and, on the other, as ‘where’), the whole clause immediately following it is ambivalent. This ambivalent PH clause therefore has two tags (tracks), one for the main clause, namely *P-siph+(=)+x+s+V+inf+*, and the other for a dependent clause, namely *H-siph+(con*)+s+V+inf+*. In the main clause, the adverbial *þer* is treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial and is assigned the symbol *x*. In the dependent clause, on the other hand, it is treated as a dependent clause connective and is assigned the symbol *con**, and the whole clause turns into a V2 clause. Since we intend to analyse the unambivalent (main and dependent) clauses and the PH clauses separately in each of the manuscripts, we need to make a distinction between the two categories of clauses. For this purpose we used the round brackets in the annotation of PH clauses in order to block their analysis while the unambivalent main and dependent clauses, annotated without round brackets, were analysed. In other words, when we analysed the unambivalent main and dependent clauses, in the search engine we first used the signs =+ and *+ respectively, which were followed by the various word order configurations manifested by these clauses, whereas the analysis of all the PH clauses was delayed, as they stayed blocked by the round brackets and thus were not taken into account then. However, having obtained data for the unambivalent (main and dependent) clauses of each of the manuscripts, we moved on to the analysis of PH clauses treated as a separate category. Here it was necessary to insert in the search engine the right round bracket between the equals mark and the plus mark, obtaining the sign =)+, when we wanted to analyse PH clauses as main, whereas it was necessary to insert in the search engine the right round bracket between the asterisk mark and the plus mark, obtaining the sign *)+, when we wanted to analyse PH clauses as

[10] The translations of the Old English examples, often modified to the needs of our analysis, come from http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/asintro2.html. If they come from a different source, we indicate that.

dependent; the signs =)+ and *)+, as in the case of unambivalent (main and dependent) clauses, were followed by the various word order configurations manifested by the PH clauses treated as main and as dependent respectively. In other words, the computer followed the paratactic tracks (P-siph) of the PH clauses when we used the sign =)+ in the search engine, whereas it followed the hypotactic tracks (H-siph) of the PH clauses when we used the sign *)+ in the search engine. Furthermore, we first analysed all the PH clauses of the ASC A as main and incorporated them, with all their word order configurations, into the unambivalent main clauses of the ASC A, and then we analysed all these PH clauses as dependent and incorporated them, with all their word order configurations, into the unambivalent dependent clauses of the ASC A. Afterwards we compared the results of this dual analysis. The same procedure was followed for the ASC E. When we analysed both of the manuscripts in this way, we compared them in order to see how they differed. The results of these procedures and conclusions are described in the last chapter of this book.

In Table 2.1 we provide general information about the number of unambivalent main and dependent clauses, with their word order configurations, as well as the number of PH clauses that our corpus of the ASC A and the ASC E contains:

Table 2.1. Unambivalent (i.e. non PH) main and dependent clauses, with their word order configurations, and PH clauses in the ASC A and the ASC E

Word order configuration	Unambivalent main clauses		Unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	
	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E
Total	1478	4190	303	1353	110	481
XV2	548	1329	70	249	—	—
SV2	272	839	69	398	—	—
VO	284	946	14	150	—	—
OV	141	351	45	150	—	—
Vo	39	217	2	33	—	—
oV	83	277	21	132	—	—

As can be seen, in the ASC A there are 1,478 unambivalent main clauses, in which there are 548 XV2 word orders, 272 SV2 word orders, 284 VO word orders with a nominal object, 141 OV word orders with a nominal object, 39 VO word orders with a pronominal object, and 83 OV word orders with a pronominal object. As regards unambivalent dependent clauses in the ASC A, there are 303 of them there. In these clauses, there are 70 XV2 word orders, 69 SV2 word orders, 14 VO word orders with a nominal object, 45 OV word orders with a nominal object, 2 VO word orders with a pronominal object, and 21 OV word orders with a pronominal object. On the other hand, in the ASC E there

are 4,190 unambivalent main clauses, in which there are 1,329 XV2 word orders, 839 SV2 word orders, 946 VO word orders with a nominal object, 351 OV word orders with a nominal object, 217 VO word orders with a pronominal object, and 277 OV word orders with a pronominal object. As regards unambivalent dependent clauses in the ASC E, there are 1,353 of them there. In these clauses, there are 249 XV2 word orders, 398 SV2 word orders, 150 VO word orders with a nominal object, 150 OV word orders with a nominal object, 33 VO word orders with a pronominal object, and 132 OV word orders with a pronominal object. As far as PH clauses are concerned, there are 110 of them in the ASC A and 481 in the ASC E. However, at the moment we are not going to discuss the number of the individual word orders that the different kinds of these clauses display because it is a more complicated matter and details will be given in the following chapters. Suffice it to say that, although the number of PH clauses in both manuscripts of the ASC is constant in our analysis, the number of the individual word order configurations changes depending on the approach to these clauses (i.e. paratactic or hypotactic). Therefore, for the time being we will leave the spaces provided for the individual word order configurations of the PH clauses empty. What is more, before general information about the number of the individual word order configurations of the PH clauses is given, we will discuss the different kinds of PH clauses one by one in the subsequent chapters.

Last but not least, the annotated corpus that we created for the investigation of para-hypotaxis can be said to be a representative one as it takes into account the entire texts of the two manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in question. Moreover, the application of a relatively simple annotation scheme not only assured consistency, but gave us the possibility to browse the corpus and obtain data of interest actually in no time at all and with a great deal of comfort.

Chapter 3

Static Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

In this chapter we will discuss different kinds of SIPH clauses in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (henceforth abbreviated as ASC). As a matter of fact, we already classified the SIPH clauses in the previous chapter and discussed them very briefly, but here we will discuss them in more detail and also provide examples for illustration, wherever possible. We chose the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* because it is said to have a higher tendency towards paratactic style[1] than other Old English documents, which fact increased the likelihood that there would also be a greater number of clauses whose status cannot easily be established, i.e. PH clauses. Indeed, we found quite many kinds of clauses in the ASC that are ambivalent (both SIPH and MIPH; the latter ones being discussed in Chapter 4), owing to which fact we were able to provide examples for the vast majority of them and thus obtain an almost complete picture of the phenomenon of para-hypotaxis on the basis of one Old English document, actually two of its manuscripts, namely the A manuscript and the E manuscript. We have chosen these two manuscripts and not other because the A manuscript, called the Parker Chronicle or the Winchester Chronicle, is the oldest one, whereas the E manuscript, called the Peterborough Chronicle or the Laud Manuscript, is the youngest one, and thus we thought that it would be more interesting to compare these manuscripts to see how they differ, or how they are similar, with respect to para-hypotaxis than to compare two randomly chosen manuscripts of the ASC.

We will start the discussion with the *PH-siph}[=x/[con** type of clauses and then we will move to their sequence variants.

[1] Cf. Baker (2003).

3.1. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses

The *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses are introduced by an explicit pronominal adverbial which is an ambivalent SIPH element and it is assigned the code *x/con** according to our annotation. In parataxis this SIPH element is treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial introducing a SIPH clause which is treated as a main clause then. In hypotaxis, on the other hand, the SIPH element is treated as a dependent clause connective introducing the same SIPH clause which is treated as a dependent clause then. Therefore, the status of the SIPH clause changes according to the status of the SIPH element in question, and vice versa. In the examples below, the explicit *x/con** SIPH element is ambivalent because on the one hand it seems to be introducing main clauses as an ordinary pronominal adverbial 'then', 'there', 'so', etc., and on the other hand it seems to be introducing dependent clauses as a dependent clause connective 'when', 'where', 'as', etc. Therefore, it needs to be approached from two different perspectives. Accordingly, the status of the SIPH clauses, at the beginning of which the *x/con** SIPH element occurs, is determined by the way one treats this element. We will first discuss SIPH clauses which are introduced by the SIPH element *þa*, which in parataxis will be treated as 'then' and in hypotaxis as 'when'[2].

As a matter of fact in the example below we do not know if we have to do with paratactic or hypotactic relation between the clauses introduced by the element *þa*:

> [125200 (1075.4)E]
> ***Þa*** *geaf se cyng his sunu þone eorldom on Norðfolc & Suðfolc,* ***þa*** *lædde he þæt wif to Norðwic…*
> '**Then** the king gave his son the earldom of Norfolk and Suffolk and he **then** led the bride to Norwich.'

We cannot be sure if the clause *Þa geaf se cyng his sunu þone eorldom on Norðfolc & Suðfolc* is dependent or main because the VS word order in this clause is the same as the word order in the clause *þa lædde he þæt wif to Norðwic…* . In paratactic relation between main clauses introduced by *þa* the sequence of events in time is usually reflected by the sequence of the clauses in space. This approach would mean that the first clause describes an event that took place earlier and the next one describes an event that took place later.

[2] Bosworth and Toller (1954) observe that *þa* may be translated as *then* when it finds itself at the beginning of a clause and the verb precedes its subject, whereas it may be translated as *when* when the subject precedes the verb. Moreover, Mitchell (1985) says that *þa* is an ambiguous adverb/conjunction, but it can also represent an intermediate stage between the two categories.

In hypotactic relation between such clauses the same sequence of events is also possible without a change in word order, provided that the first clause is dependent. So in the above example the clause starting with *Þa geaf se cyng*… would be a dependent clause in hypotaxis. If on the other hand we treated the second clause as dependent, the sequence of events would be reversed, which means that the second clause would describe an event that took place before the event described by the first clause. In the above example, however, we are most likely dealing with a sequence of events that is reflected by the sequence of the clauses, that is, the first clause describes an earlier event and the next clause describes a later event. The problem with written texts is that we do not have a direct access to the intonation patterns of the clauses and the word order does not always inform us about the kind of relations that exist between them. Intonation is important because it can give one the clue for deciding which clause is dependent and which clause is main in hypotactic relation. In parataxis, intonation is not that important and the clauses involved can be uttered with the same plain intonation pattern, as the sequence of events will usually be determined by the sequence of the clauses in space. Coming back to our example, in parataxis it will be encoded in the following way:

> [125200 (1075.4)E]
> ***Þa*** *geaf se cyng his sunu þone eorldom on Norðfolc & Suðfolc,* ***þa*** *lædde he þæt wif to Norðwic… .*
> P-siph+=+**x**+V+S+IO+DO+,+=+**x**+V+s+DO+X+,
> ‘**Then** the king gave his son the earldom of Norfolk and Suffolk; **then** he led the bride to Norwich… .’

As can be seen, in paratactic relation both clauses are treated as main and the two elements *þa* are treated as ordinary pronominal adverbials that can be translated as ‘then’. On the other hand, in hypotaxis the entry will be tagged as demonstrated below, and the element *Þa* in the clause *Þa geaf se cyng*… will have the status of ‘when’:

> [125200 (1075.4)E]
> ***Þa*** *geaf se cyng his sunu þone eorldom on Norðfolc & Suðfolc,* ***þa*** *lædde he þæt wif to Norðwic… .*
> H-siph+**con***+V+S+IO+DO+,+=+**x**+V+s+DO+X+,
> ‘**When** the king gave his son the earldom of Norfolk and Suffolk, **then** he led the bride to Norwich… .’

In our annotated corpus, therefore, the clause *þa geaf se cyng*… being an ambivalent SIPH clause is tagged as demonstrated below:

[125200 (1075.4)E]
Þa *geaf se cyng his sunu þone eorldom on Norðfolc & Suðfolc, þa lædde he þæt wif to Norðwic… .*
H-siph+(**con***)+V+S+IO+DO+,
PH-siph}[=x/[con*
P-siph+(=)+**x**+V+S+IO+DO+,

It can be observed that the SIPH element *þa* is treated as a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis (H-siph), whereas it is treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial in parataxis (P-siph). In similar contexts this fact will have an influence on the number of V2 word orders obtained for the main clauses because if we treat such *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses as main, apart from obtaining a larger total number of main clauses, we will also obtain a larger number of V2 word orders within the main clauses, because the SIPH element *þa* will be treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial and it will occupy the first position in the clauses, whereas the finite verb, which appears immediately after the element *þa*, will be in the second position.[3] On the other hand, if we treat such *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses as dependent, we will obtain a larger total number of dependent clause V1 word orders due to the fact that the SIPH element *þa* will then be treated as a dependent clause connective, whereas the total number of main clause V2 word orders will decrease accordingly.

In the context of *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses in which the SIPH element is *þa* we would also like to discuss clauses with VS word order which are preceded by clauses that probably could be treated as ambivalent but which we in fact decided not treat as such. Below we present three examples:

[018000 (633.4)E]
Þa *þet Paulinus geseah,* ***þa*** *genam Æðelburge Eadwines lafe &… .*
'**When** Paulinus saw that, **then** he took Ethelburga, the relic of Edwin and… .'

[3] Some scholars would rather be inclined to treat pronominal elements like adverbs, direct objects, indirect objects as clitic and would therefore disregard them in word order analysis. Nevertheless, in our analysis we treat such pronominal elements as ordinary syntactic elements in parataxis; cf. Van Kemenade (1987), Koopman (1991). Moreover, when in our analysis these pronominal adverbs (or pronominal subjects, pronominal direct and indirect objects) become dependent clause connectives in hypotaxis, we do not consider them as occupying the first position in V2 clauses. Therefore, the word orders of SIPH clauses, depending on the approach to them (paratactic or hypotactic), often differ in our analysis; the word orders differ in the initial SIPH clauses and not in the sequence SIPH clauses. However, if we considered them as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis, then the word orders of the PH clauses, depending on the approach to them (paratactic or hypotactic), would not differ in terms of the V2 phenomenon.

[022300 (656.21)E]
Đa *man halgode seo mynstre,* ***þa*** *wæs seo kyning Wulfere þær &… .*
'**When** they were hallowing the minster, **then** there was the king Wulfere… .'

[030000 (675.43)E]
Đa *hi wæron þær gegaderod,* ***þa*** *leot he rædon þa gewrite*
'**When** they were gathered there, **then** he ordered that the writ be read… .'

According to Mitchell (1985: §3900), the early annals of the *Chronicle* display the three basic Old English element orders in characteristic positions:

1. SV in a principal clause
2. S…V
   a) after *ond*
   b) in a subordinate clause
3. VS after an adverb

However, he also claims that the division into the three basic word orders is not as simple as that because it is sometimes difficult to decide which order we have and, moreover, each of the three orders can appear in each of the four situations distinguished above. He observes that it is difficult to establish the status of certain clauses, especially when they are introduced by an ambiguous adverb/conjunction; the ambiguous elements that he has in mind are, among others, *þær*, *þa* and *þonne*. Mitchell also notes that the place of the verb in the clause is not very informative in context of "solving the problem of the ambiguous principal/subordinate clauses" (§3944). He, moreover, observes that "the variety of orders displayed provides a salutary warning against the dangers of relying on element order to decide whether a particular clause is principal or subordinate, and in my opinion is something approaching proof that the intonation patterns of OE must have differed from those of MnE" (§3894). Coming back to the three examples provided above, we decided not to consider them in terms of ambivalence because of the fact that they follow a certain word order regularity, whereby the main clauses have VS word order and the dependent clauses are SV or V-final. In our opinion this recurring word order regularity would rather be in favour of hypotactic relations between the clauses involved. Such a word order regularity could testify to the fact that some kind of a dependency between two given sentences was developing, and the more frequently this regular pattern appeared, the stronger the dependency between the two clauses was probably actualising. However, we do not have a direct access to the intonation patterns which would help us in determining whether

the clauses are in hypotactic or paratactic relation to each other. For the time being, we are more inclined to treat them as being in hypotactic relation until we investigate this problem more thoroughly.

And now we will move to another type of ambivalent *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses. This time instead of the SIPH element *þa* we will deal with the SIPH element *þær*. Below we present two examples:

[011600 (565.2)E]
…& heora cyning him gesealde þet egland þe man nemnad Ii, ***þær*** *sindon V hida ðæs þe men cweðaþ.*
H-siph+(**con***)+V+S+X+,
PH-siph}[=x/[con*
P-siph+(=)+**x**+V+S+X+,
H-siph 'And their king gave him the so called island of Hii, **where** there are five hides (i.e. which consists of five hides), as they say.'
P-siph 'And their king gave him the so called island of Hii; **there** there are five hides (i.e. it consists of five hides), as they say.'

[016000 (616.14)E]
…& he gehalgode to Hrofeceastre Romanum ***þær*** *he ær wæs biscop.*
H-siph+(**con***)+s+X+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=x/[con*,
P-siph+(=)+**x**+s+X+V+X+,
H-siph '…and he consecrated Romanus to Rochester, **where** he himself was bishop earlier on.'
P-siph '…and he consecrated Romanus to Rochester; **there** he himself was bishop earlier on.'

In the two examples the SIPH element *þer* can be treatead either as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause as 'where' in hypotaxis, or as an ordinary pronominal adverbial introducing a main clause as 'there' in parataxis. The problem with the SIPH element *þer*, as was the case with the SIPH element *þa*, is that in Old English it had the same form when it functioned both as an ordinary adverbial in parataxis and as a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. If it had a reduced phonetic form, or a different form, as a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis, then there would probably be no problem with approaching it from the hypotactic point of view.

And finally we present an example of *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses in which the SIPH element is *swa*:

[000600 (0.12)E]
…& geferdon þis land norþanweard, & suþanweard hit hefdon Brittas ***swa*** *we ær cwedon.*
H-siph+(**con***)+s+X+V+,
PH-siph}[=x/[con*,
P-siph+(=)+**x**+s+X+V+,
H-siph '…and entered this land northward. Southward the Britons possessed it, **as** we before said.'
P-siph '…and entered this land northward. Southward the Britons possessed it; **so** we before said.'

The PH element *swa* in parataxis will be treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial 'so', and the PH clause, treated as main, will obtain an additional element *x* in the initial position, whereas in hypotaxis it will be treated as a dependent clause connective 'as' and the same PH clause, treated as dependent, will lose an additional element *x* in the initial position.

Now we will discuss *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses that find themselves in PH sequences. A PH sequence is the coexistence of two or more PH clauses placed next to each/one another. We will first concentrate upon *PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con** clauses and then upon *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** ones.

3.1.1. *PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con** clauses

A *PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con** clause is an ordinary *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clause which occurs in a PH sequence and is not the initial clause in this sequence. This clause is introduced by an explicit *x/con** SIPH element immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction (usually *and*). In the example below the SIPH element is *þær* and it is preceded by the coordinating conjunction *and*:[4]

[4] As a matter of fact, the explicit *x/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit clause, namely *Ðis wæs gedon on Eoferwic*, which is immediately preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*. Therefore, it is the implicit clause that is immediately preceded by the coordinating conjunction and not the SIPH element in question. In other words, the explicit *x/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by a coordinating conjunction followed by an implicit clause. Nevertheless, when in the discussion of sequence SIPH clauses we say that a given explicit/implicit SIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction, or by an implicit clause, what we mean is that it is immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction followed by an implicit clause; it does not refer to the situation when the use of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction is blocked, in which case the existence of an implicit clause preceding the SIPH element is out of the question.

[016900 (626.11)E]
Ðis wæs gedon on Eoferwic ***þær*** *he ær het getimbrian cyrican of treowe,* ***seo*** *wæs gehalgod on Sancte Petres naman;* ***þær*** *se cining sealde Pauline biscopsetl,* ***& þær*** *he het eft timbrian maran cyrican of stane.*
H-siph+(**con***)+s+V+X+inf+DO+,
Seq PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con*,
P-siph+(=)+**x**+s+V+X+inf+DO+,
H-siph 'This was done at York, **where** he had ordered a church to be built of timber, **which** was hallowed in the name of St. Peter, **where** the king gave the bishopric to Paulinus **and where** he afterwards ordered a larger church to be built of stone.'
P-siph 'This was done at York; **there** he had ordered a church to be built of timber; **it** was hallowed in the name of St. Peter; **there** the king gave the bishopric to Paulinus; **and there** he afterwards ordered a larger church to be built of stone.'

In this example, the PH clause *þær he ær het getimbrian cyrican of treowe* is the initial clause introducing a sequence of PH clauses (a PH sequence) and therefore it cannot be a *PH-siph}[cj=x/[cj=con** clause. Here we are concerned with the last PH clause preceded by the coordinating conjunction *and*, namely *& þær he het eft timbrian maran cyrican of stane*. Since the first PH element *þær* introduces a PH clause, the following two PH elements *þær* can probably also be regarded as ambivalent because they also have a shade of dependent clause connectives in a PH sequence as they refer back to the noun *Eoferwic* 'York', just like the first PH element *þær*. In this sense if we treat the clause *þær he ær het getimbrian cyrican of treowe* as ambivalent, the subsequent PH clauses, namely *seo wæs gehalgod on Sancte Petres naman* and *þær se cining sealde Pauline biscopsetl*, as well as *þær he het eft timbrian maran cyrican of stane*, should probably also be treated as ambivalent.

3.1.2. *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** clauses

A *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** clause is an ordinary *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clause which finds itself in a PH sequence and it is not the initial clause in this sequence. It is introduced by an explicit *x/con** SIPH element which in parataxis will be treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial, whereas in hypotaxis as a dependent clause connective. Moreover, this SIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit (invisible) coordinating conjunction (usually *and*),

whose position is sometimes blocked. Below are some examples for illustration. In the first example the *x/con** SIPH element is represented by the pronominal adverbial *þær* which is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. The SIPH element introduces a SIPH clause that finds itself in a PH sequence in which the initial PH clause is introduced by the SIPH element *se*, whereas the immediately preceding PH clause is introduced by the SIPH element *þæs*:

> [012100 (565.8)E]
> *Suðpyhtas wæron mycle ær gefullode: heom bodade fulwiht Nimia biscop,* ***se*** *wæs on Rome gelæred,* ***þæs*** *cyrice & his mynster is æt Hwiterne on Martines naman gehalgod;* ***þær*** *he restað mid manegum halgum wærum.*
> H-siph+(**con***)+s+V+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con*
> P-siph+(=)+**x**+s+V+X+,
> H-siph 'The Southern Picts were long before baptized by Bishop Ninnia, **who** was taught at Rome, **whose** church or monastery is at Hwiterne, hallowed in the name of St. Martin, **where** he resteth with many holy men.'
> P-siph 'The Southern Picts were long before baptized by Bishop Ninnia; **he** was taught at Rome; **his** church or monastery is at Hwiterne, hallowed in the name of St. Martin; **there** he resteth with many holy men.'

As can be seen, the initial PH clause of a PH sequence does not need to be the immediately preceding one, as it can be separated from the *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** by other PH clauses. Moreover, an ideal *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** clause would be the one whose *x/con** PH element were identical with that of the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding, PH clause and both referred back to the same antecedent, or at least whose *x/con** PH element referred to the same antecedent as the PH element of the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clause, without being identical with the PH element of the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding, PH clause. In this sense the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction would not be blocked. In the above example, however, since both the immediately preceding and the initial PH clause are introduced by PH elements with a different antecedent (i.e. *Nimia biscop*) than that of the *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** clause in question (i.e. *cyrice & mynster æt Hwiterne*) the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction before *þær* is blocked. Nevertheless, we treat the PH clause in question as a sequence PH clause.

Whenever the position of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of implicit clause together with it, before a given explicit/implicit PH element is blocked, we are dealing with some kind of *para-hypotaxis under para-hypotaxis* and we could call this phenomenon *sub-parahypotaxis* or *sub-PH-taxis* for short. However, whenever this position is not blocked, we are dealing with some kind of *para-hypotaxis at para-hypotaxis* and we could call this phenomenon *ad-parahypotaxis* or *ad-PH-taxis*. Ideal sequence PH clauses would therefore be the ones belonging to *ad-PH-taxis*, as clauses belonging to *sub-PH-taxis* basically behave like initial PH clauses, in which the position of the explicit/implicit PH element is never immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction. However, in our analysis we need to treat clauses belonging to *sub-PH-taxis* as sequence PH clauses in order to avoid counting the same word order configurations twice. We discuss the problem in more detail later on.

As an example of an ideal situation we will take the following entry in which, unlike in the previous example, the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction is not blocked:

> [016900 (626.11)E]
> *Ðis wæs gedon on Eoferwic* ***þær*** *he ær het getimbrian cyrican of treowe,* ***seo*** *wæs gehalgod on Sancte Petres naman;* ***þær*** *se cining sealde Pauline biscopsetl,… .*
> H-siph+(**con***)+S+V+IO+DO+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con*
> P-siph+(=)+**x**+S+V+IO+DO+,
> H-siph ‘This was done at York, **where** he had ordered a church to be built of timber, **which** was hallowed in the name of St. Peter, **(and) where** the king gave the bishopric to Paulinus… .’
> P-siph ‘This was done at York; **there** he had ordered a church to be built of timber; **it** was hallowed in the name of St. Peter; **(and) there** the king gave the bishopric to Paulinus… .’

In this example, the initial PH clause, namely *þær he ær het getimbrian cyrican of treowe*, is introduced by the SIPH element *þær*, the second PH clause, namely *seo wæs gehalgod on Sancte Petres naman*, is introduced by the SIPH element *seo*, and finally the *PH-siph}[0=x/[0=con** clause in question, namely *þær se cining sealde Pauline biscopsetl*, is introduced by the SIPH element *þær* which is preceded by the implicit coordinating conjunction *and* and which at the same time is a continuation of the SIPH element *þær* introducing the initial clause of the PH sequence. The SIPH element *þær* of the PH clause in question can be preceded by a coordinating conjunction, in this case the implicit *and*, because it is identical with the SIPH element *þær* of the initial PH clause

and, what is more important, both of them refer back to the same antecedent, namely *Eoferwic* 'York'.

And now we will move to the ambivalence corridor that we obtained for the ASC *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants. A corridor of ambivalence is the maximum span of ambivalence offered by PH clauses taken together. At the one extreme of this corridor are all PH clauses treated as main, whereas at the other extreme of this corridor are the same PH clauses treated as dependent. In other words, an ambivalence corridor is the maximum range of ambivalence that PH clauses can achieve when they are approached from the paratactic and the hypotactic points of view. The establishing of the ambivalence corridor is a correcting technique for the results obtained in the analysis of word order configurations and making them more objective. It is necessary to employ this technique while dealing with ambivalent PH clauses because what results we are going to obtain in the analysis of word order depends upon the way we approach such clauses, i.e. different results will be obtained in the paratactic approach, and different results will be obtained in the hypotactic approach. Therefore, while dealing with PH clauses, the establishing of the ambivalence corridor they offer will matter as far as the total number of dependent and main clauses are concerned, because the proportion of dependent clauses to main clauses will change according to whether we approach ambivalent PH clauses from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view. Moreover, in the paratactic approach, all the word orders found in these clauses will be classified as main clause word orders, whereas, in the hypotactic approach, all the word orders found in these clauses will be classified as dependent clause word orders.

In the two following sections we provide (in a form of tables) the ambivalence corridor that we obtained for the ASC A and the ASC E *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants; we put the data obtained for *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses together with the data obtained for their sequence variants in order to avoid the creation of unnecessary additional tables.

3.1.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

In Table 3.1 we present the total number of ambivalent *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses together with their sequence variants obtained for the ASC A:

Table 3.1. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X*		22	X + 22	Y**		22	Y + 22	X + Y + 22
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	4		V2	XV2 clauses	1		
	SV2 clauses	10			SV2 clauses	12		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		1		oV word order		1		

* X = 1,478 in the ASC A, whereas X = 4,190 in the ASC E. We will use numbers, instead, in Chapter 6. For the time being we will use the symbol X because we concentrate exclusively on PH clauses.

** Y = 303 in the ASC A, whereas Y = 1,353 in the ASC E. We will use numbers, instead, in Chapter 6. For the time being we will use the symbol Y because we concentrate exclusively on PH clauses.

The total number of the ASC A *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants amounts to 22. If we treat all of them as main, we gain 22 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Within these clauses we obtain additional 14 V2 word orders for the main clauses. Out of the 14 V2 word orders 4 are XV2 and 10 are SV2. Moreover, in the main clauses we obtain 1 additional OV word order in which the object is pronominal. On the other hand, if we approach all of these clauses from the hypotactic point of view, we gain 22 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Within the 22 clauses we then obtain 13 additional V2 word orders, out of which 1 is XV2 and 12 are SV2. Moreover, we obtain 1 additional OV word order configuration with a pronominal object in the dependent clauses of the ASC A.

It needs to be noted that it is possible to obtain such data provided that we treat all of the *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants either as main or dependent. In this way it is possible to see the full range of the ambivalence corridor. Nevertheless, it might be the case that the users analysing them will consider only some of them as main and the rest will be treated as dependent. In this case the data obtained in the analysis of the PH clauses would be different. Also other authors of annotated corpora taking into account PH clauses might discover more, or fewer, ambivalent PH clauses and, as a direct result of this, the maximum span of the ambivalence corridor would differ from the one suggested by us. Moreover, the maximum span of the ambivalence corridor, which allows to see that the extent of ambivalence in a given language can also be determined by the kind of language or by the phase in which a given language being under analysis finds itself.

3.1.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

As regards the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E, we obtained the following ambivalence corridor for them:

Table 3.2. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		60	X + 60	Y		60	Y + 60	X + Y + 60
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	15		V2	XV2 clauses	6		
	SV2 clauses	6			SV2 clauses	25		
VO word order		6		VO word order		6		
Vo word order		1		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		2		OV word order		2		
oV word order		8		oV word order		8		

In the ASC E we found 60 ambivalent *PH-siph}[=x/[con** clauses and their sequence variants. If we treat all of them as main, we obtain 60 additional main clauses in the ASC E. Within these clauses are 21 additional V2 word orders for the total number of the main clause V2 word orders of the ASC E. Out of the additional 21 V2 word orders 15 are XV2, whereas 6 are SV2. Moreover, we obtain 7 additional VO word orders. In these VO word orders, 6 objects are nominal and 1 is pronominal. We also obtain 10 additional OV word orders in which 2 objects are nominal and 8 are pronominal. On the other hand, if we treat all the ambivalent PH clauses in question as dependent, we obtain 60 additional dependent clauses for the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. Within these clauses we obtain 31 additional V2 word orders for the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders. Out of the additional 31 V2 word orders 6 are XV2 and 25 are SV2. Moreover, we obtain 6 additional VO word order configurations with a nominal object and 10 additional OV word order configurations within which 2 objects are nominal and 8 objects are pronominal.

And now we will move on to the discussion of *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants.

3.2. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses

*PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses are introduced by an explicit *s/con** SIPH element which is treated as an ordinary pronominal subject introducing a main clause in parataxis, whereas it is treated as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause in hypotaxis. We will start the discussion with some examples with the *s/con** SIPH element *se* in which it is difficult to establish whether this *s/con** SIPH element is just an ordinary pronominal subject introducing a main clause or a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause, because of the distance between this SIPH element and the noun to which it refers back. It needs to be noted that in the annotation patterns accompanying these clauses there is an additional *s* element when they are approached from the paratactic point of view:

[035000 (716.1)E]
Her Osred Norðanhymbra cininga wærð ofslagen be suðan gemære, ***se*** *hæfde VII winter æfter Ealdferþe;*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
H-siph 'This year Osred, king of the Northumbrians, was slain near the southern borders, **who** reigned seven winters after Ealdferth.'
P-siph 'This year Osred, king of the Northumbrians, was slain near the southern borders; **he** reigned seven winters after Ealdferth.'

[019600 (643.1)E]
Her forðferde Paulinus ærcebiscop on Rofesceastre VI idus Octobris; ***se*** *wæs biscop an læs XX wintra & II monðas & XXI daga.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+
H-siph 'This year died at Rochester archbishop Paulinus on the tenth of October, **who** was bishop nineteen winters, two months, and one and twenty days.'
P-siph 'This year died at Rochester archbishop Paulinus on the tenth of October; **he** was bishop nineteen winters, two months, and one and twenty days.'

Although in an inflected language it is not a problem for the dependent clause connective to be separated from its antecedent, as in the two examples quoted above, we think that the larger the distance, the smaller the chances for

it to be treated as a dependent clause connective, all the more if its spelling and pronunciation is the same as that of the demonstrative pronoun from which it originates. Below we provide two examples where the *s/con** SIPH element *se* immediately follows its antecedent:

[049500 (896.56)A]
Þy ilcan gere forðferde Wulfric cynges horsðegn, ***se*** *wæs eac wealhgefera.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
H-siph 'Wulfric, the king's hors-thane, **who** was also viceroy of Wales, died the same year.'[5]
P-siph 'Wulfric, the king's hors-thane, died the same year; **he** was also viceroy of Wales.'

[031500 (678.2)E]
…& man gehalgode Lindiswarum to biscope Eadhed ***se*** *wæs on Lindissi ærost biscopa.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
H-siph '…and Eadhed was consecrated bishop over the people of Lindsey, **who** was the first bishop on Lindsey.'
P-siph '…and Eadhed was consecrated bishop over the people of Lindsey; **he** was the first bishop on Lindsey.'

If it is possible for the *s/con** SIPH element *se* to be treated as a demonstrative pronoun when it is far away from its antecedent, then it should theoretically be no problem to treat it as a demonstrative pronoun when it occurs in the immediate proximity to its antecedent. Analogically, if it is possible for the *s/con** SIPH element *se* to be treated as a dependent clause connective when it is far away from its antecedent, then it should be no problem to treat it as a dependent clause connective when it is in the immediate proximity with respect to its antecedent. Therefore, its status remains ambivalent and we are inclined to treat the clauses introduced by the element *se* as ambivalent SIPH clauses, especially if their word order is that of main clauses. Additionally, in the case of *se* it is quite difficult to draw a clear dividing line between what is a demonstrative pronoun and what is a dependent clause connective because both have the same form. However, we can say that the difference between *se* as a dependent clause connective and *se* as an ordinary pronominal subject consists

[5] The translation was taken from Ford (2005).

in that the dependent clause connective *se* is a more abstract (less expressive) form of the demonstrative pronoun *se*; there is a similar relation between the personal pronoun *he* and the dependent clause connective *se*, because the personal pronoun, like the demonstrative pronoun, is more expressive. We illustrate the problem below:

> [039600 (885.14)A]
> *Þy ilcan geare ær middum wintra forþferde Carl Francna cyning, & hiene ofslog an efor, & ane geare ær his broður forþferde,* ***se*** *hæfde eac þæt westrice, & hie wæron begen Hloþwiges suna,* ***se*** *hæfde eac þæt westrice & forþferde þy geare þe sio sunne aþiestrode;* ***se*** *wæs Karles sunu þe Eþelwulf Westseaxna cyning his dohtor hæfde him to cuene.*
> 'The same year, ere midwinter, died Charles, king of the Franks. He was slain by a boar; and one year before his brother died, who had also the Western kingdom. They were both the sons of Louis, who also had the Western kingdom, and died the same year that the sun was eclipsed. He was the son of that Charles whose daughter Ethelwulf, king of the West-Saxons, had to wife.'[6]

In this example the element *se* is mentioned three times. Whereas the first and the second *se* seem to be introducing dependent clauses, the third *se* is most likely a demonstrative pronoun due to the large distance between this element and its antecedent and it behaves more or less like the personal pronoun *he* in the following example:

> [005700 (381.1)A]
> *Her Maximianus se casere feng to rice —* ***he*** *wæs on Bretenlonde geboren — & þonne for in <Gallia> & he ðar ofsloh ðone casere Gratianum… .*
> 'This year Maximus the Caesar came to the empire. He was born in the land of Britain, whence he passed over into Gaul. He there slew the Emperor Gratian… .'

However, while the status of the pronoun *he* is unambivalent (because it was never used as a dependent clause connective in Old English), it is sometimes difficult to establish the status of the element *se*. Therefore, since the status of the clauses introduced by the SIPH element *se* is ambivalent, we need to tag them in two ways in order to be able to analyse them both from the point of view of parataxis and from the point of view of hypotaxis, and then compare the results.

---

[6] The translation was taken from Ford (2005).

Below we present other *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses, which this time are introduced by the SIPH elements *seo* and *þa*. These clauses, however, are not as frequent in the ASC as the ones introduced by the SIPH element *se*:

[176910 (1121.11)E]
& his dohter let feccean, ***seo*** *wæs Willelme þes cynges sune æror to wife forgyfan.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+IO+X+papt+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+IO+X+papt+,
H-siph '…and sent to fetch his daughter, **who** had been given to wife to William, the king's son.'
P-siph '…and sent to fetch his daughter; **she** had been given to wife to William, the king's son.'

[016500 (640.3)A]
Ermenred gestrynde twegen sunu, ***þa*** *syððan wurðan gemartirode of Ðunore.*
H-siph+(con*)+X+V+papt+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+X+V+papt+X+,
H-siph 'Ermenred begat two sons, **who** were afterwards martyred by Thunnor.'
P-siph 'Ermenred begat two sons; **they** were afterwards martyred by Thunnor.'

[014800 (605.4)E]
Þær man sloh eac CC preosta ***þa*** *comon ðider þet heo scoldan gebiddan for Walana here.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=s/[con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
H-siph 'There were also slain two hundred priests, **who** came thither to pray for the army of the Welsh.'
P-siph 'There were also slain two hundred priests; **they** came thither to pray for the army of the Welsh.

We will leave the clauses without comment, as the observations that we made about the clauses introduced by the SIPH element *se* can apply here too. However, we would like to devote more attention to *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses with the SIPH element *þet*, because they are very frequent in the ASC, as was the case with the clauses introduced by the SIPH element *se*. The SIPH element

þet has the same form both when it functions as a demonstrative pronoun and as a dependent clause connective. Because of this fact it is often difficult to say which of the two functions it has in a given context. Below we present two examples:

> [008800 (449.17)E]
> *Heora heretogan wæron twegen gebroðra Hengest & Horsa,* ***þet*** *wæron Wihtgilses suna.*
> H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
> PH-siph}[=s/[con*
> P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
> H-siph 'Their leaders were two brothers, Hengest and Horsa, **who** were the sons of Wihtgils.'
> P-siph 'Their leaders were two brothers, Hengest and Horsa; **they** were the sons of Wihtgils.'

> [080900 (1007.1)E]
> *Her on ðissum geare wæs þet gafol gelæst þam unfriðehere,* ***þet*** *wæs XXX þusend punda.*
> H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
> PH-siph}[=s/[con*
> P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
> H-siph 'In this year was the tribute paid to the hostile army, **that** was 30.000 pounds.'
> P-siph 'In this year was the tribute paid to the hostile army; **it** was 30.000 pounds.'

Moreover, we include the clauses introduced by the PH element *þet* into the *PH-siph}[=s/[con** type of clauses because the element *þet* can usually be used interchangeably with the neuter personal pronoun *hit* functioning as a pronominal subject. However, whereas *hit* is unambivalent, *þet* is not. Below we present an entry in which both *hit* and *þet* appear:

> [120900 (1070.19)E]
> *Þa comen hi þurh fyre in æt Bolhiðe geate, & þa munecas comen heom togeanes, beaden heom grið; ac hi na rohten na þing, geodon into þe mynstre, clumben upp to þe halge rode, namen þa þe kynehelm of ure Drihtnes heafod eall of smeate golde, namen þa þet fotspure þe wæs undernæðen his fote,* ***þet*** *wæs eall of read golde, clumben upp to þe stepel, brohton dune þet hæcce þe þær wæs behid,* ***hit*** *wæs eall of gold & of seolfre.*

‘Then came they in through fire at the Bull-hithe gate; where the monks met them, and besought peace of them. But they regarded nothing. They went into the minster, climbed up to the holy rood, took away the diadem from our Lord’s head, all of pure gold, and seized the bracket that was underneath his feet, **which** was all of red gold. They climbed up to the steeple, brought down the table that was hid there; **it** was all of gold and silver.’

In this entry, *þet* and *hit* appear in similar contexts, but whereas *þet* can be taken both for a dependent clause connective and for an ordinary demonstrative pronoun, the element *hit* can only be taken for an ordinary personal pronoun because personal pronouns did not function as dependent clause connectives in Old English.

We will now move to the discussion of *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses which form part of PH sequences and are not the initial clauses in these sequences. We distinguish two types of such sequence PH clauses. The first type are *PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** sequence clauses.

3.2.1. *PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** clauses

These clauses are introduced by an explicit *s/con** SIPH element which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. In the entry below, the *PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** clause is introduced by the explicit SIPH element *þet* which is immediately preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*:

[174400 (1118.14)E]
Eac on þison geare to Sancte Thomas mæsse wæs swa swiðe ungemetlice mycel wind ***þet*** *nan man þe þa lifode* ***nænne maran*** *ne gemunde,* ***& þet*** *wæs æghwer geseone, ægðer ge on husan & eac on treowan.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+X+papt+X+,
Seq PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con*
P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+papt+X+,
H-siph ‘In this year also, on the feast of St. Thomas, was so very immoderately violent a wind, **that** no man who was then living ever remembered any greater **and that** was everywhere seen both in houses and also in trees.’
P-siph ‘In this year also, on the feast of St. Thomas, was so very immoderately violent a wind; **that** no man who was then living ever

remembered any greater; **and it/that** was everywhere seen both in houses and also in trees.'

In this entry the SIPH element *þet* has the status of the demonstrative pronoun 'that' (or of the personal pronoun 'it') in parataxis, whereas in hypotaxis it has the status of the dependent clause connective 'that'. It appears twice here. The first *þet* is an ambivalent *do/con** SIPH element[7] introducing the initial *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clause in a PH sequence, namely *þet nan man þe þa lifode nænne maran ne gemunde*; however, it should most likely be treated as a dependent clause connective here because its function as an ordinary pronominal direct object (while in parataxis) is blocked by the direct object *nænne maran*, and it is sort of unusual for a properly built clause to have two direct objects; therefore the initial PH clause is problematic. As regards the second *þet*, it introduces the sequence *PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** clause, namely *& þet wæs æghwer geseone, ægðer ge on husan & eac on treowan*, and it can be considered either from the paratactic or the hypotactic point of view. If we look at it from the paratactic point of view, we will obtain a main clause beginning with an ordinary pronominal subject preceded by the coordinating conjunction *and*. In this situation the initial SIPH clause, supposing it is ambivalent too, will also be treated as a main clause and the coordinating conjunction before the second SIPH clause continues the non-dependency. Looked at from the hypotactic point of view, the sequence SIPH clause functions as a dependent clause in a PH sequence. In this situation the initial SIPH clause is also treated as a dependent clause and the coordinating conjunction before the sequence SIPH clause continues the dependency. We will now move on to the discussion of the second type of sequence PH clauses, namely *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con**.

3.2.2. *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** clauses

These clauses are introduced by an explicit *s/con** SIPH element which is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction; however, the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction is sometimes blocked altogether. While we found only one example of *PH-siph}[cj=s/[cj=con** clauses, which in fact is an imperfect one because of the problematic initial PH clause, we found a number of *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** clauses in the ASC. Ideally, a *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** is introduced by the same *s/con** SIPH element that introduces

[7] We will discuss *do/con** SIPH elements under the section devoted to *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses.

the initial, the immediately preceding, or any intermediate PH clause in a PH sequence and both have the same antecedent. In this situation the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction is not blocked. We found a few examples of such a situation. Below is one of them:

> [060310 (885.13)E]
> *…& ane geare ær his broðor forðferde — **se** heafde eac þet westrice — **se** forðferde þy geare þe seo sunne aðystrode;*
> H-siph+(con*)+V+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con*
> P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+,
> H-siph '…and one year before his brother died, **who** had also the Western kingdom, **(and) who** died the same year that the sun was eclipsed.'
> P-siph '…and one year before his brother died; **he** had also the Western kingdom; **(and) he** died the same year that the sun was eclipsed.'

In the above example the element *se* is the *s/con** SIPH element of both the initial PH clause, namely *se heafde eac þet westrice*, and the *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** sequence PH clause, namely *se forðferde þy geare þe seo sunne aðystrode*. In parataxis it has the status of the personal pronoun 'he' and in hypotaxis it has the status of the dependent clause connective 'who'. In another example both the initial SIPH clause, namely *þæt is ute on þære sæ*, and the *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** sequence PH clause, namely *þæt is Meresig haten*, are introduced by the same *s/con** SIPH element *þæt*:

> [046200 (894.5)A]
> *…hie comon on Eastseaxna lond easteweard on an igland **þæt** is ute on þære sæ, **þæt** is Meresig haten.*
> H-siph+(*)+V+X+papt+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con*
> P-siph+(=)+s+V+X+papt+,
> H-siph '…they came into Essex eastward, on an island **that** is out at sea, **that** is called Mersey.'
> P-siph '…they came into Essex eastward, on an island; **it** is out at sea; **it** is called Mersey.'

In this example the *s/con** SIPH element *þæt*, both in the initial PH clause and in the sequence PH clause, in parataxis has the status of the personal pronoun 'it' and in hypotaxis it has the status of the dependent clause connective 'that'.

According to our observations, the majority of *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** clauses are not that ideal because they are introduced by other PH elements

than the ones introducing in the initial, intermediate, or immediately preceding PH clauses in PH sequences and moreover the PH elements have different antecedents. Below we provide an example of such a situation:

> [017200 (627.1)E]
> *Her wes Eadwine cining gefullod fram Pauline, & eac þes Paulinus bodad fulluht on Lindisse* ***þær*** *gelifde ærest sum rice man mid ealre his duguðe,* ***se*** *wæs gehaten Blecca.*
> H-siph+(con*)+V+papt+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con*
> P-siph+(=)+s+V+papt+X+,
> H-siph 'This year was King Edwin baptised by Paulinus, and this Paulinus also preached baptism in Lindsey, **where** the first person who believed with all his people was a certain rich man, **who** was called Bleek.'
> P-siph 'This year was King Edwin baptised by Paulinus, and this Paulinus also preached baptism in Lindsey; the first person who believed **there** with all his people was a certain rich man; **he** was called Bleek.'

As can be noticed, the initial PH clause, namely *þær gelifde ærest sum rice man mid ealre his duguðe*, is introduced by *þær*, which is in fact an *x/con** SIPH element and not the same *s/con** PH element that introduces the *PH-siph}[0=s/[0=con** sequence clause in question, namely *se wæs gehaten Blecca*. More importantly, the *s/con** SIPH element of the sequence PH clause and the *x/con** SIPH element of the initial PH clause have different antecedents and therefore the position of the immediately preceding coordinating conjunction is blocked.

We will now move on to the discussion of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses together with their sequence variants.

3.2.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

As regards the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants, we obtained the following ambivalence corridor for the ASC A:

Table 3.3. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		33	X + 33	Y		33	Y + 33	X + Y + 33
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	2		
	SV2 clauses	30			SV2 clauses	0		
VO word order		4		VO word order		4		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		1		OV word order		1		
oV word order		0		oV word order		0		

In the ASC A we found 33 ambivalent *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses together with their sequence variants. If we analyse them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 33 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Within these clauses there are 30 additional V2 word orders for the total number of the main clause V2 word orders of the ASC A. All of these V2 word orders are SV2. As far as the position of the finite verb with respect to the object is concerned, in the total number of the VO and OV word orders obtained for the ASC A main clauses, there are 4 additional VO word orders with nominal objects and only 1 additional OV word order in which the object is also nominal. We did not find any VO or OV word orders in which the object is pronominal. On the other hand, in the hypotactic approach to the ambivalent PH clauses in question we gain 33 additional dependent clauses for the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Moreover, for the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders of the ASC A we obtain 2 additional V2 word orders, all of which are XV2. As regards the position of the finite verb with respect to the object, in the total number of the dependent clause VO and OV word order configurations we obtain 4 additional VO word orders with a nominal object and 1 additional OV word order in which the object is also nominal. We did not find any VO or OV word orders in which the object is pronominal.

3.2.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

As regards the ASC E *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants, we obtained the following ambivalence corridor for them:

Table 3.4. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		150	X + 150	Y		33	Y + 150	X + Y + 150
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	7		
	SV2 clauses	141			SV2 clauses	0		
VO word order		6		VO word order		6		
Vo word order		1		Vo word order		1		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		2		oV word order		2		

We obtained 150 *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses, including their sequence variants, in the ASC E. If we analyse them from the paratactic point of view, we gain 150 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Within these clauses we obtain 141 additional V2 word orders, all of which are SV2, for the total number of the main clause V2 word orders of the ASC E. As regards the position of the finite verb with respect to the object, there are 7 additional VO word order configurations. In 6 of them the object is nominal, and in 1 of them the object is pronominal. Moreover, there are 2 additional OV word order configurations in which the object is pronominal. On the other hand, if we approach the SIPH clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, there are 150 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the dependent clauses of the ASC E. In these 150 additional clauses we obtain 7 V2 word orders, all of which are XV2. Moreover, in the total number of the VO and OV dependent clause word orders of the ASC E we obtain 7 additional VO word orders and 2 additional OV ones. In the VO word orders 6 objects are nominal and 1 is pronominal, whereas in the OV word orders 2 objects are pronominal and no objects are nominal.

It should be remembered that such data will be obtained for the ASC A and for the ASC E only if we go to both of the extremes, namely if we analyse all of the ambivalent clauses in question from the paratactic point of view, on the one hand, and from the hypotactic point of view, on the other; in this way

we establish the boundaries of the ambivalence corridor. Therefore, we do not consider situations in which only part of the ambivalent PH clauses are approached from the paratactic point of view and the rest of them from the hypotactic one.

And now we will move on to the discussion of another type of SIPH clauses, namely *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses and their sequence variants.

3.3. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses

*PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses are introduced by an explicit *io/con** SIPH element. In parataxis, this element functions as an ordinary pronominal indirect object and it introduces a main clause, while in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause. Moreover, when a *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clause changes its status, this fact is immediately reflected in the annotation, namely in parataxis the main clause gains a pronominal indirect object at the beginning and, at the same time, an additional OV word order with a pronominal indirect object is created for the total number of main clause OV word orders, whereas in hypotaxis this pronominal object changes into a dependent clause connective and the total number of main clauses lose an additional OV word order configuration with a pronominal object.

We will now discuss some examples of *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses, all of which are about the use of the demonstrative pronoun *þæm*. In parataxis the SIPH element *þæm* is interpreted as the dative personal pronoun 'him', while in hypotaxis it is interpreted as the relative pronoun 'whom'. It was not the case with *PH-siph}[=x/[con** and *PH-siph}[=s/[con** clauses, we did not find many examples of this type of clauses: but the ones that we found could probably be approached either from the paratactic or from the hypotactic point of view. In the following examples we consider the element *þam* as ambivalent because it is quite far away from its antecedent:

> [045700 (794.5)E]
> *& Eadbriht onfeng rice on Cent,* ***þam*** *wæs oðer nama nemned Præn.*
> H-siph+(con*)+V+S+papt+X+,
> PH-siph}[=io/[con*
> P-siph+(=)+io+V+S+papt+X+,
> H-siph 'And Eadbert, **whom** (i.e. whose) other name was Pryn, obtained the kingdom of Kent.'
> P-siph 'And Eadbert obtained the kingdom of Kent; **him** (i.e. his) other name was Pryn.'

[174500 (1118.17)E]
Ðises geares eac forðferde se papa Paschalis, & feng Iohan of Gaitan to þam papdome, ***þam*** *wæs oðer nama Gelasius.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+S+X+,
PH-siph}[=io/[con*
P-siph+(=)+io+V+S+X+,
H-siph 'This year also died Pope Paschalis; and John of Gaeta succeeded to the popedom, **whom** (i.e whose) other name was Gelasius.'
H-siph 'This year also died Pope Paschalis; and John of Gaeta succeeded to the popedom; **him** (i.e his) other name was Gelasius.'

[175100 (1119.14)E]
& æfter him se arcebiscop of Uiana wearð to papan gecoren, ***þam*** *wearð nama Calixtus,*
H-siph+(con*)+V+S+X+,
PH-siph}[=io/[con*
P-siph+(=)+io+V+S+X+,
H-siph 'And after him the Archbishop of Vienna was chosen pope, **whom** (i.e. whose) name was Calixtus.'
P-siph 'And after him the Archbishop of Vienna was chosen pope; **him** (i.e. his) name was Calixtus.'

We think that the further away the element *þam* is from its antecedent, the more likely it is to be treated as an ordinary pronominal object because in such a situation it is easy to ascribe it to a wrong antecedent. On the other hand, if the link between the element *þam* and its antecedent is not interrupted by any other elements, it is more likely to be treated as a dependent clause connective, as presented in the following examples:

[008900 (508.1)A]
Her Cerdic & Cynric ofslogon ænne brettisc cyning, ***þam*** *was nama Natanleod…*
H-siph+(con*)+V+S+X+,
PH-siph}[=io/[con*
P-siph+(=)+io+V+S+X+,
H-siph 'This year Cerdic and Cynric slew a British king, **whom** (i.e. whose) name was Natanleod… .'
P-siph 'This year Cerdic and Cynric slew a British king; **him** (i.e. his) name was Natanleod… .'

[134200 (1086.52)E]
…se þridda het Heanric ***þam*** *se fæder becwæð gersuman unateallendlice.*

H-siph+(con*)+S+V+DO+,
PH-siph}[=io/[con*
P-siph+(=)+io+S+V+DO+,
H-siph '…the third one's name was Henry, **whom** the father bequeathed an innumerable treasure.'
P-siph '…the third one's name was Henry; **him** the father bequeathed an innumerable treasure.'

Nevertheless, in both situations, namely when *þam* immediately follows its antecedent and when it is placed a little farther from its antecedent, it can be interpreted either as an ordinary demonstrative pronoun in the dative case or as a dependent clause connective due to the fact that its form does not change at all regardless of the interpretation. Therefore, much depends on the interpretation of this PH element.

3.3.1. *PH-siph}[cj=io/[cj=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses. Theoretically speaking, *PH-siph}[cj=io/[cj=con* clauses are ordinary *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses which find themselves in PH sequences and are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by explicit *io/con** SIPH elements, which function in parataxis as ordinary pronominal indirect objects and in hypotaxis as dependent clause connectives; depending on whether these explicit PH elements are treated as ordinary pronominal indirect objects or as dependent clause connectives the status of the clauses in which they appear changes accordingly. Moreover, in *PH-siph}[cj=io/[cj=con** clauses the explicit *io/con** SIPH elements are immediately preceded by explicit coordinating conjunctions, usually *and*.

3.3.2. *PH-siph}[0=io/[0=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses either. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses which find themselves in PH sequences and at the same time are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by explicit *io/con** SIPH elements, which in parataxis function as ordinary pronominal indirect objects and in hypotaxis as dependent clause connectives; depending on whether we treat these explicit PH elements

as ordinary pronominal indirect objects or as dependent clause connectives, the status of the clauses in which they appear changes accordingly. What is more, in *PH-siph}[0=io/[0=con** clauses the explicit *io/con** SIPH elements are immediately preceded by implicit coordinating conjunctions, usually *and*. However, the position of the coordinating conjunction can sometimes be blocked; for example when the *io/con** SIPH element of a *PH-siph}[0=io/[0=con** clause is not identical with the PH element that introduces the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clause in a PH sequence and when it has its own antecedent not shared by any other PH element in a given PH sequence.

We can now discuss the ambivalence corridor established by the ASC A and the ASC E *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses; we found no sequence variants here.

3.3.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses

As far as the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses are concerned, we obtained the following ambivalence corridor for the ASC A:

Table 3.5. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		3	X + 3	Y		3	Y + 3	X + Y + 3
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	3		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	0		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		3		oV word order		0		

In the ASC A we found only 3 *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses. If we analyse them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 3 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Moreover, in the total number of the ASC A main clause V2 word orders we obtain 3 additional V2 word orders, all of which are XV2. As regards the position of the finite verb with respect to the object, in the total number of the ASC A main clause VO and OV word order configurations we obtain 3 additional OV word orders in which the object

is pronominal. On the other hand, if we analyse the ambivalent PH clauses in question from the point of view of hypotaxis, we obtain 3 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Moreover, in the total number of the ASC A dependent clause V2 word orders we obtain no additional V2 word orders. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, there are no additional VO or OV word order configurations in the total number of the ASC A VO and OV word order configurations.

We will now discuss the data obtained for the ASC E.

3.3.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses

The table below presents the data that we obtained for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses:

Table 3.6. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	Unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		6	X + 6	Y		6	Y + 6	X + Y + 6
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	5		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	1		
VO word order		1		VO word order		1		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		6		oV word order		0		

In the ASC E we found only 6 *PH-siph}[=io/[con** clauses; however, with no sequence variants. If we analyse them from the point of view of parataxis, there are 6 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Moreover, we obtain 5 additional V2 word orders, all of which are XV2, in the total number of the ASC E main clause V2 word orders. In the total number of the ASC E main clause OV and VO word order configurations we obtain 1 additional VO word order configuration with a nominal object, and 6 additional OV word orders with a pronominal object. On the other hand, if we approach the clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses grows by 6. In the total number of

the ASC E dependent clause V2 word orders we obtain only 1 V2 word order, which is SV2. Moreover, we obtain 1 additional VO word order configuration with a nominal object in the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO and OV word order configurations.

And now we will move to the discussion of another type of SIPH clauses, namely *PH-siph}[=do/[con**.

3.4. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses

*PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses are introduced by an explicit *do/con** SIPH element. In parataxis this element functions as an ordinary pronominal direct object introducing a main clause, whereas in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing the same clause which then becomes dependent. When a *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clause has the status of a main clause, it gains a pronominal direct object at the beginning, and at the same time in the total number of main clause OV word orders there appears an additional OV word order configuration with a pronominal direct object. However, when it has the status of a dependent clause, it loses this additional pronominal direct object (and thus an OV word order with a pronominal direct object) because then it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause; at the same time the additional main clause OV word order, obtained when the PH clause in question is approached from the paratactic point of view, disappears in the total number of main clause OV word orders.

Below we present a few examples of this type of SIPH clauses. We will start with the clauses introduced by the element *þone*:

> [014300 (604.2)E]
> *…þær wes se cing gehaten Sæberht, Ricolan sunu Æðelberhtes suster,* ***þone*** *Æðelberht gesette þær to cininga, & Æðelberht gesealde Mellite biscopsetle on Lundenwic.*
> H-siph+(con*)+S+V+X+,
> PH-siph}[=do/[con*
> P-siph+(=)+do+S+V+X+,
> H-siph '… their king was called Seabert, the son of Ricola, Ethelbert's sister, **whom** Ethelbert placed there as king. Ethelbert also gave Mellitus the bishopric of London.'
> P-siph '…their king was called Seabert, the son of Ricola, Ethelbert's sister; **him** Ethelbert placed there as king. Ethelbert also gave Mellitus the bishopric of London.'

[034600 (709.6)E]
& þi ilcan geare Wilferð biscop forðferde in Undalum, & his lic man lædde to Ripum; he wæs biscop XLV wintra, ***þone*** *Ecgferð cining ær bedraf to Rome.*
H-siph+(con*)+S+X+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=do/[con*
P-siph+(=)+do+S+X+V+X+,
H-siph 'And the same year died Bishop Wilferth, at Oundle, but his body was carried to Ripon. He was a bishop for forty five years, **whom** King Everth compelled to go to Rome.'
P-siph 'And the same year died Bishop Wilferth, at Oundle, but his body was carried to Ripon. He was a bishop for forty five years; **him** King Everth compelled to go to Rome.'

[164800 (1106.37)E]
Eadgar æþeling […] *þær wæs eac gefangen;* ***þone*** *let se cyng syððan sacleas faran.*
H-siph+(con*)+V+S+X+inf+,
PH-siph}[=do/[con*
P-siph+(=)+do+V+S+X+inf+,
H-siph 'Edgar Etheling […] was also there taken, **whom** the king afterwards let go unpunished.'
P-siph 'Edgar Etheling […] was also there taken; **him** the king afterwards let go unpunished.'

In the three analysed clauses the *do/con** SIPH element *þone* can be interpreted either as an ordinary pronominal direct object at the beginning of a main clause in parataxis, namely as 'him/it', or as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause in hypotaxis, namely as 'whom/which'. Since its form does not change regardless of the approach and that it is somewhat detached from its antecedent, we classify the clauses in which it appears as ambivalent and tag them in two ways.

The same can be said about *PH-siph}[=do/[con** SIPH clauses introduced by the *do/con** SIPH element *þæt*, which in parataxis is interpreted as 'it' and in hypotaxis as 'that':

[026100 (656.100)E]
Ðus wæs seo mynstre Medeshamstede agunnen ***þet*** *man siððon cleopede Burh.*
H-siph+(con*)+S+X+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=do/[con*
P-siph+(=)+do+S+X+V+X+,

H-siph ‘Thus was the minster of Medhamsted begun, **that** was afterwards called [Peter-]borough.’
P-siph ‘Thus was the minster of Medhamsted begun; **it** was afterwards called [Peter-]borough.’

In this example the *do/con** SIPH element *þet* is rather remote from its antecedent, which decreases its chances to be treated as a dependent clause connective. Nevertheless, the distance is not that large. In the example below, on the other hand, the SIPH element *þet* follows its antecedent immediately and this fact makes it more probable to be treated as a dependent clause connective:

[023700 (656.53)E]
…Ic haue here godefrihte muneces þa wolden drohtien here lif on ankersetle gif hi wisten hwere, oc her is an igland ***þet*** *man cleopeð Ancarig, & wile þes geornen þet we moten þær wircen an mynstre Sancte Marie to loue,… .*
H-siph+(con*)+S+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=do/[con*
P-siph+(=)+do+S+V+X+,
H-siph ‘I have here some good monks that would lead their life in retirement, if they wist where. Now here is an island, **that** people call Ankerig; and I will request, that we may there build a minster to the honour of St. Mary.’
P-siph ‘I have here some good monks that would lead their life in retirement, if they wist where. Now here is an island; people call **it** Ankerig; and I will request, that we may there build a minster to the honour of St. Mary.’

Although in the two above examples the SIPH element *þet* will most likely be taken for a dependent clause connective by most analysts, it should be remembered that the sense in which it is used there is not that far away from the sense in which it is used in the example below:

[207900 (1154.1)E]
On þis gær wærd þe king Stephne ded & bebyried þer his wif & his sune wæron bebyried æt Fauresfeld, ***þæt*** *minstre hi makeden.*
‘In this year died the King Stephen; and he was buried where his wife and his son were buried, at Faversham; **that** monastery they founded.’

In this example the function of *þæt* as a dependent clause connective is blocked by the noun *minstre*, and *þæt* functions as a determiner of this noun and not as a connective. So we can see that the dividing line between what

is a demonstrative pronoun and what is a dependent clause connective in Old English is very vague and not easy to draw. It would be much easier to interpret *þæt* as a dependent clause connective if it had the form *þe*, as in the example below:

> [025300 (656.81)E]
> *Ðet wæron be nam: Ithamar biscop of Rofecestre and Wine biscop of Lundene & Ieruman se wæs Myrcene biscop & Tuda biscop & Wilfrid preost seo wæs siððon biscop & Eoppa preost* ***þe*** *seo kyning Wulhfere seonde to bodian Cristendome on Wiht & Saxulf abbot &… .*
> '(Then confirmed it all the others that were there with the cross of Christ): namely, Ithamar, Bishop of Rochester; Wina, Bishop of London; Jeruman, Bishop of the Mercians; and Tuda, bishop; and Wilfrid, priest, who was afterwards bishop; and Eoppa, priest, **whom** the king, Wulfere, sent to preach Christianity in the Isle of Wight; and Saxulf, abbot and… .'

In this example we can be sure that the element *þe* is a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause, and such clauses should be tagged only in one way in an annotated corpus, because they are unambivalently dependent. We can also be sure that the element *þet* is a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause, when its function as an ordinary pronominal direct object introducing a main clause is blocked, as in the example below:

> [006800 (418.1)E]
> *Her Romane gesamnodan ealle þa goldhord ðe on Brytene wæron & sume on eorðan behyddan* ***þet*** *heo nan man syððan findon ne mihton & sume mid heom on Gallia læddon.*
> 'This year the Romans collected all the hoards of gold that were in Britain; and some they hid in the earth, **that** no man afterwards might find them, and some they carried away with them into Gaul.'

Here the function of *þet* as an ordinary pronominal direct object introducing a main clause is blocked by the pronoun *heo* which already functions as an ordinary pronominal direct object. Since it is unusual for a properly constructed clause to have two direct objects, the element *þet* in this case needs to be interpreted as a dependent clause connective.

We will now discuss the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con** and *PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con** clauses.

3.4.1. *PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses. Theoretically speaking, when a *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clause finds itself in a PH sequence and it is not the initial clause of this sequence, and moreover its explicit *do/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction, for example *and*, the clause becomes a *PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con** clause. In parataxis the explicit *do/con** SIPH element functions as an ordinary pronominal direct object, while in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective; the SIPH clause in question changes its status accordingly, depending on whether the SIPH element that introduces it is approached from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view.

3.4.2. *PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses either. Theoretically speaking, *PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con** clauses are similar to *PH-siph}[cj=do/[cj=con** clauses, with the difference that the explicit *do/con** SIPH element which introduces them is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. However, the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction is sometimes blocked here; for example when the *do/con** SIPH element of a *PH-siph}[0=do/[0=con** clause is not identical with the PH element that introduces the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clause in a PH sequence and when it has its own antecedent not shared by any other PH element in a given PH sequence.

We will now present the data obtained for the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses; we found no sequence variants among them.

3.4.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses

Below we present the range of the ambivalence corridor that the *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses are capable of producing in the ASC A:

Table 3.7. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		2	X + 2	Y		2	Y + 2	X + Y + 2
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	2		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		2		oV word order		0		

In the ASC A we found only 2 *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses. This means that if we analyse them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 2 additional main clauses in the total number of the main clauses of the ASC A. Moreover, there are 2 additional main clause OV word orders in which the object is pronominal. On the other hand, if we treat the ambivalent SIPH clauses in question as dependent, we obtain 2 additional dependent clauses within the total number of the dependent clauses of the ASC A. In the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders we obtain 2 additional V2 word orders, both of which are SV2. Moreover, there are no consequences as far as the position of the object with respect to the finite verb in dependent clauses is concerned.

3.4.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses

Table 3.8 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor that the *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses are capable of producing in the ASC E.

In the ASC E there are 12 *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses. If they are analysed from the paratactic point of view, there are 12 additional main clauses within the total number of the main clauses of the ASC E. The total number of the main clause V2 word orders increases by 1 XV2 word order. As far as the position of the object with respect to the finite verb is concerned, in the total number of main clause OV and VO word order configurations of the ASC E we obtain 1 additional VO word order with a nominal object and 12 additional OV word orders in which the object is pronominal. On the other hand, if the SIPH clauses in question are analysed from the point of view of hypotaxis, there are

Table 3.8. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=do/[con** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		12	X + 12	Y		12	Y + 12	X + Y + 12
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	1		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	6		
VO word order		1		VO word order		1		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		12		oV word order		0		

12 additional dependent clauses within the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. In the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders there are 6 additional V2 clauses, all of which are SV2. And finally, in the total number of dependent clause OV and VO word order configurations of the ASC E there is 1 additional VO word order configuration with a nominal object.

In the following section we are going to discuss PH clauses of the *PH-siph} [=0/[0** type together with their sequence variants.

3.5. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses

*PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses are the ones that are introduced by an implicit *x/con**, *s/con**, *do/con** or *io/con** SIPH element. In parataxis these implicit SIPH elements are treated as implicit ordinary elements, namely as pronominal adverbials, pronominal subjects, pronominal direct objects and pronominal indirect objects respectively and they introduce SIPH clauses treated as main, whereas in hypotaxis they are treated as implicit dependent clause connectives introducing the same SIPH clauses which then become dependent. Moreover, the SIPH clauses in question function as the initial clauses of PH sequences, provided they are part of such sequences, and therefore they cannot be preceded by any PH clauses of the same type, or of other types, but they can be followed by them. In other words, a *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clause may be the only PH clause in a given context or it may be the first PH clause introducing a sequence of PH clauses of the same type, or of different types. In the latter case, the clauses following a *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clause usually are, but do not have to be, conjoined by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction.

We will first analyse clauses which we tag as *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s*. Since they are very frequent in the ASC, we would like to devote more attention to them; they are basically typical of the ASC E, as the ones that appear in the ASC A are usually unambivalent.

3.5.1. *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses

In this type of clauses the position of the implicit SIPH element is filled with an implicit *s/con** SIPH element, which in parataxis is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject introducing a SIPH clause treated as main, while in hypotaxis it is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing the same SIPH clause, which becomes dependent then. Below we present a few examples for sake of illustration:

[125110 (1075.2)E]
*& se ylca Raulf wæs bryttisc on his moderhealfe, & his fæder wæs englisc, **Raulf hatte**, & wæs geboren on Norðfolce.*
'This same Ralph was British on his mother's side; and his father, **called Ralph**, was English; and born in Norfolk.'

[183800 (1124.37)E]
*& on þæs dæies XIX kalendas Ianuarii forðferde se pape on Rome, **Calistus wæs gehaten**, & Honorius feng to papedom.*
'And on the nineteenth day before the calends of January died the Pope of Rome, **called Calixtus**, and Honorius succeeded to the popedom.'

[197000 (1132.8)E]
*…& te king iaf ðat abbotdrice an prior of Sancte Neod, **Martin was gehaten**; he com on Sancte Petres messedei mid micel wurscipe into the minstre.*
'And the king gave the abbacy to a prior of St. Neot's, **called Martin**; he came on St. Peter's mass-day with great pomp into the minster.'

[020800 (654.7)E]
*…& hi ongunnan þa þet grundwalla & þæron wrohten; betahten hit þa an munec **Saxulf wæs gehaten**.*
'And they began the groundwall, and wrought thereon; after which they committed the work to a monk, **called Saxulf**.'

The problem consists in difficulty of classifying the clauses marked in bold in one way only, as on the one hand it might be supposed that in such cases we are dealing with clauses that are juxtaposed by asyndetic parataxis,[8] but on the other hand, on closer consideration, it can be observed that they behave like dependent clauses connected with the main clauses by means of invisible dependent clause connectors. In other words, the clauses on the one hand seem to behave like main clauses that are in paratactic relation with the clauses that immediately precede them, while, at the same time, they seem to behave like dependent clauses that are in hypotactic relation with the same clauses immediately preceding them. We therefore classify them as ambivalent and they can be approached from the paratactic point of view and from the hypotactic point of view; in hypotaxis they are introduced by an implicit dependent clause connective, while in parataxis by an implicit ordinary pronominal subject. Mitchell and Robinson (2007: 103) discuss such clauses under the section entitled "Some special idioms." They observe that the clause *…wæs gehaten* '…was called' was frequently used independently of the rest of the Old English sentence. They also seem to hesitate about the status of such clauses, as in the example that they give they provide two words, namely *who* and *they*, within the square brackets:

> *Mid heora cyningum, Radiota and Eallerica wæron hatne*
> 'With their kings, [who/they] were called R. and E.'
>
> (Mitchell and Robinson 2007: 103)

In our analysis, if the clause in question is approached from the hypotactic point of view, it is introduced by the implicit dependent clause connective *who*, while if it is approached from the paratactic point of view, it is introduced by the implicit ordinary pronominal subject 'they'. A similar procedure can be observed in Meuerman-Solin (2004) who claims that in corpus annotation it is necessary to indicate 'zero-realisations' if there is evidence of the explicit alternatives, which is the case here. Put another way, a link is marked as zero-realisation only if there is an attested variation in that position in the data.

The clauses in question would not be ambivalent if they were accompanied by some additional element, as in the following example:

> [001300 (60BC.7)E]
> *Ða genamon þa Walas & adrifon sumre ea ford ealne mid scearpum pilum greatum innan þam wetere;* ***sy ea hatte Temese****.*
> 'Then took the Welsh sharp piles, and drove them with great clubs into the water, at a certain ford of **the river called Thames**.'

[8] A detailed discussion on asyndeton can be found in Bednarczuk (1971).

In this example it is clear that the clause *sy ea hatte Temese* is a main clause because it can stand independently. If the element *sy* are not followed by the noun *ea*, then its status as a main clause could be questioned because in this case *sy* becomes an ambivalent *s/con** SIPH element and therefore, depending on the approach, it can be interpreted as a dependent clause connective or as an ordinary pronominal subject. In the example below, we also have no doubt that the clause *Agatho he wæs gehaten* is in paratactic relation with the preceding main clause because it can stand independently, and moreover, it is not possible to introduce a dependent clause connective in front of the noun *Agatho* because this operation is blocked by the pronoun *he*:

> [028700 (675.3)E]
> *On his time þa seonde he to Rome Wilfrid biscop to þam pape þe þa wes,* ***Agatho he wæs gehaten****, & cydde him mid writ & mid worde hu his bre*ðre *Peada &… .*
> 'In his time sent he to Rome Bishop Wilfrid to the pope that then was, **he was called Agatho**, and told him by word and by letter, how his brothers Peada and… .'

In another example we cannot treat the clause *he was Pusa gehaten* as a dependent clause because it is introduced by the pronoun *he*, which could not function as a dependent clause connective in Old English:

> [042610 (777.13)E]
> *He georn*de *at se kyning þet he scolde for his luuen freon his ane mynstre Wocingas het, forþi ðet he hit wolde giuen into Medeshamstede & Sancte Peter & þone abbote þe þa was;* ***he was Pusa gehaten****.*
> 'He requested the king for his sake to free his own monastery, called Woking, because he would give it to Medhamsted and St. Peter, and the abbot that then was; **he was called Pusa**.'

In a yet another example the clause with the verb *hatan* also seems to be unambivalent:

> [194200 (1130.14)E]
> *Æfter him com se abbot <of> Clunni* ***Petrus gehaten*** *to Englelande bi þes kynges leue & wæs underfangen… .*
> 'After him came the Abbot of Clugny, **called Peter**, to England by the king's leave; and was received… .'

In our opinion, it is unambivalent because it has no finite verb; the verb *wæs* is missing in it. In this situation *Petrus gehaten* should be treated as some

kind of an adjectival attribute of the noun *se abbot of Clunni*. If the verb *wæs* was present there, then we would obtain a full sentence, which would be an ambivalent SIPH clause.

Furthermore, clauses with the verb *hatan* are unambivalent dependent clauses whenever they are introduced by an unambivalent dependent clause connective, as in the examples below:

> [136400 (1086.96)E]
> *Normandige þet land wæs his gecynde, & ofer þone eorldom* ***þe Mans is gehaten*** *he rixade.*
> 'As to Normandy, that was his native land; but he reigned also over the earldom **that is called Maine**.'

> [009900 (495.1)E]
> *Her coman twegen ealdormen on Brytene, Certic & Cynric his sunu, mid V scipum on þone stede* ***þe is gehaten Certices ora****, & on þam ilcan dæge gefuhton wið Walas.*
> 'This year came two leaders into Britain, Cerdic and Cynric his son, with five ships, at a place **that is called Cerdic's-ore**. And they fought with the Welsh the same day.'

> [068600 (963.64)E]
> *Þa cæs man oðer abbot of þe silue minstre* ***þe wæs gehaten Ælfsi****.*
> 'Then another abbot was chosen of the same monastery, **who was called Elfsy**.'

There is no doubt that the clauses introduced by the dependent clause connective *þe* are dependent because this element functioned as a dependent clause connective in Old English. Therefore, such clauses should be treated as being in hypotactic relation with respect to the main clauses immediately preceding them.

In our opinion, the reason why the ambivalent SIPH clauses with the verb *hatan* were not introduced by a dependent clause connective is that they usually started with a name (a nominal element). Therefore the use of a dependent clause connective was avoided because if it was used in front of the name it would most likely be interpreted as a demonstrative pronoun or as a definite article. Moreover, the use of *se* was avoided in such contexts because without an adequate modification in the word order the clauses *se Raulf hatte…* and *se Calistus wæs gehaten…* could be taken for incomplete and the reader would expect some more information about *Raulf* and *Calistus*, as in the two hypothetical examples:

(*) *Se Raulf hatte Agathos*
'This Raulf was called Agathos'

(*) *Se Calistus hatte Bonus* etc.
'This Calistus was called Bonus'

In this case the two clauses starting with *se Raulf* and *se Calistus* would obtain the status of main clauses because the use of *se* as a dependent clause connective would be blocked by the names that follow it, namely *Raulf* and *Calistus*.

As regards the dependent clause connective *þe*, it was not used in the same sense as the demonstrative pronoun *se* because it was not so expressive. In this sense *þe* was a better candidate for a dependent clause connective. Nevertheless, we did not find many examples where this element appears as a dependent clause connective in the type of clauses in question, as the majority of such clauses are introduced by some expressive element which gives them the status of main clauses, or by no element at all. Therefore, in the light of the fact that on the one hand the expressive element *se*, and especially *he*, gives clauses with the verb *hatan* the status of main clauses, and that on the other hand the dependent clause connective *þe* gives them the status of dependent clauses, the clauses with the verb *hatan* introduced by an implicit *s/con** SIPH element should be treated as ambivalent and they need to be annotated in two ways. We will use the examples mentioned above for illustration. If a clause with the verb *hatan* is unambivalent from the paratactic point of view, we tag it in the following way:

[042610 (777.13)E]
…***he was Pusa gehaten***.
P-siph+=+s+V+X+papt+,
'…he was called Pusa'

And if such a clause is unambivalent from the point of view of hypotaxis, we tag it in the following way:

[136400 (1086.96)E]
…***þe Mans is gehaten***
H-siph+con*+X+V+papt+,
'…that is called Maine.'

And the ambivalent *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses with the verb *hatan* introduced by an implicit *s/con** SIPH element are tagged in the following way:

[125110 (1075.2)E]
& se ylca Raulf wæs bryttisc on his moderhealfe, & his fæder wæs englisc, ***Raulf hatte****, & wæs geboren on Norðfolce.*
H-siph+(*)+X+V+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+X+V+,
H-siph 'This same Ralph was British on his mother's side; but his father, **(who) was also called Ralph**, was English; and born in Norfolk.'
P-siph 'This same Ralph was British on his mother's side; but his father was English and born in Norfolk; **(he) was also called Ralph**.'

[183800 (1124.37)E]
& on þæs dæies XIX kalendas Ianuarii forðferde se pape on Rome, ***Calistus wæs gehaten****, & Honorius feng to papedom.*
H-siph+(*)+X+V+papt+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+X+V+papt+,
H-siph 'And on the nineteenth day before the calends of January died the Pope of Rome, **(who) was called Calixtus**, and Honorius succeeded to the popedom.'
P-siph 'And on the nineteenth day before the calends of January died the Pope of Rome, **(he) was called Calixtus**, and Honorius succeeded to the popedom.'

[197000 (1132.8)E]
…& te king iaf ðat abbotdrice an prior of Sancte Neod, ***Martin was gehaten****; he com on Sancte Petres messedei mid micel wurscipe into the minstre.*
H-siph+(*)+X+V+papt+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+X+V+papt+,
H-siph 'And the king gave the abbacy to a prior of St. Neot's, **(who) was called Martin**; he came on St. Peter's mass-day with great pomp into the minster.'
P-siph 'And the king gave the abbacy to a prior of St. Neot's; **(he) was called Martin**; he came on St. Peter's mass-day with great pomp into the minster.'

[020800 (654.7)E]
…& hi ongunnan þa þet grundwalla & þæron wrohten; betahten hit þa an munec ***Saxulf wæs gehaten****.*
H-siph+(*)+X+V+papt+,

PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+X+V+papt+,
H-siph 'And they began the groundwall, and wrought thereon; after which they committed the work to a monk, **(who) was called Saxulf**.'
P-siph 'And they began the groundwall, and wrought thereon; after which they committed the work to a monk; **(he) was called Saxulf**.'

If we are also to tag the clauses around the ambivalent PH clauses in question, we obtain the following annotation pattern. We will take only one of the above examples for illustration:

[183800 (1124.37)E]
& on þæs dæies XIX kalendas Ianuarii forðferde se pape on Rome, ***Calistus wæs gehaten****, & Honorius feng to papedom.*
H-siph+(*)+X+V+papt+,
+cj=+X+V+S+X+,**PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s**,+cj=+S+V+X+,
P-siph+(=)+X+V+papt+,
H-siph 'And on the nineteenth day before the calends of January died the Pope of Rome, **(who) was called Calixtus**, and Honorius succeeded to the popedom.'
P-siph 'And on the nineteenth day before the calends of January died the Pope of Rome, **(he) was called Calixtus**, and Honorius succeeded to the popedom.'

There are also other kinds of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses in which the position of the implicit *s/con** SIPH element is occupied by an implicit pronominal subject but which are not about the use of the verb *hatan*. For example:

[050300 (900.18)A]
& on þys ilcan gere forðferde Æþered, ***wæs on Defenum ealdormon****, feower wucum ær Ælfred cyning.*
H-siph+(*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+V+X+,
H-siph 'In this year died Ethered, (**who) was alderman of Devonshire**, four weeks before King Alfred.'
P-siph 'In this year died Ethered, **(he) was alderman of Devonshire**, four weeks before King Alfred.'
[051400 (905.1)A]
Her on þys geare gefor Ælfred, ***wæs æt Baðum gerefa****.*
H-siph+(*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s

P-siph+(=)+V+X+,
H-siph ‘This year died Alfred, **who** was governor of Bath.’
P-siph ‘This year died Alfred; **he** was governor of Bath.’

[180400 (1123.47)E]
…& Iohan ærcedæcne of Cantwarabyrig & Gifard, ***wæs þes kinges hirdclerc****.*
H-siph+(*)+V+X+,
PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s
P-siph+(=)+V+X+,
H-siph ‘…and John, Archdeacon of Canterbury and Gifard, **who** was the king’s court-chaplain.’
P-siph ‘…and John, Archdeacon of Canterbury and Gifard; **he** was the king’s court-chaplain.’

We will now move to another type of *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses. So far we have concentrated on the *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses and now we will discuss clauses that we classify as *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from x*.

3.5.2. *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from x* clauses

In this type of clauses the position of the implicit SIPH element is occupied by an implicit *x/con** SIPH element. In parataxis this element functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial introducing a SIPH clause treated as main, and in hypotaxis it functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing the same SIPH clause, which is then treated as dependent. Below we present an example in which the position of the implicit *x/con** SIPH element is occupied by the implicit SIPH element *þa*:

[059600 (963.3)A]
…& hine mon gehalgode in uigilia Sancti Andree, ***wæs sunnandæg on dæg****.*
H-siph+(*)+V+X+,
*PH-siph}[=0/[0** from x
P-siph+(=)+V+X+,
H-siph ‘…and he was consecrated on the vigil of St. Andrew, **(when) it was Sunday**.’
P-siph ‘…and he was consecrated on the vigil of St. Andrew; **(then) it was Sunday**.’

If the above clause was unambivalent from the paratactic point of view, it would receive the following annotation pattern:

P-siph+=+x+V+X+,

If, on the other hand, it was unambivalent from the paratactic point of view, it would be annotated in the following way:

H-siph+con*+V+X+,

However, since the clause in question could be introduced by the same element *þa* both in parataxis and in hypotaxis, it is ambivalent.

There are also other types of *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses, namely *from io* and *from do*. Unfortunately, we did not find any examples of this type of clauses in the ASC. Nevertheless, we will describe them only theoretically, without providing any examples for illustration.

3.5.3. *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clauses

Theoretically speaking, in *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clauses the position of the implicit SIPH element is occupied by an implicit *io/con** SIPH element, which when approached from the paratactic point of view is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object, and which when approached from the hypotactic point of view is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective. Moreover, a *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clause introduced by an *io/con** SIPH element changes its status accordingly, namely in parataxis it has the status of a main clause, whereas in hypotaxis it has the status of a dependent one.

3.5.4. *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clauses

In *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clauses the position of the implicit SIPH element is occupied by an implicit *do/con** SIPH element, which is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in parataxis and as an implicit dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. Moreover, a *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clause introduced by an implicit *do/con** SIPH element changes its status

accordingly, namely in parataxis it turns into a main clause and in hypotaxis it turns into a dependent clause.

Let us now move to the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0** and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0**.

3.5.5. SIPH-taxis: *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0** and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0** clauses

*PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0** and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0** clauses are ordinary *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses but they form part of PH sequences and are not the initial PH clauses in these sequences. They are introduced by an implicit SIPH element, namely *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** or *do/con**, the position of which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction in *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0** and by an implicit coordinating conjunction in *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0**. Therefore, depending on the presence or absence of a coordinating conjunction, we can distinguish two types of such clauses. Moreover, the implicit SIPH elements introducing these clauses often are, but do not need to be, identical with the explicit/implicit PH elements introducing the initial, intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clauses in PH sequences and they often do not have the same antecedents; if they are not identical with any of the explicit/implicit elements introducing the initial, intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clauses and have different antecedents the position of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction is blocked.

We will first discuss the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from x* clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from x* clauses.

3.5.6. *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* clauses

PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0 from x* clauses are introduced by an implicit *x/con** SIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* clause treated as dependent, whereas in parataxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial introducing the same clause, which then obtains the status of a main clause. Moreover, this implicit SIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. As an example of a *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* clause, we will take a clause in which the position of the implicit *x/con**

SIPH element is occupied by the implicit element *þær* which in turn is preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*:

> [187300 (1127.12)E]
> *Ðes ilces gæres on þone lententide wæs se eorl Karle of Flandres ofslagen on ane circe* ***þær*** *he læi* ***&*** *bæd hine to Gode tofor þone weofede amang þane messe fram his agene manne.*
> H-siph+(*)+V+rf+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x
> P-siph+(=)+V+rf+X+,
> H-siph 'In the Lent-tide of this same year was the Earl Charles of Flanders slain in a church, **where** he lay **and (where) (he)** prayed to God, before the altar, in the midst of the mass, by his own men.'
> P-siph 'In the Lent-tide of this same year was the Earl Charles of Flanders slain in a church by his own men before the altar, in the midst of the mass; **there** he lay **and (there) (he)** prayed to God.'

In another example of *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* clauses the position of the implicit *x/con** SIPH element is occupied by the implicit SIPH element *þa* which is immediately preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*:

> [045400 (893.82)A]
> ***Þa*** *hie ða fela wucena sæton on twa healfe þær e,* ***&*** *se cyng wæs west on Defnum wiþ þone sciphere, þa wæron hie mid metelieste gewægde & hæfdon miclne dæl þara horsa freten, & þa oþre wæron hungre acwolen.*
> H-siph+(*)+S+V+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x
> P-siph+(=)+S+V+X+,
> H-siph '**When** they had sat there many weeks on both sides of the water, **and (when)** the king meanwhile was in Devonshire westward with the naval force, then were the enemy weighed down with famine. They had devoured the greater part of their horses; and the rest had perished with hunger.'
> P-siph '**Then** they had sat there many weeks on both sides of the water; **and (then)** the king meanwhile was in Devonshire westward with the naval force; then were the enemy weighed down with famine. They had devoured the greater part of their horses; and the rest had perished with hunger.'

Let us now discuss the other sequence variant of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from x* clauses, namely *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from x*.

3.5.7. *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from x* clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses. Theoretically speaking, these clauses are introduced by an implicit *x/con** SIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from x* SIPH clause treated as dependent, whereas in parataxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial introducing the same SIPH clause which this time is treated as main. Moreover, the implicit *x/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction, whose position is sometimes blocked, for example when the *x/con** SIPH element has its own antecedent not shared by any PH element in a given PH sequence.

Now we will discuss the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s* and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s*.

3.5.8. *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s* clauses

What we said about *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from x* clauses can also be said about this type of clauses, the difference being that instead of an implicit *x/con** SIPH element we have to do with an implicit *s/con** SIPH element here. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s* clause treated as dependent, while in parataxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject introducing the same clause but this time treated as main. This implicit SIPH element is moreover immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. For example:

> [015000 (616.14)A]
> *Þa æfter him feng to arcebiscopdome Iustus,* ***se*** *was biscop of Hrouecistre,* ***&*** *þarto gehalgode Romanum to biscope.*
> H-siph+(*)+X+V+DO+X+,
> Seq PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s
> P-siph+(=)+X+V+DO+X+,
> H-siph ‘After him succeeded to the archbishopric Justus, **who** was Bishop of Rochester, **and (who)** consecrated Romanus bishop thereto.’
> P-siph ‘After him succeeded to the archbishopric Justus; **he** was Bishop of Rochester, **and (he)** consecrated Romanus bishop thereto.’

[000200 (0.3)E]
Erest weron bugend þises landes Brittes ***þa*** *coman of Armenia* ***&*** *gesætan suðewearde Bryttene ærost.*
H-siph+(*)+V+DO+X+,
Seq PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s
P-siph+(=)+V+DO+X+,
H-siph 'The first inhabitants of this land were the Britons, **who** came from Armenia, **and (who)** peopled Britain southward first.'
P-siph 'The first inhabitants of this land were the Britons; **they** came from Armenia, **and (they)** peopled Britain southward first.'

We also found quite a few examples of *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s* clauses in which the implicit *s/con** SIPH element is not identical with the explicit PH element introducing the initial PH clause (which at the same time is the immediately preceding one) in a PH sequence; however, although the PH elements are not identical, they have the same antecedent. Below one of them is presented:

[001100 (0.27)A]
Þa feng Sigebryht to, ***þæs*** *cyn gęþ to Cerdice,* ***&*** *heold an gear.*
H-siph+(*)+V+X+,
Seq PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from s
P-siph+(=)+V+X+,
H-siph 'Then succeeded Sigebriht, **whose** kin goeth to Cerdic, **and (who)** reigned one year.'
P-siph 'Then succeeded Sigebriht; **his** kin goeth to Cerdic, **and (he)** reigned one year.'

In this example the initial PH clause, namely *þæs cyn gęþ to Cerdice*, is introduced by the explicit PH element *þæs* which according to our annotation would be classified as an *x/con** SIPH element, whereas the sequence PH clause, namely *& heold an gear*, requires an *s/con** SIPH element.

And now we will move on to the second sequence variant of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from s* clauses, namely to *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s*.

3.5.9. *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s* clauses

In this type of clauses the position of the implicit SIPH element is occupied by an implicit *s/con** SIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s*

clause treated as dependent, and in parataxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject introducing the same clause, but this time treated as main. Moreover, the SIPH element in question is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction, whose position is sometimes blocked. For example:

> [120500 (1070.12)E]
> *Þa wæs þære an cyrceweard Yware wæs gehaten; nam þa be nihte eall þet he mihte…*
> H-siph+(*)+V+X+DO+,
> Seq PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s
> P-siph+(=)+V+X+DO+,
> H-siph 'Now there was a churchwarden, **(who)** was called Yware, **(and who)** took away by night all that he could… .'
> P-siph 'Now there was a churchwarden; **(he)** was called Yware, **(and he)** took away by night all that he could… .'

In this example the clause *nam þa be nihte eall* is a *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from s* clause and it finds itself in a PH sequence, in which *Yware wæs gehaten* is the initial clause (and at the same time the immediately preceding one). The position of the implicit *s/con** SIPH element in this clause, as in the initial one, is occupied by the implicit SIPH element *se*. Therefore, the implicit SIPH elements of both clauses are identical, and moreover they refer back to the same antecedent (i.e. *cyrceweard* 'churchwarden'), and thus the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction *and* is not blocked here.

Below we present the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from io* and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from io*. However, we did not find any examples of these clauses in the ASC, and therefore, we will just provide their theoretical description.

3.5.10. *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from io* clauses

Theoretically speaking, these clauses are ordinary *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clauses but they appear in PH sequences and are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by an implicit *io/con** SIPH element, which in parataxis is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object, while in hypotaxis as an implicit dependent clause connective. Therefore, depending on the approach to this implicit SIPH element the status of the clauses which it introduces changes accordingly. Moreover, the implicit *io/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

3.5.11. *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from io* clauses

As regards *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from io* clauses, theoretically speaking they also are ordinary *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from io* clauses but they form part of PH sequences and are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by an implicit *io/con** SIPH element, which in parataxis functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object, whereas in hypotaxis as an implicit dependent clause connective; the status of the clauses which the implicit SIPH element introduces changes accordingly. Moreover, the implicit *io/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction, whose position is sometimes blocked.

And finally, below we present the sequence variants of *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clauses, namely *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from do* and *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from do*. Since we did not find any examples of these clauses in the ASC either, we will just describe them theoretically.

3.5.12. *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from do* clauses

Theoretically speaking, *PH-siph}[cj=0/[cj=0* from do* clauses are ordinary *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clauses, but they form a part of PH sequences and do not function as the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by an implicit *do/con** SIPH element, which in parataxis functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object, whereas in hypotaxis as an implicit dependent clause connective; the status of the clauses which the SIPH element in question introduces changes accordingly. Moreover, the implicit *io/con** SIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

3.5.13. *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from do* clauses

As to *PH-siph}[0=0/[0=0* from do* clauses, theoretically, they are ordinary *PH-siph}[=0/[0* from do* clauses that occur in PH sequences and at the same time are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced by an implicit *do/con** SIPH element, which in parataxis functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object, while in hypotaxis as an implicit dependent clause connective; the status of the clauses which the SIPH element in question

introduces changes accordingly. The implicit *io/con** SIPH element is moreover immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction, whose position is sometimes blocked.

Having discussed the *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants, we will now move on to the discussion of the range of the ambivalence corridor that they are capable of producing in the ASC. We will first discuss the ambivalence corridor produced by them in the ASC A.

3.5.14. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 3.9 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants:

Table 3.9. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Paratactic approach</td><td colspan="3">Hypotactic approach</td><td rowspan="2">Overall number of clauses</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Unambivalent main clauses</td><td>PH clauses</td><td>total</td><td colspan="2">unambivalent dependent clauses</td><td>PH clauses</td><td>total</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">X</td><td>17</td><td>X + 17</td><td colspan="2">Y</td><td>17</td><td>Y + 17</td><td>X + Y + 17</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8">Word order configurations</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">V2</td><td>XV2 clauses</td><td colspan="2">2</td><td rowspan="2">V2</td><td>XV2 clauses</td><td colspan="2">2</td><td rowspan="7"></td></tr>
<tr><td>SV2 clauses</td><td colspan="2">1</td><td>SV2 clauses</td><td colspan="2">1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">VO word order</td><td colspan="2">2</td><td colspan="2">VO word order</td><td colspan="2">2</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Vo word order</td><td colspan="2">1</td><td colspan="2">Vo word order</td><td colspan="2">1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">OV word order</td><td colspan="2">0</td><td colspan="2">OV word order</td><td colspan="2">0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">oV word order</td><td colspan="2">0</td><td colspan="2">oV word order</td><td colspan="2">0</td></tr>
</table>

We found 17 ambivalent SIPH clauses of this type in the ASC A. It means that if we approach them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 17 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Within these 17 clauses there are 3 V2 word orders, in which 2 are XV2 and 1 is SV2, so the total number of the ASC A main clause V2 word orders increases by 3. As regards the position of the object with respect to the finite verb, within the ambivalent clauses there are 2 VO word order configurations, in which the object is nominal, and 1 VO word order configuration, in which the object is pronominal. This means that the total number of the ASC A VO main clause word orders increases by 3. If we approach the clauses in question from the

hypotactic point of view, we obtain 17 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of dependent clause V2 word orders of the ASC A is enriched by 3 additional V2 word orders, 2 of them being XV2 and one SV2. As to the position of the object with respect to the finite verb, within the ambivalent clauses there are 2 VO word order configurations, in which the object is nominal, and 1 VO word order configuration, in which the object is pronominal, which in turn means that the total number of the ASC A VO dependent clause word orders increases by 3.

And now we will discuss the ambivalence corridor offered by the *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E.

3.5.15. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 3.10 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants:

Table 3.10. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		35	X + 35	Y		35	Y + 35	X + Y + 35
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	28		V2	XV2 clauses	28		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	0		
VO word order		4		VO word order		4		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		0		oV word order		0		

There are 35 ambivalent SIPH clauses of this type in the ASC E. If we approach them from the paratactic point of view, the total number of the ASC E main clauses increases by 35 clauses. Moreover, we obtain 28 additional V2 word orders in the total number of the ASC E main clause V2 word orders; all of the V2 word orders are XV2. We also obtain 4 additional VO word order configurations with a nominal object in the total number of the main clause VO word orders of the ASC E. On the other hand, if we approach all of the

clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses also increases by 35 clauses. Moreover, we obtain 28 additional V2 word orders in the total number of the ASC E dependent clause V2 word orders; all of the V2 word orders are XV2. Furthermore, we obtain 4 additional VO word orders with a nominal object in the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders.

Since we have already discussed all kinds of SIPH clauses, together with their sequence variants, it is time to see what is the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor that they offer together. We will start with the ASC A SIPH clauses.

3.6. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC A SIPH clauses

In Table 3.11 on the following page we present the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor offered by the ASC A SIPH clauses. Altogether there are 77 SIPH clauses in the ASC A. If they are approached from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 77 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Moreover, the total number of the ASC A main clause V2 word orders increases by 50 V2 word orders out of which 41 are SV2 and 9 are XV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, in the total number of the ASC A main clause VO and OV word order configurations there are 7 additional VO word orders (6 with a nominal object and 1 with a pronominal one) and 7 additional OV word orders (1 with a nominal object and 6 with a pronominal one). On the other hand, if the SIPH clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses grows by 77 additional dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders increases by 20 V2 clauses, out of which 15 are SV2 and 5 are XV2. As far as the position of the object with respect to the verb is concerned, in the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO and OV word orders there are 7 additional VO word orders (6 with a nominal object and 1 with a pronominal one) and 2 additional OV word orders (1 with a nominal object and 1 with a pronominal one). It can be observed that the most active SIPH element in the ASC A is the explicit *s/con** element, which introduces 33 SIPH clauses. In the second place is the explicit *x/con** SIPH element and it introduces 22 SIPH clauses. In the third place are the implicit *0/0** SIPH elements and they introduce 17 SIPH clauses. In the fourth place is the explicit *io/con** SIPH element, introducing 3 SIPH clauses, and in the fifth place is the explicit *do/con** SIPH element, which introduces

Table 3.11. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC A SIPH clauses

Paratactic approach							Hypotactic approach						
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses		total			unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses		total		
X		77		X + 77			Y		77		Y + 77		
Word order configurations													
PH clauses		total	***0/0****	***x/con****	***s/con****	***io/con****	***do/con****	PH clauses		total	***0/0****	***x/con****	***s/con****	***io/con****	***do/con****
		77	**17**	**22**	**33**	**3**	**2**			**77**	**17**	**22**	**33**	**3**	**2**
V2	XV2 clauses	**9**	2	4	0	3	0	V2	XV2 clauses	**5**	2	1	2	0	0
	SV2 clauses	**41**	1	10	30	0	0		SV2 clauses	**15**	1	12	0	0	2
VO word order		**6**	2	0	4	0	0	VO word order		**6**	2	0	4	0	0
Vo word order		**1**	1	0	0	0	0	Vo word order		**1**	1	0	0	0	0
OV word order		**1**	0	0	1	0	0	OV word order		**1**	0	0	1	0	0
oV word order		**6**	0	1	0	3	2	oV word order		**1**	0	1	0	0	0

2 SIPH clauses. Table 3.12 contains the percentages of the participation of the individual SIPH elements in the ASC A SIPH clauses:

Table 3.12. Participation of explicit and implicit SIPH elements in the ASC A SIPH clauses

PH clauses	Types of SIPH elements					
	Total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	77	17	22	33	3	2
Per cent	100.00	22.07	28.57	42.85	3.89	2.59

As regards the 17 implicit SIPH elements of the ASC A, we can also demonstrate what is their participation in the creation of *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses:

Table 3.13. Participation of implicit SIPH elements in the ASC A *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses

PH-siph}[=0/[0* clauses	Types of SIPH elements				
	Total	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	17	4	13	0	0
Per cent	100.00	23.52	76.47	0.00	0.00

We can see that the implicit *s/con** SIPH element again takes the lead in the creation of SIPH clauses. In the second place is the implicit *x/con** SIPH element, and there are no implicit *io/con** or *do/con** SIPH elements in the *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses.

We will now move on to the discussion of the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for all of the ASC E SIPH clauses.

3.7. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E SIPH clauses

Table 3.14 presents the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E SIPH clauses. In the ASC E there are 263 SIPH clauses altogether. If they are approached from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 263 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. The total number of the ASC E main clause V2 word orders increases by 196 V2 word orders, out of which 147 are SV2 and 49 are XV2. As far as the position of the object with respect to the verb is concerned, in the total number of the ASC E main clause VO and OV word order configurations there are 20 additional VO word orders, in which 18 objects are nominal and 2 are pronominal. Moreover, there are 30 additional OV word orders, in which

Table 3.14. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E SIPH clauses

Paratactic approach								Hypotactic approach							
Unambivalent main clauses			PH clauses		total			unambivalent dependent clauses			PH clauses		total		
X			263		X + 263			Y			263		Y + 263		
Word order configurations															
PH clauses		total	***0/0****	***x/con****	***s/con****	***io/con****	***do/con****	PH clauses		total	***0/0****	***x/con****	***s/con****	***io/con****	***do/con****
		263	**35**	**60**	**150**	**6**	**12**			**263**	**35**	**60**	**150**	**6**	**12**
V2	XV2 clauses	**49**	28	15	0	5	1	V2	XV2 clauses	**41**	28	6	7	0	0
	SV2 clauses	**147**	0	6	141	0	0		SV2 clauses	**32**	0	25	0	1	6
VO word order		**18**	4	6	6	1	1	VO word order		**18**	4	6	6	1	1
Vo word order		**2**	0	1	1	0	0	Vo word order		**1**	0	0	1	0	0
OV word order		**2**	0	2	0	0	0	OV word order		**2**	0	2	0	0	0
oV word order		**28**	0	8	2	6	12	oV word order		**10**	0	8	2	0	0

2 objects are nominal and 28 are pronominal. On the other hand, if the SIPH clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses increases by 263 additional dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders increases by 73 V2 word orders, out of which 32 are SV2 and 41 are XV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, in the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO and OV word orders there are 19 additional VO word orders (18 with a nominal object and 1 with a pronominal one) and 12 additional OV word orders (2 with a nominal object and 10 with a pronominal one). It can be observed that the most active SIPH element in the ASC E, as in the ASC A, is the explicit *s/con** element, which introduces 150 SIPH clauses. In the second place is the explicit *x/con** element and it introduces 60 SIPH clauses. In the third place are the implicit *0/0** elements and they introduce 35 SIPH clauses. In the fourth place is the explicit *do/con** element, which introduces 12 SIPH clauses, and in the fifth place is the explicit *io/con** element, which introduces 6 SIPH clauses. Table 3.15 contains the percentages of the participation of the individual SIPH elements in the ASC E SIPH clauses:

Table 3.15. Participation of explicit and implicit SIPH elements in all of the ASC E SIPH clauses

PH clauses	Types of SIPH elements					
	total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	263	35	60	150	6	12
Per cent	100.00	13.30	22.81	57.03	2.28	4.56

As far as the 35 SIPH clauses with implicit *0/0** SIPH elements are concerned, we can also demonstrate which element is the most active one there:

Table 3.16. Participation of implicit SIPH elements in the ASC E *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses

PH-siph}[=0/[0* clauses	Types of SIPH elements				
	total	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	35	2	33	0	0
Per cent	100.00	5.71	94.28	0.00	0.00

As can be seen, the implicit *s/con** SIPH element takes the lead in the creation of SIPH clauses. In the second place is the implicit *x/con** SIPH element. Moreover, there are no implicit *io/con** or *do/con** SIPH elements in the ASC E *PH-siph}[=0/[0** clauses.

It should be remembered that in our analysis we discuss only the maximum numbers of main and dependent clauses that can be obtained from PH clauses. In other words, we treat all of the clauses either as main or as dependent in

order to observe the maximum span of the ambivalence corridor that they offer. Afterwards we compare the results and examine the influence of the PH clauses upon the general state of the main clause and of the dependent clause word orders of a given text.

We will now move on to the discussion of *Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis* (i.e. *MIPH-taxis* or *Para-Hypotaxis 2*).

Chapter 4

Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

As we said in Chapter 2, clauses of *Mobile Intrinsic Para-Hypotaxis* become dependent in hypotaxis and the explicit/implicit *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** and *do/con** MIPH elements introducing them function as explicit/implicit dependent clause connectives. In parataxis, however, they become main clauses and the very same explicit/implicit *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** and *do/con** MIPH elements move abstractly to the final position of the clauses immediately preceding[1] the MIPH clauses in question. As a result, *do/con** MIPH elements function in them as ordinary explicit/implicit pronominal adverbials, subjects, indirect objects, and direct objects, respectively. Because of this abstract movement of the MIPH elements, unlike in SIPH-taxis, in MIPH-taxis it is necessary to take into account two clauses, namely the MIPH clause and the immediately preceding one, in the analysis of word order configurations. It results from the fact that, depending on whether we consider MIPH elements from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view, they appear once in the immediately preceding clauses (while in parataxis) and once in the MIPH clauses themselves (while in hypotaxis).[2] In other words, it is necessary to take into account the two clauses in question because, unlike in SIPH-taxis, a change in the status of

[1] The immediately preceding clause can sometimes be a PH clause when a MIPH clause finds itself in a PH sequence.

[2] Unlike a SIPH element, a MIPH element can go to the final position of the immediately preceding clause and function in it as an ordinary pronominal adverbial, pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, or pronominal indirect object in parataxis because usually it is then the only adverbial (of manner, place, time, etc., and often the only adverbial at all), the only subject, the only direct object or the only indirect object, respectively, in that clause, and therefore it can easily occupy the empty adverbial position, the empty subject position, the empty direct object position or the empty indirect object position, respectively.

MIPH clauses, and that of the corresponding MIPH elements together with it, also affects the word order of the immediately preceding clauses.

We will now discuss various types of MIPH clauses and we will start with the *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses.

4.1. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses

*PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses are the ones that are introduced/preceded by an explicit *x/con** MIPH element, which can be approached from two different points of view. If approached from the paratactic point of view, the *x/con** MIPH element functions as an ordinary pronominal adverbial that occupies the final position of the clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question. In this way the MIPH element precedes the MIPH clause and the MIPH clause in turn becomes main. On the other hand, if approached from the hypotactic point of view, the *x/con** MIPH element functions as a dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause in question, which in hypotaxis becomes dependent and immediately follows the clause at the end of which the MIPH element functions as an ordinary adverbial while in parataxis. In this way the *x/con** MIPH element goes from one clause to another, namely in paratactic relation between the two clauses involved it is the final element (ordinary pronominal adverbial) of the first clause, while in hypotaxis it is the first element (dependent clause connective) of the second clause. A direct consequence of this situation is that in parataxis the first clause will gain one more element *x* at the end (an ordinary pronominal adverbial), whereas in hypotaxis it will lose this element because it will serve as a dependent clause connective introducing the following MIPH clause, in this case treated as dependent;[3] this fact is automatically reflected in the annotation pattern.

Now we will have a look at some examples of *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses that we found in the ASC. We will start the discussion with clauses in which the *x/con** MIPH element is *forþan þet*.[4] We can distinguish two types of such clauses. In the first type the MIPH element *forþan þet* refers back to the information preceding it and we can call this phenomenon *retrospective reason*. The following example illustrates it:

---

[3] In order for this phenomenon to happen visibly, the first clause needs to be explicit and the second clause needs to be an initial *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clause, or a sequence *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clause in which the position of the coordinating conjunction is blocked. Otherwise, the phenomenon is not visible and we can only talk about it in abstract terms.

[4] This element had different variants in OE, such as for example *forþon*, *forþæm*, etc.

[015500 (616.4)E]
Ða mynte Laurentius þe ða wæs ercebiscop on Cænt þet he wolde suþ ofer se & þet eall forlæton, ac him com to on niht se apostol Petrus & hine hetelice swang ***forþan þet*** *he wolda swa þa Godes hyrde forleton,… .*
H-miph+(con*)+s+V+X+DO+inf+,
PH-miph}=x]/[con*
…+x+,P-miph+(=)+s+V+X+DO+inf+,
H-miph 'Then Laurentius, who was archbishop in Kent, meant to depart southward over sea, and abandon everything. But there came to him in the night the apostle Peter, and severely chastised him, **because** he would so desert the flock of God… .'
P-miph 'Then Laurentius, who was archbishop in Kent, meant to depart southward over sea, and abandon everything. But there came to him in the night the apostle Peter, and severely chastised him **for that;** he would so desert the flock of God… .'

Roughly speaking, in order to signal that *forþan þet* in parataxis refers back to the information given before (i.e. *he wolde suþ ofer se & þet eall forlæton*), we can employ an intonation pattern that would signal that the MIPH element in question behaves as if it occupied the final position of the clause *& hine hetelice swang…* and as if there were no other clauses after this clause. In hypotaxis, the fact that the MIPH element refers back to the previous information is blurred because a dependent clause connective is not as expressive as an ordinary pronominal adverbial from which it emerged. The intonation pattern here indicates that the *x/con** MIPH element is a dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause *he wolda swa þa Godes hyrde forleton* treated as dependent. In other words, the intonation pattern incorporates the *x/con** MIPH element into the MIPH clause treated as dependent. In the second type of clauses the *x/con** MIPH element *forþan þet* refers to the information anticipated by it and we can call this phenomenon *prospective reason*. Below we provide three examples that illustrate that:

[020800 (654.7)E]
And hi swa diden & nama hit gauen Medeshamstede, ***forþan þet*** *ðær is an wæl þe is gehaten Medeswæl,…*
H-miph+(con*)+X+V+S+,
PH-miph}=x]/[con*
…+x+,P-miph+(=)+X+V+S+,
H-miph 'And they did so, and gave it the name of Medhamsted, **because** there is a well there, called Meadswell.'
P-miph 'And they did so, and gave it the name of Medhamsted **for the following reason**: there is a well there, called Meadswell.'

[043600 (893.30)A]
Þa he þa wæs þiderweardes, & sio oþeru fierd wæs hamweardes, & ða Deniscan sæton þær behindan ***forþæm*** *hiora cyning wæs gewundod on þæm gefeohte þæt hi hine ne mehton ferian,…*
H-miph+(con*)+S+V+papt+X+,
PH-miph}=x]/[con*
…+x+,P-miph+(=)+S+V+papt+X+,
H-miph 'But while he was advancing thitherwards, the other force was returning homewards. The Danes, however, still remained behind; **for** their king was wounded in the fight, so that they could not carry him.'
P-miph 'But while he was advancing thitherwards, the other force was returning homewards. The Danes, however, still remained behind **for the following reason:** their king was wounded in the fight, so that they could not carry him.'

[149800 (1095.17)E]
Heræfter to Pentecosten wæs se cyng on Windlesoran & ealle his witan mid him butan þam eorle of Norðhymbran ***forþam*** *se cyng him naþer nolde ne gislas syllan ne uppon trywðan geunnon þet he mid griðe cumon moste & faran.*
H-miph+(con*)+S+io+X+V+DO+inf+X+,
PH-miph}=x]/[con*
…+x+,P-miph+(=)+S+io+X+V+DO+inf+X+,
H-miph 'Hereafter at Pentecost was the king at Windsor, and all his council with him, except the Earl of Northumberland, **for** the king would neither give him hostages, nor own upon truth, that he might come and go with security.'
P-miph 'Hereafter at Pentecost was the king at Windsor, and all his council with him, except the Earl of Northumberland **for the following reason**: the king would neither give him hostages, nor own upon truth, that he might come and go with security.'

In this case it is also necessary to employ a proper intonation pattern in order to indicate the relations between the clauses involved. Roughly speaking, the notion of prospective reason can only clearly be seen in parataxis, where we can employ an uninterrupted intonation pattern and put a strong emphasis on the *x/con** MIPH element (i.e. *forþan þet* in the first example, *forþæm* in the second example, and *forþam* in the third example), the way it signals that it anticipates the information that follows. Then, we can pause for a second before mentioning the awaited information. The next clause should be pronounced as if it were another main clause in a sequence of main clauses, but at the same time the intonation should signal that the clause is exactly the anticipated information,

and thus the explanation of the cause. In hypotaxis, however, the intonation pattern will be similar to the hypotactic pattern of the clauses of the first type. Therefore, the distinction between the first and the second type of clauses with respect to retrospective and prospective reason disappears in hypotaxis, although the distinction is inherently present.

The *x/con** MIPH elements *forþan þet*, *forði þet*, *forþæm, forði* and some other variants, can be regarded as ambivalent because, on the one hand, they can be interpreted as dependent clause connectives and, on the other hand, as ordinary pronominal adverbials without a change in form; the status of the MIPH clauses they introduce/precede changes accordingly. It is because they were not yet fully grammaticalised in the ASC and they could appear as ordinary adverbials without being MIPH elements, as can be seen in the following examples:

[147700 (1094.14)E]
*…ac he nolde þæs geþafa beon ne eac þa forewarde healdan, & **forþam** hi þa mid mycelon unsehte tocyrdon.*
'…but he would not confess this, nor even adhere to the treaty, and **for this reason** they parted with much dissatisfaction.'

[149400 (1095.8)E]
*And þa to Eastran heold se cyng his hired on Winceastre; & se eorl Rodbeard of Norðhymbran nolde to hirede cuman, & se cyng **forðan** wearð wið hine swiðe astyrod &…*
'And then at Easter held the king his court in Winchester; and the Earl Robert of Northumberland would not come to court. And the king was much stirred to anger with him **for this**, and… .'

[146200 (1093.14)E]
*Ac þa ða he to þam cynge com, ne mihte he beon weorðe naðer ne ure cynges spæce ne þæra forewarde þe him ær behatene wæron, & **forþi** hi þa mid mycclon unsehte tohwurfon, & se cyng Melcolm ham to Scotlande gewænde.*
'But when he came to the king, he could not be considered worthy either of our king's speech, or of the conditions that were formerly promised to him, and **for this reason** they parted with great dissatisfaction, and the King Malcolm returned to Scotland.'

[187600 (1127.20)E]
*Siððen þa nam he þes kynges wifes swuster of France to wife, & **forþi** iæf se kyng him þone eorldom of Flandres.*
'Afterwards took he to wife the sister of the king's wife of France, and **for this reason** the king gave him the earldom of Flanders.'

[149800 (1095.17)E]
Heræfter to Pentecosten wæs se cyng on Windlesoran & ealle his witan mid him butan þam eorle of Norðhymbran, forþam se cyng him naþer nolde ne gislas syllan ne uppon trywðan geunnon þet he mid griðe cumon moste & faran. & se cyng ***forþi*** *his fyrde bead & uppon þone eorl to Norðhymbran for,…*
'Hereafter at Pentecost was the king at Windsor, and all his council with him, except the Earl of Northumberland; for the king would neither give him hostages, nor own upon truth, that he might come and go with security. And the king **therefore** ordered his army, and went against the earl to Northumberland,…'

Here the function of *forþam*, *forðan* and *forði* as dependent clause connectives is blocked by the fact that the clauses in which they appear are not sequence PH clauses although the explicit coordinating conjunction *and* is present here. Rissanen (2012b: 135), on the basis of *for þam*, presents a hypothetical development of subordinators from adverbs and adverbial prepositional phrases:

a. (*) *Ic eom nacod. Ic ondræde me* ***for ðam****.*
'I am naked. I fear me for that.'
'I am naked. I am afraid therefore.'
b. (*) *Ic ondræde me* ***for ðam****: ic eom nacod.*
'I fear me for that: I am naked.'
'I am afraid therefore: I am naked.'
c. (*) *Ic ondræde me* ***for ðam*** *ic eom nacod.*
'I fear me for that I am naked.'
'I am afraid therefore/because I am naked.'
d. *ic ondræde me* ***for ðam ðe*** *ic eom nacod.* (*Hept.Gen. 3 AELFOLD HC*)
'I fear me for that I am naked.'
'I am afraid for that reason that/because I am naked.'

Rissanen claims that in the hypothetical examples (a) and (b) it is obvious that we are dealing with an adverbial use of *for ðam* 'therefore' and thus he uses the full stop or colon to indicate a pause between the two clauses. However, if the pause disappears in allegro speech as presented in (c), the adverbial function of *for ðam* becomes less clear and even misinterpretation is possible, which would go as follows: 'I am afraid: therefore I am naked.' In a recorded example from Ælfrician text, namely in (d), the problem has been solved by means of the particle *þe*, which evidently points to the subordinator function of the connective *for ðam.* Rissanen further says that "This suggestion for one possible line of development from adverb to subordinator is, of course,

simplified but it may illustrate the important role of the particle, either *þe* or *þæt*, making the subordinator use of an adverbial connective in Old English. One of the most interesting Old English developments in the area of adverbial subordinators was, indeed, the gradual increase of these particles, particularly *þe*" (p. 136). He also indicates that the choice between *þe* or *þæt* following the adverbial connective and making it as a subordinator was not a random one.

Coming back to *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses, their explicit *x/con** MIPH element can also be represented by the element *swa þæt*, as shown in the two examples below:

> [061200 (1001.19)A]
> *& hy foran þa þanon to Exan muðan,* ***swa þæt*** *hy asettan him upp on ænne sið oð hy coman to Peonho, &…*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+V+rf+X+,
> PH-miph}=x]/[con*
> …+x+,P-miph+(=)+s+V+rf+X+,
> H-miph 'And they proceeded thence towards Exmouth, **so that** they marched at once till they came to Pin-hoo, and … .'
> P-miph 'And they proceeded thence towards Exmouth **in the following manner**: they marched at once till they came to Pin-hoo, and… .'
>
> [142800 (1089.3)E]
> *…& wæs swiðe lætsum gear on corne & on ælces cynnes wæstmum* ***swa þet*** *manig men ræpon heora corn onbutan Martines mæssan & gyt lator.*
> H-miph+(con*)+S+V+DO+X+,
> PH-miph}=x]/[con*
> …+x+,P-miph+(=)+S+V+DO+X+,
> H-miph '…and it was a very late year in corn, and in every kind of fruits, **so that** many men reaped their corn about Martinmas, and yet later.'
> P-miph '…and it was a very late year in corn, and in every kind of fruits, **in the following way**: many men reaped their corn about Martinmas, and yet later.'

We will now move on to the discussion of the sequence variants of *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses, namely *PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** and *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con**.

4.1.1. *PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** clauses

*PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses with the difference that they appear in PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an explicit *x/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an explicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** clause, which then becomes dependent, and it has the same antecedent as a PH element (basically an *x/con** MIPH element) that appears earlier on in a PH sequence. In parataxis, on the other hand, it functions as an explicit ordinary pronominal adverbial which appears in the final position of an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, treated as main this time, in which it functions as an explicit dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. Moreover, in these clauses the *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. We found only one example of this type of clauses in the ASC:[5]

> [188500 (1127.42)E]
> *…& se kyng hit him iætte **forði þet** he wæs his mæi, **& forþi þet** he wæs an hæfod ða að to swerene &…*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+V+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con*
> P-miph+(=)+s+V+X+,
> H-miph '…and the king procured it for him, **because** he was his relation, **and because** he was the principal person to make oath and… .'
> P-miph '…and the king procured it for him **for the following reason**: he was his relation, **and for the following reason**: he was the principal person to make oath and… .'

[5] As a matter of fact in this example the explicit *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit clause (at the end of which it appears as an ordinary pronominal adverbial while in parataxis, and which is identical with the clause *se kyng hit him iætte* in the quoted example) which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. Therefore, it is the implicit clause that is immediately preceded by the coordinating conjunction and not the MIPH element in question. In other words, the explicit *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by a coordinating conjunction followed by an implicit clause at the end of which it appears as an ordinary pronominal adverbial while in parataxis. Nevertheless, when in the discussion of sequence MIPH clauses we say that a given explicit/implicit MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction, or by an implicit clause, what we mean is that it is immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction followed by an implicit clause; it does not refer to the situation when the use of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction is blocked, in which case the existence of an implicit clause preceding the MIPH element is out of the question.

The implicit clause that occurs between the explicit coordinating conjunction *and* and the explicit *x/con** MIPH element *forði þet* is *se kyng hit him iætte*.

We also found an example which we unfortunately could not classify as a *PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** clause because it seems to be unambivalent:

> [198900 (1137.1)E]
> *Ðis gære for þe king Stephne ofer sæ to Normandi & ther wes underfangen,* ***forþi ðat*** *hi uuenden ðat he sculde ben alsuic alse the eom wes,* ***& for*** *he hadde get his tresor, ac he todeld it & scatered sotlice.*
> 'This year went the King Stephen over sea to Normandy, and there was received, **for that** they concluded that he should be all such as the uncle was, and **for** he had got his treasure, but he dealed it out, and scattered it foolishly.'

In this example the explicit coordinating conjunction *and* before the clause *& for he hadde get his tresor…* is followed by the element *for* whose form is not identical with the element *forþi ðat* which appears in the clause *forþi ðat hi uuenden…*, although it also has the meaning of *prospective reason* and it is as if a continuation of the element *forþi ðat*. Moreover, unlike *forþi ðat*, it cannot appear at the end of a clause in parataxis without the necessity of introducing a dependent clause after it, in which case it functions as a dependent clause connective and not as an ordinary pronominal adverbial. Therefore, we cannot put this example on the list of *PH-miph}cj=x]/[cj=con** clauses because the element *for* is a dependent clause connective here. Moreover, if *for* is a dependent clause connective, it cannot be used for the first time after an explicit coordinating conjunction, and in this situation we should most likely interpret the element *forþi ðat* of the clause *forþi ðat hi uuenden…* as a dependent clause connective introducing a sequence of unambivalent dependent clauses.

And now we will move on to the second type of the sequence variants of *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses, namely to *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con**.

4.1.2. *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** clauses

These clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses which appear in PH sequences but do not function as the initial PH clauses of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an explicit *x/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is treated as an explicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** clause, whereas in parataxis it functions as an explicit ordinary pronominal adverbial which appears in the final position of

an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which then becomes main. Moreover, in this type of clauses the explicit *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction; as a matter of fact the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked for example when the MIPH element in question is not a continuation of the PH element of the initial, an intermediate, or the immediately preceding clause in a given PH sequence because it is selected by a different verb and refers to something else. Below we present an example of *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** clauses:

> [040800 (887.7)A]
> *Þæt wæs þeah mid Earnulfes geþafunge, & hi cuędon **þæt** hie þæt to his honda healdan sceoldon **forþæm** hira nan næs on fedrenhealfe to geboren buton him anum.*
> H-miph+(con*)+S+V+X+papt+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con*
> P-miph+(=)+S+V+X+papt+X+,
> H-miph 'This, however, was done with the consent of Arnulf; and they agreed **that** they should hold in subjection to him, **because** none of them had by birth any claim on the father's side, except him alone.'
> P-miph 'This, however, was done with the consent of Arnulf; and they agreed **the following**: they should hold in subjection to him **for the following reason**: none of them had by birth any claim on the father's side, except him alone.'

In this example the clause *forþæm hira nan næs on fedrenhealfe to geboren buton him anum* is a sequence *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** clause. In this clause the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction *and* immediately before the *x/con** MIPH element *forþæm* is blocked because the initial PH clause (a *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clause), namely *hie þæt to his honda healdan sceoldon*, which at the same time is the immediately preceding one, is introduced/preceded by the PH element *þet*, which in fact is a *do/con** MIPH element. In this sense the PH element of the sequence PH clause in question is not a continuation of the PH element of the immediately preceding PH clause. Unfortunately, we did not find any examples of *PH-miph}0=x]/[0=con** clauses in which the use of an implicit coordinating conjunction were not blocked.

Having discussed *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants, we will now discuss the ambivalence corridor that they offer. We will start with the ASC A.

4.1.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 4.1 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC A:

Table 4.1. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		10	X + 10	Y		10	Y + 10	X + Y + 10
Word order configurations								
V2*	XV2 clauses	1		V2	XV2 clauses	1		
	SV2 clauses	5			SV2 clauses	5		
VO word order		3		VO word order		3		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		1		OV word order		1		
oV word order		1		oV word order		1		

* The ASC V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to MIPH clauses do not differ from the V2 word orders in the hypotactic approach to these clauses because in our analysis we do not consider MIPH elements as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis; i.e. when the MIPH elements become dependent clause connectives. However, if we consider them as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis, then the word orders of the PH clauses, depending on the approach to them (paratactic or hypotactic), differs in terms of the V2 phenomenon; i.e. there would be more V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to the clauses.

In the ASC A there are 10 ambivalent MIPH clauses of this type. When we analyse them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 10 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. In the total number of the main clause V2 word orders we obtain 6 additional V2 word orders, out of which 5 are SV2 and 1 is XV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, we obtain 3 additional VO word orders, in which the object is nominal, and 2 additional OV word orders, in which 1 object is nominal and 1 object is pronominal. Furthermore, unlike a *PH-siph} [=x/[con** SIPH clause, if a *PH-miph}=x]/[con** MIPH clause is approached from the paratactic point of view, the clause which immediately precedes it, no matter if it is an unambivalent main clause or an ambivalent PH clause in a PH sequence, gains an additional pronominal adverbial in its final position. This, in turn, means that in the paratactic approach to the MIPH clauses in question we obtain 10 additional pronominal adverbials in the clauses (both explicit and implicit) immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question.

However, this number is only theoretical because we have to subtract from it the ordinary pronominal adverbials (both explicit and implicit) which come from sequence *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses in which the position of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction is not blocked, for the reason that here the *x/con** MIPH elements exist only at the end of implicit clauses immediately preceding them. Moreover, from this number we also need to subtract explicit ordinary pronominal adverbials which come from sequence *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses in which the position of the explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction is blocked because in parataxis the *x/con** MIPH elements belong to the initial, intermediate, or the immediately preceding PH clauses, whose word orders are counted when the different kinds of these clauses are discussed. In the light of this, out of the 10 additional pronominal adverbials in question only those will count that in parataxis become part of explicit unambivalent main clauses immediately preceding initial *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses. However, we are not going to perform the calculations here because we are basically concerned with VO, OV, and V2 word order configurations and the subtraction has no influence upon these word orders. On the other hand, when we approach the clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, we obtain 10 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. In the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders we obtain 6 additional V2 clauses, out of which 5 are SV2 and 1 is XV2. As far as the position of the object with respect to the verb is concerned, we obtain 3 additional VO word orders, in which the objects are nominal, and 2 additional OV word orders, in which 1 object is pronominal and 1 is nominal. Moreover, the clauses (both explicit and implicit) immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question lose the 10 ordinary pronominal adverbials because in hypotaxis they become explicit/implicit dependent clause connectives; as a matter of fact only those ordinary pronominal adverbials will be lost here that in hypotaxis disappear from explicit unambivalent main clauses immediately preceding initial *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses.

And now we will discuss the ambivalence corridor offered by the *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E.

4.1.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 4.2 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor created by the *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E:

Table 4.2. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		50	X + 50	Y		50	Y + 50	X + Y + 50
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	9		V2	XV2 clauses	9		
	SV2 clauses	31			SV2 clauses	31		
VO word order		15		VO word order		15		
Vo word order		9		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		4		OV word order		4		
oV word order		7		oV word order		7		

In the ASC E there are 50 MIPH clauses of this type. It means that if we approach them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 50 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. In these clauses there are 40 additional V2 word orders (out of which 9 are XV2 and 31 are SV2) for the total number of the main clause V2 word orders of the ASC E. As far as the position of the object with respect to the finite verb is concerned, in the total number of the VO and OV word order configurations of the ASC E there are 24 additional VO word order configurations, 15 with a nominal object and 9 with a pronominal one, and 11 OV word order configurations, in which 4 have a nominal object and 7 have a pronominal object. Moreover, the clauses (both explicit and implicit) immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question gain 50 additional ordinary pronominal adverbials at the end; however, this number is only theoretical due to the same reasons given for the ASC A in the section above. On the other hand, if we analyse the ambivalent MIPH clauses in question from the point of view of hypotaxis, we obtain 50 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. In these clauses there are 40 additional V2 word orders (out of which 9 are XV2 and 31 are SV2) for the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders of the ASC E. As regards the position of the object with respect to the finite verb, in the total number of the VO and OV word order configurations of the ASC E there are 15 additional VO word order configurations with a nominal object and 11 OV word order configurations, out of which 4 have a nominal object and 7 have a pronominal object. Moreover, the clauses (both explicit and implicit) immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question lose 50 additional ordinary pronominal adverbials, which would then function as dependent clause connectives; this number is, however, again theoretical, hypothetical.

And now we will discuss another type of MIPH clauses, namely *PH-miph}=s]/[con**.

4.2. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses

*PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses are introduced/preceded by an explicit *s/con** MIPH element, which can be looked at from two points of view. On the one hand, if looked at from the paratactic point of view it functions as an explicit ordinary pronominal subject occupying the final position of the clause immediately preceding a *PH-miph}=s]/[con** MIPH clause, which in parataxis becomes a main clause. On the other hand, if looked at from the hypotactic point of view, the *s/con** MIPH element functions as a dependent clause connective introducing the same MIPH clause, which in hypotaxis becomes dependent; this dependent clause immediately follows the clause at the end of which the *s/con** MIPH element functions as an ordinary pronominal subject in parataxis. In other words, depending on the approach, the *s/con** MIPH element goes from one clause to another and the MIPH clause, which it introduces in hypotaxis and precedes in parataxis, changes its status accordingly. An immediate consequence of the movement of the *s/con** MIPH element is that in parataxis the immediately preceding clause obtains a pronominal subject in its final position, which at the same time is the only subject in this particular clause, whereas in hypotaxis the same clause loses this MIPH element because then it serves as a dependent clause connective introducing the following MIPH clause. We found only three examples of this type of clauses in the ASC, one in the ASC A and two in the ASC E:

[063400 (1070.18)A]
*Þa sona æfter þysan belamp **þæt** se arcebiscop Landfranc ferde to Rome & Thomas forðmid.*
H-miph+(con*)+S+V+X+,
PH-miph}=s]/[con*
…+s+,P-miph+(=)+S+V+X+,
H-miph ‘Soon after this, it happened **that** the Archbishop Landfranc went to Rome, and Thomas with him.’
P-miph ‘Soon after this happened **that** (i.e. the following thing): the Archbishop Landfranc went to Rome, and Thomas with him.’

[138300 (1086.132)E]
*Eac wearð on Ispanie **þet** þa hæðenan men foran & hergodan uppon þam Cristenan mannan & mycel abegdan to heora anwealde;*
H-miph+(con*)+S+V+,
PH-miph}=s]/[con*
…+s+,P-miph+(=)+S+V+,

H-miph ‘It happened also in Spain **that** the heathens went and made inroads upon the Christians, and reduced much of the country to their dominion.’
P-miph ‘In Spain also happened **that** (i.e. the following thing): the heathens went and made inroads upon the Christians, and reduced much of the country to their dominion.’

[150600 (1095.35)E]
*<Onmang> þison wearð þam cynge cuð **þet** þa wylisce men on Wealon sumne castel heafdon tobroken Muntgumni hatte & Hugon eorles menn ofslagene þe hine healdon sceoldan.*
H-miph+(con*)+S+DO+V+papt+,
PH-miph}=s]/[con*
…+s+,P-miph+(=)+S+DO+V+papt+,
H-miph ‘Among these things it was made known to the king **that** the Welshmen in Wales had broken into a castle called Montgomery, and slain the men of Earl Hugo that should have held it.’
P-miph ‘Among these things it was made known to the king **that** (i.e. the following thing): the Welshmen in Wales had broken into a castle called Montgomery, and slain the men of Earl Hugo that should have held it.’

If approached from the parataxis point of view, the *s/con** MIPH element *þet* functions as a pronominal subject of the verbs *belamp*, *wearð* and *wearð … cuð* in the main clauses *Þa sona æfter þysan belamp þæt*, *Eac wearð on Ispanie þet* and *<Onmang> þison wearð þam cynge cuð þet*, respectively. The immediately following MIPH clauses, namely *se arcebiscop Landfranc ferde to Rome*, *þa hæðenan men foran* and *þa wylisce men on Wealon sumne castel heafdon tobroken*, function as ordinary main clauses then and they start with the subject *se arcebiscop Landfranc…*, *þa hæðenan men…* and *þa wylisce men on Wealon…* respectively. On the other hand, in hypotaxis the *s/con** MIPH element *þet* becomes a dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clauses in question, which then become dependent. Both in hypotaxis and in parataxis we can employ an intonation pattern that would signal the relation between the clauses neighbouring each other. Although the clauses in the above examples rather seem to be conjoined hypotactically, nevertheless there is some shade of ambiguity about them because the *s/con** MIPH element *þet* in parataxis is the only subject of the immediately preceding clauses, at the end of which it appears, and the immediately following MIPH clauses have their own subjects. However, if in parataxis such immediately preceding clauses place the element *þet* in their final position, and at the same time contain an explicit subject, there is no doubt that the element *þet* is a dependent clause

connective introducing the immediately following dependent clauses, as in the following example:

> [141300 (1087.50)E]
> *…ac **hit** wearð þam cynge cuð **þet** se biscop wæs afaren to ðam castele a Pefenesea.*
> '…but **it** was made known to the king **that** the bishop was gone to the castle at Pevensea.'

In this example the function of the element *þet* as an ordinary pronominal subject in the clause *ac hit wearð þam cynge cuð þet* is blocked by the impersonal pronominal subject *hit*, as a correctly constructed sentence cannot have two subjects.

And now we will discuss the two sequence variants of *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses, namely *PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con** and *PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con**.

4.2.1. *PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses. Theoretically speaking, a *PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con** clause is an ordinary *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clause which forms part of a PH sequence but does not function as the initial clause of this sequence. It is introduced/preceded by an explicit *s/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this element is interpreted as a dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause in question, while in parataxis it functions as an ordinary pronominal subject occupying the final position of an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question. Therefore, depending on the approach to the *s/con** MIPH element, the status of the MIPH clause it introduces/precedes changes accordingly, and vice versa. Moreover, in a *PH-miph}cj=s]/[cj=con** clause the *s/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

4.2.2. *PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con** clauses

A *PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con** clause is an ordinary *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clause which occurs in a PH sequence but does not function as the initial clause of this sequence. It is introduced/preceded by an explicit *s/con** MIPH element.

In hypotaxis this element is interpreted as a dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause in question, which is then treated as dependent, whereas in parataxis it functions as an ordinary pronominal subject occupying the final position of an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question (then treated as a main clause) in which it functions as a dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. Moreover, in a *PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con** clause the *s/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction; the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is, however, sometimes blocked.

We found only one example of this type of MIPH clauses in the ASC, and more specifically in the ASC E:

> [154100 (1097.21)E]
> *Sona æfter þyson se arcebiscop Ansealm of Cantwarbyrig leafe æt þam cynge nam, þeah hit þam cynge ungewill wære þæs þe men leton, & ofer sæ for,* ***forþam*** *him þuhte* ***þet*** *man on þisne þeodan lytel æfter rihte & æfter his dyhte dyde.*
> H-miph+(con*)+S+X+DO+X+V+,
> Seq PH-miph}0=s]/[0=con*
> P-miph+(=)+S+X+DO+X+V+,
> H-miph 'Soon after this Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury obtained leave of the king (though it was contrary to the wishes of the king, as men supposed), and went over sea, **because** he thought **that** men in this country did little according to right and after his instruction.'
> P-miph 'Soon after this Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury obtained leave of the king (though it was contrary to the wishes of the king, as men supposed), and went over sea **for the following reason**: he thought **that**[6] (i.e. the following thing): men in this country did little according to right and after his instruction.'

The sequence MIPH clause, namely *þet man on þisne þeodan lytel æfter rihte & æfter his dyhte dyde*, in the above example is introduced/preceded by the MIPH element *þet*, which depending on the approach, changes its status and position. Moreover, in this example the use of the implicit coordinating conjunction *and* is blocked because the immediately preceding PH clause is introduced/preceded by a PH element of a different kind and the *s/con** MIPH element *þet* is not its continuation.

[6] In the Old English version 'that' is in the nominative case. When we translate the clause literally, we obtain 'him thought that'.

And now we will discuss the ambivalence corridor offered by the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants. However, we will start with the ASC A; in which we found no sequence variants.

4.2.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses

Table 4.3 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor created by the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses in the ASC A:

Table 4.3. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		1	X + 1	Y		1	Y + 1	X + Y + 1
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	1			SV2 clauses	1		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		0		OV word order		0		
oV word order		0		oV word order		0		

In the ASC A there is only 1 ambivalent MIPH clause of the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** type. When we analyse it from the paratactic point of view, we gain 1 additional main clause in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. As regards the total number of main clause V2 word orders in the ASC A, their number increases by 1 SV2 word order. Moreover, since the main clause immediately preceding the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clause gains a pronominal subject in its final position, there is 1 additional VS word order with a pronominal subject in the ASC A main clauses. On the other hand, if we approach the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clause from the hypotactic point of view, we obtain 1 additional dependent clause in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. As to the number of dependent clause V2 word orders of the ASC A, we gain one additional SV2 word order here. Moreover, the clause immediately preceding the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clause loses the pronominal subject in its final position, which it would have obtained if the following PH clause in question had been approached from the point of view of hypotaxis, which in turn means that one VS word order would have disappeared from the ASC A main clauses. It is because it

then functions as a dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following MIPH clause with the status of a dependent clause.

4.2.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Below we present a table which shows the range of the ambivalence corridor offered by the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E:

Table 4.4. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		3	X + 3	Y		3	Y + 3	X + Y + 3
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	1			SV2 clauses	1		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		2		OV word order		2		
oV word order		0		oV word order		0		

In the ASC E we found 3 ambivalent MIPH clauses of this kind. If we approach them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 3 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. In these clauses there is one SV2 word order, which in turn means that the total number of the main clause V2 word orders of the ASC E increases by 1. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, the total number of the VO and OV main clause word orders of the ASC E is enriched by 2 OV word orders with a nominal object. Moreover, since the 3 clauses immediately preceding the *PH-miph}=s]/[con** clauses in question gain an additional pronominal subject in their final position each, there are 3 additional VS word orders with a pronominal subject in the ASC E main clauses; as a matter of fact the immediately preceding clauses would gain 2 pronominal subjects in their final position because one of the clauses is a sequence PH clause preceded by an implicit clause. On the other hand, if we approach the clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, we gain 3 additional dependent clauses in the total number of the ASC E

dependent clauses. These clauses have one SV2 word order, which means that the total number of the ASC E dependent clause V2 word orders increases by 1. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, the total number of the VO and OV dependent clause word orders increases by 2 OV word orders with a nominal object. Moreover, the 3 clauses immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question lose an additional pronominal subject each; as a matter of fact 2 of those clauses.

And now we will move on to another type of MIPH clauses, namely to *PH-miph}=io]/[con** but we will discuss them only theoretically because of the lack of examples illustrating them in the ASC manuscripts in question.

4.3. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clauses

We did not find any *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clauses in the ASC. Theoretically speaking, however, in hypotaxis a *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clause is introduced by an explicit *io/con** MIPH element. This element functions as a dependent clause connective then and the clause it introduces becomes dependent. In parataxis, on the other hand, the same *io/con** MIPH element belongs to the clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question and it functions as an ordinary pronominal indirect object in its end position; the MIPH clause becomes main then. Therefore, the *io/con** MIPH element abstractly moves from one clause to another, depending on whether it is looked at from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic one.

And now we will discuss the two sequence variants of *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clauses, namely *PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con** and *PH-miph}0=io]/[0=con**.

4.3.1. *PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of sequence clauses in the ASC. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clauses which occur in PH sequences but they never function as the initial PH clauses in these sequences. As regards the explicit *io/con** MIPH element, in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con** clause, which then functions as dependent, whereas in parataxis it belongs to an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which becomes main then, and it functions as an ordinary pronominal

indirect object in its final position. Moreover, in a *PH-miph}cj=io]/[cj=con** clause the explicit *io/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

4.3.2. *PH-miph}0=io]/[0=con** clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses in the ASC either. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=io]/[con** clauses which find themselves in PH sequences but they never function as the initial PH clauses in these sequences. As regards the explicit *io/con** MIPH element, in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=io]/[0=con** clause, which becomes dependent then, whereas in parataxis it belongs to an immediately preceding implicit clause and it functions as an ordinary pronominal indirect object in its final position. Moreover, the explicit *io/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. However, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked altogether.

Now we will discuss *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and then their sequence variants.

4.4. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses

A *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clause is introduced by an explicit *do/con** MIPH element, which in hypotaxis functions as a dependent clause connective introducing this clause; the clause functions as dependent then. However, in parataxis the same *do/con** MIPH element belongs to the clause immediately preceding the clause in question and it functions as an ordinary pronominal direct object in its final position. Moreover, although the *do/con** MIPH element does not move from place to place physically, it changes its position in an abstract sense, namely, depending on whether it is looked at from the paratactic or the hypotactic point of view, it belongs either to the clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause or it belongs to the very MIPH clause.

We will now discuss some examples of *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses in which the *do/con** MIPH element is *þæt*. These clauses are very frequent in

the ASC and as a matter of fact they are the only kind of *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses in our corpus. Below we present an example of such clauses:

> [047000 (895.12)A]
> *Þa hie ða þæt geweorc furþum ongunnen hæfdon & þærto gewicod hæfdon, þa onget se here **þæt** hie ne mehton þa scipu ut brengan.*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+X+V+DO+X+inf+,
> PH-miph}=do]/[con*
> …+do+,P-miph+(=)+s+X+V+DO+X+inf+,
> H-miph 'And when they had begun the work, and encamped before it, then understood the army **that** they could not bring out their ships.'
> P-miph 'And when they had begun the work, and encamped before it, then understood the army **that** (i.e. the following thing): they could not bring out their ships.'

In parataxis the *do/con** MIPH element *þæt* is the final element of the main clause *þa onget se here* and it functions in it as a pronominal direct object of the verb *ongeat*. The immediately following MIPH clause, namely *hie ne mehton þa scipu ut brengan*, becomes main then, and therefore the two clauses in question are in paratactic relation. On the other hand, in hypotaxis the *do/con** MIPH element *þæt* is the initial element introducing the MIPH clause *hie ne mehton þa scipu ut brengan*, which becomes dependent then, and it functions in it as a dependent clause connective. Moreover, the immediately preceding clause *þa onget se here* is then deprived of an ordinary pronominal direct object in its final position. We can see that the MIPH element *þæt* changes its status and goes from one clause to another. The criteria that would be in favour of the MIPH clause in question being a main clause are the following: it has main clause SVO word order, the verb *mehton* is in the indicative mood and, moreover, the clause *þa onget se here*, when in isolation, has no direct object in it and therefore the MIPH element *þæt* can easily occupy this position. On the other hand, one of the arguments for the MIPH clause in question being dependent could be that it is written in the imperfect tense third person narrative after *þæt*, which indicates that we are dealing with reported speech here, and therefore with a dependent clause. However, in the ASC A we found an example which testifies to the fact that in this type of MIPH clauses there can be a tendency to get rid of the third person narrative, in which case the notion of reported speech is disrupted:

> [025710 (755.38)A]
> *Þa cuędon hie **þæt** hie hie þæs ne onmunden þon ma þe eowre geferan þe mid þam cyninge ofslægene wærun.*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+do+X+V+X+,
> PH-miph}=do]/[con*

…+do+,P-miph+(=)+s+do+X+V+X+,
H-miph ‘They said **that** they were as regardless of the result as our comrades who with the king were slain.’
P-miph ‘They said **that** (i.e. the following thing): they were as regardless of the result as our comrades who with the king were slain.’

The MIPH clause *hie hie þæs ne onmunden þon ma þe eowre geferan* starts in the third person plural narrative in the imperfect tense and then it suddenly continues in the second person plural narrative as if in direct speech: *þon ma þe **eowre** geferan.*[7] So in the above example we are dealing with a mixture of reported speech and direct speech, which fact makes the MIPH clause in question ambivalent. In the ASC E, on the other hand, the corresponding clause has the following form, and it does not seem to be ambivalent:

[039800 (755.30)E]
*…ða cwædon hi **þet þet** hi þæs ne gemundon þonne ma þe heora geferen þe mid þam cininge wæron ofslagene.*
‘They said **that** they were as regardless of the result as their comrades who with the king were slain.’

In this example the whole clause, namely *hi þæs ne gemundon þonne ma þe heora geferen*, is in the third person narrative in the imperfect tense and the possessive pronoun *eowre* from the ASC A is rendered as *heora*. Moreover, we can see that the demonstrative pronoun *þet* appears twice here. While the first *þet* in parataxis could theoretically belong to the main clause *ða cwædon hi* and function in it as a pronominal direct object of the verb *cwædon*, the second *þet* already belongs to the clause immediately following, namely *hi þæs ne gemundon þonne ma þe heora geferen*, and it functions in it as a dependent clause connective introducing it as a dependent clause. In other words, the clause *hi þæs ne gemundon þonne ma þe heora geferen* is not a true MIPH clause because it is dependent only, and therefore cannot be regarded as ambivalent. The clause in question cannot be looked at from the paratactic point of view because even though the first *þet* could be interpreted as a pronominal direct object belonging to the immediately preceding main clause, the second *þet* is already a dependent clause connective. Otherwise we would be dealing with some kind of rare syntactic anomaly whereby the ordinary pronominal direct object *þet* occupying the final position of a main clause is repeated twice. In hypotaxis, however, this problem does not exist because the doublet *þet þet* can

[7] The clause *þon ma þe eowre geferan* should perhaps be treated as some kind of a separate dependent clause without a verb but we treat it as an integral part of the MIPH clause here. Therefore, this example is somewhat imperfect.

easily be interpreted as a strengthened dependent clause connective. A similar observation can be made about the following example:

> [052200 (910.8)A]
> *Þa geascade se cyng* ***þæt þæt*** *hie ut on hergað foron, þa sende he his fird ægðer ge of Westseaxum ge of Mercum, &…*
> 'When the king heard **that** they were gone out to ravage,[8] then he sent his army both from Wessex and Mercia, and… .'

The use of the doublet *þet þet* seems to be a later development than the use of the single *þet* with the function of an ordinary pronominal direct object. We can attempt to reconstruct this development here. Initially, the clauses that immediately preceded the clauses that we now consider *PH-miph}=do]/[con** ended in a single *þet* and they were main only, and the *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses were also main. Therefore the two clauses were in paratactic relation with respect to each other. Afterwards, some kind of dependency started to develop between the clauses, and the single element *þet* started to acquire the status of a dependent clause connective. However, the transition from an ordinary pronominal object to a dependent clause connective was not an abrupt one, and we can distinguish an intermediate stage here. In the intermediate stage the single *þet* started to be accompanied by another element *þet*, whose presence was an evidence that there was something going on in the behaviour of the original *þet*. We think that the function of the second *þet* in the doublet *þet þet* was, so to speak, to moderate the transition in question and in order to make it less abrupt. Later on, when the element *þet* was mature enough to function as a dependent clause connective on its own, it did not need any additional auxiliary element to support this function and in this way the doublet *þet þet* became a single *þet*. However it is probably the first *þet* in the combination *þet þet* that disappeared, while the second *þet* stayed in its place and was interpreted as a dependent clause connective due to its proximity to the clause that it started to introduce as a dependent clause connective.

Generally speaking, although the clauses preceded by the doublet *þet þet* are not true MIPH clauses, because they are unambivalently dependent, they can in a sense also be called para-hypotactic. But the new kind of para-hypotaxis that they represent is different from the para-hypotaxis that we have so far been concerned with. In true para-hypotaxis, namely in SIPH-taxis or in MIPH-taxis, we deal with one and the same PH element and with one and the same PH clause which are inherently both paratactic and hypotactic without a mechanic change in word order; as a matter of fact in MIPH-taxis the PH element (i.e. the MIPH element) changes its position but only in an abstract sense of this word. In the

[8] This part of the translation comes from Bosworth and Toller (1898).

new type of para-hypotaxis, however, which we call *Extended-Para-Hypotaxis* (*EPH-taxis* or *PH-eph*), we always deal with two clauses in proximity, one of which is always main and the other is always dependent, connected with each other by means of different doublets, for example *þet þet*, which we refer to as *EPH doublets*. Since in EPH-taxis we deal with two clauses with an unalterable status, the notion of ambivalence is out of the question as far as the entire clauses are concerned. However, there is some ambivalence about the EPH doublets, basically the first element of such doublets, because it can be looked at either from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view. Depending on whether the first element of a given EPH doublet is looked at from the point of view of parataxis or from the point of view of hypotaxis, we can distinguish two types of EPH clauses. However, we will not discuss them here because we will devote a separate chapter to this problem. In the meantime we will discuss the sequence variants of *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses, namely *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con** and *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con**.

4.4.1. *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con* clauses

PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses which occur in PH sequences but are not the initial PH clauses of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an explicit *do/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this MIPH element functions as an explicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con** clause, which then becomes dependent. In parataxis, on the other hand, this MIPH element functions as an explicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which becomes main then. Moreover, the explicit *do/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. Below we present two examples of such sequence MIPH clauses:

> [052100 (910.6)A]
> *Þa wende se here **þæt** his fultumes se mæsta dæl wære on þæm scipum **& þæt** hie mehten faran unbefohtene þær þær hie wolden.*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+V+inf+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con*
> P-miph+(=)+s+V+inf+X+,
> H-miph ‘The army therefore supposed **that** the greatest part of his force was in the ships, **and that** they might go, without being attacked, wherever they would.’

P-miph ‘The army therefore supposed **that** (i.e. the following thing): the greatest part of his force was in the ships, **and that** (i.e. the following thing): they might go, without being attacked, wherever they would.’

[024000 (656.61)E]
And ic bidde þe broðer Æðelred & mine swustre Cyneburh & Cynesuuith, for iure sawle alesednesse, ***þet*** *ge beon witnesse* ***& þet*** *geo hit write mid iure fingre.*
H-miph+(*)+s+do+V+X+,
Seq PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con*
P-miph+(=)+s+do+V+X+,
H-miph ‘And I bid thee, brother Ethelred, and my sisters, Kyneburga and Kyneswitha, for the release of your souls **that** you be witnesses, **and that** you subscribe it with your fingers.’
P-miph ‘And I bid thee, brother Ethelred, and my sisters, Kyneburga and Kyneswitha, for the release of your souls **that** (i.e. the following thing): you be witnesses, **and that** (i.e. the following thing): you subscribe it with your fingers.’

In the two examples the explicit *do/con** MIPH element *þet* of the *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con* clauses (*hie mehten faran unbefohtene þær* in the first entry and *geo hit write mid iure fingre* in the second one), is immediately preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and* and it is identical with the explicit *do/con** MIPH element *þet* from the corresponding initial PH clauses (*his fultumes se mæsta dæl wære on þæm scipum* in the first entry and *ge beon witnesse* in the second one). While in parataxis it appears in the final position of the implicit clauses, namely *Þa wende se here* in the first entry and *And ic bidde þe broðer Æðelred & mine swustre Cyneburh & Cynesuuith, for iure sawle alesednesse* in the second one, and functions in them as a pronominal direct object of the implicit verbs *wende* and *bidde* respectively, in hypotaxis it functions as a dependent clause connective introducing the *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con* clauses in question, which are treated as dependent then.

In the following section we discuss the other variant of *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses, namely *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con**.

4.4.2. *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses

*PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses which occur in PH sequences but are not the initial PH clauses

of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an explicit *do/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this MIPH element functions as an explicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clause, which becomes dependent then, whereas in parataxis it functions as an explicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of an implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which then is treated as main. Moreover, the MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction; however, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause coupled with it, is sometimes blocked. Below we present two examples of *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses:

[029400 (675.29)E]
*Nu bidde ic þe broðer Theodorus **þet** þu lete bedon geond æl Englelande **þet** seo sinað wurðe gegaderod…*
H-miph+(con*)+S+V+papt+,
Seq PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con*
P-miph+(=)+S+V+papt+,
H-miph 'Now bid I thee, brother Theodorus, **that** thou let it be proclaimed through all England **that** a synod should be gathered… .'
P-miph 'Now bid I thee, brother Theodorus, **that** (i.e. the following thing): proclaim through all England **that** (i.e. the following thing): a synod should be gathered… .'

[080800 (1006.38)E]
*Ða sende se cyng to þam here & him cyþan het **þet** he wolde **þet** heom grið betweonan beon sceolde… .*
H-miph+(*)+X+S+X+inf+V+,
Seq PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con*
P-miph+(=)+X+S+X+inf+V+,
H-miph 'The king then sent to the army, and ordered to be made known to them **that** his desired **that** there should be peace between them … .'
H-miph 'The king then sent to the army, and ordered to be made known to them **that** (i.e. the following thing): he desired **that** (i.e. the following thing): there should be peace between them… .'

Here the *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses (*seo sinað wurðe gegaderod* in the first entry and *heom grið betweonan beon sceolde* in the second one) find themselves in PH sequences whose initial PH clauses (*þu lete bedon geond æl Englelande* in the first entry, and *he wolde* in the second one), which at the same time are the immediately preceding ones, are introduced/preceded by the explicit *do/con** MIPH element *þet*. In these sequence PH clauses, however, unlike was

the case with the *PH-miph}cj=do]/[cj=con** sequence clauses discussed right above, the MIPH element introducing/preceding them is not a continuation of the *do/con** MIPH element introducing/preceding the immediately preceding PH clauses because it is selected by a different verb and thus the use of the implicit coordinating conjunction is blocked. However, theoretically speaking, in the two entries we could obtain PH sequences in which the *do/con** MIPH element *þet* of the *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses would be a continuation of the *do/con** MIPH element introducing/preceding the immediately preceding PH clauses and would be selected by the same verb as the one that selects the *do/con** MIPH element introducing/preceding the immediately preceding PH clauses. In this situation the use of the implicit coordinating conjunction, and of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, would be unblocked.

In another example, the *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clause, namely *<hi> <ne> <mihton> <ealle> <ætgædere> <gewunian> <þær>*, is part of a PH sequence in which the immediately preceding clause, namely *hi cwædon*, which at the same time is the initial clause of the PH sequence, is a *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clause introduced/preceded by the *x/con** MIPH element *forðan*. It means that the *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clause, being introduced/preceded by the *do/con** MIPH element *þæt*, is not introduced/preceded by the MIPH element that introduces/precedes the immediately preceding MIPH clause, and therefore the position of the coordinating conjunction, and of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is blocked:

> [000400 (0.7)E]
> *Ac hi noldan heom lyfan,* ***forðan*** *hi cwædon <**þæt**> <hi> <ne> <mihton> <ealle> <ætgædere> <gewunian> <þær>.*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+X+V+X+inf+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con*
> P-miph+(=)+s+X+V+X+inf+X+,
> H-miph 'But they would not give them leave, **for** they told them **that** they could not all dwell there together.'
> P-miph 'But they would not give them leave **for the following reason**: they told them **that** (i.e. the following thing): they could not all dwell there together.'

In this example, as can be seen in the annotation pattern, the immediately preceding clause does not receive an additional element *do* in its final position while in parataxis, although we are dealing with an explicit *do/con** MIPH element here, which abstractly changes its position depending on the approach. It is because it was already taken into account when *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses have been discussed above (when they were approached from the paratactic point of view), so we cannot take it into account again in order to avoid counting

the same direct objects twice. Otherwise the annotation pattern of the PH clause in question would have the following form:

H-miph+(con*)+s+X+V+X+inf+X+,
Seq PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con*
…+do+,P-miph+(=)+s+X+V+X+inf+X+,

This observation also refers to similar cases where we do not provide additional elements (be it *x*, *s*, *io* or *do*) in the paratactic annotation patterns of sequence PH clauses.

And now we will move on to the discussion of the ambivalence corridor created by the *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants. We will start with the ASC A.

4.4.3. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 4.5 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC A:

Table 4.5. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		21	X + 21	Y		21	Y + 21	X + Y + 21
Word order configurations								
V2*	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	9			SV2 clauses	9		
VO word order		2		VO word order		2		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		1		OV word order		1		
oV word order		8		oV word order		8		
Immediately preceding clauses								
Vo word order		21 – 1 = 20						

* The ASC V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to MIPH clauses do not differ from the V2 word orders in the hypotactic approach to these clauses because in our analysis we do not consider MIPH elements as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis; i.e. when the MIPH elements become dependent clause connectives. However, if we considered them as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis, then the word orders of the PH clauses, depending on the approach to them (paratactic or hypotactic), would differ in terms of the V2 phenomenon; i.e. there would be more V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to the clauses.

In the ASC A there are 21 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses, including their sequence variants. If they are approached from the paratactic point of view, the total number of the main clauses of the ASC A increases by 21. Moreover, the total number of the main clause V2 word orders is enriched by 9 additional SV2 word orders. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the VO and OV main clause word order configurations there are 2 additional VO word orders with a nominal object and 9 additional OV word orders: 8 with a pronominal object and 1 with a nominal object. On the other hand, if the clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the dependent clauses of the ASC A increases by 21 additional dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders is then enriched by 9 additional SV2 word orders. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the VO and OV dependent clause word order configurations there are 2 additional VO word orders with a nominal object and 9 additional OV word orders: 8 with a pronominal object and 1 with a nominal object. Additionally, in MIPH-taxis, unlike in SIPH-taxis, the clauses immediately preceding the MIPH clauses receive additional elements when the MIPH clauses are approached from the paratactic point of view, whereas they lose the same elements when the MIPH clauses are approached from the hypotactic point of view. In the light the above, when the 21 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses are approached from the paratactic point of view, the immediately preceding clauses gain 21 additional pronominal direct objects in their final position and, what goes with it, they gain 21 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object; actually they gain 20 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object because one immediately preceding clause is implicit and such clauses do not count in our analysis, while the remaining 20 immediately preceding clauses, none of which is a PH clause, are explicit. On the other hand, when the same 21 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the immediately preceding clauses lose the 21 additional VO word orders, because the ordinary pronominal direct objects become dependent clause connectives then; actually they lose 20 of them.

And now we will discuss the ambivalence corridor produced by the *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses in the ASC E.

4.4.4. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 4.6 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor created by the *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants in the ASC E:

Table 4.6. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		128	X + 128	Y		128	Y + 128	X + Y + 128
Word order configurations								
V2*	XV2 clauses	2		V2	XV2 clauses	2		
	SV2 clauses	81			SV2 clauses	81		
VO word order		37		VO word order		37		
Vo word order		12		Vo word order		10		
OV word order		7		OV word order		7		
oV word order		18		oV word order		18		
Immediately preceding clauses								
Vo word order		128 – 3 – 15 = 110						

* The ASC V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to MIPH clauses do not differ from the V2 word orders in the hypotactic approach to these clauses because in our analysis we do not consider MIPH elements as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis; i.e. when the MIPH elements become dependent clause connectives. However, if we considered them as occupying the first position in V2 clauses while in hypotaxis, then the word orders of the PH clauses, depending on the approach to them (paratactic or hypotactic), would differ in terms of the V2 phenomenon; i.e. there would be more V2 word orders in the paratactic approach to the clauses.

In the ASC E there are 128 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses, including their sequence variants. If we approach them from the paratactic point of view, the total number of the main clauses of the ASC E grows by 128 additional main clauses. Moreover, the total number of the main clause V2 word order configurations increases by 83 additional V2 clauses, in which 2 are XV2 and 81 are SV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the VO and OV main clause word orders there are 49 additional VO word orders (37 with a nominal object and 12 with a pronominal one) and there are 25 additional OV word orders (7 with a nominal object and 18 with a pronominal one). On the other hand, if the clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the dependent clauses of the ASC A increases by 128 additional dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word order configurations increases by 83 additional V2 word orders, in which 2 are XV2 and 81 are SV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the VO and OV dependent clause word orders there are 47 additional VO word orders (37 with a nominal object and 10 with a pronominal one) and there are 25 additional OV word orders (7 with a nominal object and 18 with a pronominal one). Furthermore, if the 128 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses are approached from the paratactic point of view, the immediately preceding clauses should gain 128

additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object, whereas if they are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the immediately preceding clauses should lose the 128 additional VO word orders, due to the fact that the ordinary pronominal direct objects then become dependent clause connectives. As a matter of fact, however, the immediately preceding clauses gain/lose 110 such word order configurations because 15 *PH-miph}=do]/[con** clauses are sequence PH clauses, and therefore, the VO word orders of their immediately preceding clauses, introduced/preceded by different PH elements, were counted when the immediately preceding clauses were discussed above as initial PH clauses according to their kind. Moreover, 3 sequence PH clauses are implicit and such clauses do not count in our analysis. We will discuss the problem further while describing the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor offered by all of the ASC E MIPH clauses later on. In the meantime, we will discuss *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses with implicit MIPH elements.

4.5. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses

*PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses are the ones in which the implicit *x/xon**, *s/con**, *io/con**, or *do/con** MIPH elements in hypotaxis are interpreted as implicit dependent clause connectives introducing them, in which case they have the status of dependent clauses, whereas in parataxis they are interpreted as implicit ordinary pronominal adverbials, pronominal subjects, pronominal indirect objects or pronominal direct objects, respectively, and they belong to the clauses immediately preceding the MIPH clauses in question, which become main clauses then. Moreover, they are always the initial PH clauses introducing PH sequences. In the following sections we discuss different kinds of these clauses.

4.5.1. *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clauses

In a *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clause, the position of the MIPH element is occupied by an implicit *x/con** element, which in parataxis is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial at the end of the immediately preceding clause, while in hypotaxis it is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause in question; therefore, when a *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clause is approached from the paratactic point of view, the immediately

preceding clause gains an additional implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial in its final position.

Below we present an example in which the position of the MIPH element is occupied by the implicit *x/con** MIPH element *forþan (þet)*:

> [201400 (1137.47)E]
> *Gif twa men oþer III coman ridend to an tun, al þe tunscipe flugæn for heom,* ***wenden*** *ðat hi wæron ræueres.*
> H-miph+(*)+V+,+(con*)+…
> PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x
> P-miph+(=)+V+do+,+(=)+…
> H-miph 'If two men, or three, came riding to a town, all the township fled for them, (because) they concluded them to be robbers.'
> P-miph 'If two men, or three, came riding to a town, all the township fled for them (for the following reason): they concluded them to be robbers.'

In hypotaxis the implicit MIPH element *forþan (þet)* in the above example is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing the MIPH clause *wenden*, whereas in parataxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial that finds itself in the final position of the immediately preceding main clause *al þe tunscipe flugæn for heom*.

Below we present two more examples of *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clauses for further illustration:

> [203300 (1138.1)E]
> *On þis gær com Dauid king of Scotland mid ormete færd to þis land;* ***wolde*** *winnan þis land, & him com togænes Willelm …*
> H-miph+(*)+V+inf+DO+,
> PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x
> P-miph+(=)+V+inf+DO+,
> H-miph 'In this year came David, King of Scotland, with an immense army to this land, (because) he was ambitious to win this land; but against him came William… .'
> P-miph 'In this year came David, King of Scotland, with an immense army to this land (for the following reason): he was ambitious to win this land; but against him came William… .'

> [120000 (1070.3)E]
> *Þa on þam ilcan geare com Swegn cyng <of> Denmarcan into Humbran, & þet landfolc comen him ongean & griðedon wið hine,* ***wændon*** *þet he sceolde þet land ofergan.*

H-miph+(*)+V+,+(con*)+…
PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x
P-miph+(=)+V+do+,+(=)+…
H-miph ‘In the same year came King Sweyne from Denmark into the Humber; and the landsmen came to meet him, and made a treaty with him, (because) they thought that he would overrun the land.’
P-miph ‘In the same year came King Sweyne from Denmark into the Humber; and the landsmen came to meet him, and made a treaty with him (for the following reason): they thought that he would overrun the land.’

And now we will discuss other types of *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses, namely *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s*, *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io* and *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from do.*

4.5.2. *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s* clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses in the ASC. Theoretically speaking, in these clauses the position of the MIPH element is occupied by an implicit *s/con** element. In parataxis this element is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject at the end of the immediately preceding clause, whereas in hypotaxis it is treated as an implicit ordinary dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s* clause; therefore when a *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s* clause is approached from the paratactic point of view, the immediately preceding clause gains an additional implicit ordinary pronominal subject in its final position.

4.5.3. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io*

We did not find any examples of *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io* clauses in the ASC either. Theoretically speaking, these clauses are the ones in which the position of the MIPH element is occupied by an implicit *io/con** element. In parataxis this element is treated as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object in the final position of the immediately preceding clause, while in hypotaxis it is treated as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io* clause; therefore when

a MIPH clause of this type is looked at from the paratactic point of view, the immediately preceding clause gains an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object in its final position.

4.5.4. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}[=0/[0* from do*

We did not find any examples of this type of MIPH clauses in the ASC either. Theoretically speaking, in a *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from do* clause instead of an implicit *x/con**, *s/con** or *io/con** MIPH element there is an implicit *do/con** MIPH element. In hypotaxis this element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing this MIPH clause, which becomes dependent then, while in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of the clause immediately preceding the same MIPH clause, which then becomes main. Therefore, when a *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from do* clause is approached from the point of view of parataxis, the immediately preceding clause obtains an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in its final position.

Having discussed *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses, we will now discuss their sequence variants, namely *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0** and *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0**.

4.5.5. MIPH-taxis: *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0** and *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0** clauses

*PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0** and *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0** clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses that are preceded by an implicit *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** or *do/con** MIPH element, the difference being that these implicit MIPH elements are immediately preceded by an explicit/implicit coordinating conjunction; in *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0** clauses the coordinating conjunction is explicit and in *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0** clauses it is implicit, or blocked altogether. Both kinds of clauses form a part of PH sequences but do not function as the initial PH clauses of these sequences. We will first concentrate upon different kinds of *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0** clauses (i.e. with an explicit coordinating conjunction) and afterwards we will discuss different kinds of *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0** clauses (i.e. with an implicit coordinating conjunction).

4.5.6. *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x* clauses

PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0 from x* clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clauses which form a part of PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. If a *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x* clause is analysed from the hypotactic point of view, the implicit *x/con** MIPH element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing this MIPH clause, which then becomes dependent, whereas if it is analysed from the point of view of parataxis, the same implicit *x/con** MIPH element functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause and the MIPH clause in question becomes main then. Moreover, here the implicit *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

In the example below the implicit *x/con** MIPH element *forþi þet* of the *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x* sequence clause, namely *se penig wæs swa ifel*, is identical with the explicit *x/con** MIPH element *forþi þet* of the initial *PH-miph}=x]/[con** PH clause, namely *corn wæs litel*, as it is selected by the same verb:

> [183400 (1124.29)E]
> *Þet wæs **forþi þet** corn wæs litel, **&** se penig wæs swa ifel þet se man þa hæfde at an market an pund, he ne mihte cysten þærof for nan þing twelfe penegas.*
> H-miph+(*)+S+V+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x
> P-miph+(=)+S+V+X+,
> H-miph 'That was **because** corn was scarce, **and** (**because**) the penny was so adulterated, that a man who had a pound at a market could not exchange twelve pence thereof for anything.'
> P-miph 'That was **for the following reason**: corn was scarce, **and** (**for the following reason**): the penny was so adulterated, that a man who had a pound at a market could not exchange twelve pence thereof for anything.'

In this example, the implicit *x/con** MIPH element *forþi þet* is moreover preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*.

Below we present an example in which the position of the implicit *x/con** MIPH element is occupied by the implicit MIPH element *swa þet*:

> [181800 (1123.74)E]
> *Ða wæs se kyng eall þes geares in Normandie, & weax þa micel unfrið betwux him & hise þeignas, **swa þet** se eorl Walaram of Mellant*

& Hamalri & Hugo of Mundford & Willelm of Romare and fela oðre wendan fram him ***&*** *helden here castles him togeanes.*
H-miph+(*)+V+DO+X+,
Seq PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x
P-miph+(=)+V+DO+X+,
H-miph 'Then was the king all this year in Normandy. And much hostility arose betwixt him and his thanes, **so that** the Earl Waleram of Mellent, and Hamalric, and Hugh of Montfort, and William of Romare, and many others, went from him, **and** (**so that**) they held their castles against him.'
H-miph 'Then was the king all this year in Normandy. And much hostility arose betwixt him and his thanes (**in the following way**): the Earl Waleram of Mellent, and Hamalric, and Hugh of Montfort, and William of Romare, and many others, went from him, **and** (**in the following way**): they held their castles against him.'

In this entry, *se eorl Walaram of Mellant & Hamalri & Hugo of Mundford & Willelm of Romare and fela oðre wendan fram him* is the initial PH clause, whereas *helden here castles him togeanes* is the sequence *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from x* clause in question. Moreover, the implicit *x/con** MIPH element *swa þet* is immediately preceded by the explicit coordinating conjunction *and*.

And now we will discuss *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from s* clauses and then other kinds of sequence PH clauses preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction.

4.5.7. *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from s* clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s* clauses which form a part of PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an implicit *s/con** MIPH element which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. In hypotaxis the implicit MIPH element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from s* clause, which becomes dependent then, while in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject in the final position of the implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which becomes main then.

4.5.8. *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from io* clauses

We did not find any examples of this type of clauses either. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io* clauses which form a part of PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. They are introduced/preceded by an implicit *io/con** MIPH element which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. While in hypotaxis the implicit *io/con** MIPH element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from io* clause, which becomes dependent then, in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object in the final position of the implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which then becomes main.

4.5.9. *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do* clauses

As regards *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do* clauses, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from do* clauses which form a part of PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. Moreover, they are introduced/preceded by an implicit *do/con** MIPH element which is immediately preceded by an explicit coordinating conjunction. In hypotaxis the implicit *do/con** MIPH element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do* clause, which becomes dependent then, whereas in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of the implicit clause immediately preceding the MIPH clause in question, which then becomes main. Below we present two examples of this kind of clauses:

> [078200 (1003.11)E]
> *Đa Swegen geseah **þet** hi anræde næron **&** ealle tohwurfon, þa lædde he his here into Wiltune,...*
> H-miph+(*)+S+V+,
> Seq PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do
> P-miph+(=)+S+V+,
> H-miph 'When Sweyne saw **that** they were not ready, **and** (**that**) they all retreated, then led he his army into Wilton,… .'
> P-miph 'Then Sweyne saw **that** (i.e. the following thing): they were not ready, **and** (**that**) (i.e. the following thing): they all retreated, then led he his army into Wilton,… .'

[183100 (1124.20)E]
*…& sæidon **þet** se king heold his broðer Rotbert mid wrange on heftnunge **&** his sunu Willelm mid unrihte aflemde ut of Normandi.*
H-miph+(*)+DO+X+V+X+,
Seq PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do
P-miph+(=)+DO+X+V+X+,
H-miph '…and said **that** the king held his brother Robert wrongfully in captivity, **and** (**that**) he drove his son William unjustly out of Normandy.'
P-miph '…and said **that** (i.e. the following thing): the king held his brother Robert wrongfully in captivity, **and** (**that**) (i.e. the following thing): he drove his son William unjustly out of Normandy.'

Since in both examples the position of the implicit *do/con** MIPH element is occupied by the implicit MIPH element *þæt*, we will only discuss the second one. In this example, the implicit *do/con** MIPH element of the sequence *PH-miph}cj=0]/[cj=0* from do* clause, namely *his sunu Willelm mid unrihte aflemde ut of Normandi*, in parataxis functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause, namely *& sæidon*, and it is identical with the explicit ordinary pronominal direct object *þæt* of the explicit main clause, namely *& sæidon*, immediately preceding the initial MIPH clause, namely *se king heold his broðer Rotbert mid wrange on heftnunge*, which becomes main then. In hypotaxis, on the other hand, the position of the implicit *do/con** MIPH element is occupied by the implicit dependent clause connective *þæt* which introduces the sequence MIPH clause in question, which then becomes dependent. Moreover, this implicit dependent clause connective is identical with the explicit dependent clause connective of the immediately preceding MIPH clause.

We will now discuss different kinds of *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0** clauses and we will start with *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from x* clauses.

4.5.10. *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from x* clauses

We did not find any clauses of this kind. Theoretically speaking, they are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from x* clauses which occur in PH sequences but are not the initial clauses of these sequences. In these clauses the position of an implicit *x/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. While in hypotaxis the implicit *x/con** MIPH element functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0**

from x clause, which then becomes dependent, in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal adverbial in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause, which finds itself between the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction and the implicit *x/con** MIPH element in question, and the *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from x* clause then becomes main. Moreover, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked.

4.5.11. *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from s* clauses

We did not find any clauses of this kind either. Theoretically speaking, these clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from s* clauses which form part of PH sequences but do not function as the initial clauses of these sequences. In *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from s* clauses the position of the implicit *s/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. While in hypotaxis the implicit *s/con** MIPH element functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from s* clause, which becomes dependent then, in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal subject in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause, which finds itself between the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction and the implicit *s/con** MIPH element in question, and the *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from s* clause becomes main then. Moreover, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked.

4.5.12. *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from io* clauses

We did not find any clauses of this kind either. Theoretically speaking, *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from io* clauses are ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from io* clauses which form part of PH sequences but do not function as the initial clauses of these sequences. In these clauses the position of the implicit *io/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. In hypotaxis, the implicit *io/con** MIPH element functions as a dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from io* clause, which becomes dependent then. In parataxis, on the other hand, the implicit *io/con** MIPH

element functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal indirect object in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause, which finds itself between the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction and the implicit *io/con** MIPH element in question, and the *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from io* clause becomes main then. Moreover, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked.

4.5.13. *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do* clauses

Ordinary *PH-miph}=0]/[0* from do* clauses which form part of PH sequences but do not function as the initial clauses of these sequences. Here the position of the implicit *do/con** MIPH element is immediately preceded by an implicit coordinating conjunction. While in hypotaxis the implicit *do/con** MIPH element functions as an implicit dependent clause connective introducing a *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do* clause, which becomes dependent then, in parataxis it functions as an implicit ordinary pronominal direct object in the final position of the immediately preceding implicit clause, which finds itself between the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction and the implicit *do/con** MIPH element, and the *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do* clause then becomes main. Moreover, the position of the immediately preceding implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause together with it, is sometimes blocked. Below we present two examples of *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do* clauses:

> [025700 (656.91)E]
> *…& ic forbede **þet** ne kyning ne nan man ne haue nan onsting buton þon abbot ane, **ne** he ne hersumie nan man buton þone papa on Rome & se ærcebiscop on Cantwarbyrig.*
> H-miph+(*)+X+s+X+V+IO+X+,
> Seq PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do
> P-miph+(=)+X+s+X+V+IO+X+,
> H-miph '…and I forbid, **that** any king, or any man, have any ingress, but the abbot alone, (**and**) (**that**) he be subject to any man, except the Pope of Rome and the Archbishop of Canterbury.'
> P-miph '…and I forbid **that** (i.e. the following thing): any king, or any man, have any ingress, but the abbot alone, (**and**) (**that**) (i.e. the following thing): he be subject to any man, except the Pope of Rome and the Archbishop of Canterbury.'

[029000 (675.15)E]
And ic bebeode of Godes half & Sancte Petres & ealra halgan & ealre hadode heafde ***þet*** *ne kyning ne biscop ne eorl ne nan man ne haue nan onsting, ne gafle ne geold ne feording* ***ne*** *nanes cinnes ðeudom ne nime man of þet abbotrice of Medeshamstede.*
H-miph+(*)+X+DO+X+V+S+X+,
Seq PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do
P-miph+(=)+X+DO+X+V+S+X+,
H-miph 'And I ordain, in behalf of God, and of St. Peter, and of all saints, and of every hooded head, **that** neither king, nor bishop, nor earl, nor any man whatever, have any claim, or gable, or gild, or levy, (**and**) (**that**) none take any service of any kind, from the abbey of Medhamsted.'
P-miph 'And I ordain, in behalf of God, and of St. Peter, and of all saints, and of every hooded head **that** (i.e. the following thing): neither king, nor bishop, nor earl, nor any man whatever, have any claim, or gable, or gild, or levy, (**and**) (**that**) (i.e. the following thing): no one take any service of any kind, from the abbey of Medhamsted.'

In both examples, the initial PH clauses (i.e. *ne kyning ne nan man ne haue nan onsting buton þon abbot ane* in the first entry and *ne kyning ne biscop ne eorl ne nan man ne haue nan onsting, ne gafle ne geold ne feording* in the second one) are introduced/preceded by the explicit *do/con** MIPH element *þet*, and the sequence *PH-miph}0=0]/[0=0* from do* clauses (i.e. *ne he ne hersumie nan man buton þone papa on Rome & se ærcebiscop on Cantwarbyrig* in the first entry and *ne nanes cinnes ðeudom ne nime man of þet abbotrice of Medeshamstede* in the second one) are introduced/preceded by the implicit *do/con** MIPH element *þet*, which is immediately preceded by the implicit coordinating conjunction *and*. In other words, the implicit *do/con** MIPH elements of the sequence clauses are identical with the explicit *do/con** MIPH elements of the initial PH clauses and therefore the position of the implicit coordinating conjunction, and that of the immediately preceding implicit clause, is not blocked.

Having discussed all kinds of *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses and their sequence variants, we will now move on to the discussion of the ambivalence corridor that they are capable of producing. We will start with the discussion of the ASC A.

4.5.14. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses

Table 4.7 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the ASC A *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses:

Table 4.7. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC A *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		1	X + 1	Y		1	Y + 1	X + Y + 1
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	0		V2	XV2 clauses	0		
	SV2 clauses	0			SV2 clauses	0		
VO word order		0		VO word order		0		
Vo word order		0		Vo word order		0		
OV word order		1		OV word order		1		
oV word order		0		oV word order		0		

In the ASC A we found only one *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clause and no sequence variants of it. If we analyse it from the point of view of parataxis, there is 1 additional main clause in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Moreover, as far as the position of the object with respect to the verb is concerned, there is 1 additional OV word order with a nominal object in the total number of the VO and OV main clause word order configurations of the ASC A. On the other hand, if we approach the MIPH clause in question from the hypotactic point of view, there is 1 additional dependent clause in the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Moreover, as regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, there is 1 additional OV word order configuration with a nominal object in the total number of the VO and OV dependent clause word order configurations of the ASC A.

Now we will discuss the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses and their sequence variants.

4.5.15. The ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

Table 4.8 presents the range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the ASC E *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses and their sequence variants:

Table 4.8. Ambivalence corridor for the ASC E *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses and their sequence variants

Paratactic approach				Hypotactic approach				Overall number of clauses
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses	total	unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	total	
X		37	X + 37	Y		37	Y + 37	X + Y + 37
Word order configurations								
V2	XV2 clauses	1		V2	XV2 clauses	1		
	SV2 clauses	7			SV2 clauses	7		
VO word order		9		VO word order		9		
Vo word order		6		Vo word order		2		
OV word order		6		OV word order		6		
oV word order		4		oV word order		4		

There are 37 *PH-miph}=0]/[0** clauses together with their sequence variants in the ASC E. If we approach them from the paratactic point of view, we obtain 37 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Moreover, the total number of the ASC E main clause V2 word orders is enriched by 8 additional V2 clauses, one of which is XV2 and 7 are SV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the ASC E main clause OV and VO word order configurations there are 15 additional VO word orders and 10 additional OV ones. In the 15 additional VO word orders 9 objects are nominal and 6 are pronominal, whereas in the 10 additional OV word orders 6 objects are nominal and 4 are pronominal. On the other hand, if we approach the MIPH clauses in question from the hypotactic point of view, there are 37 additional dependent clauses within the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the ASC E dependent clause V2 word orders increase by 8 additional V2 clauses, one of which is XV2 and 7 are SV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, within the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV and VO word orders there are 11 additional VO word orders and 10 additional OV ones. In the additional 11 VO word orders 9 objects are nominal and 2 are pronominal, while in the additional 10 OV word orders 6 objects are nominal and 4 are pronominal.

And now we will discuss the maximum ambivalence corridor obtained for all of the ASC A and the ASC E MIPH clauses. We will start with the discussion of the ASC A MIPH clauses.

4.6. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC A MIPH clauses

Table 4.9 on the following page presents the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor that we obtained for all MIPH clauses of the ASC A.

In the ASC A there are 33 MIPH clauses. If all of them are approached from the paratactic point of view, there are 33 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. Moreover, the total number of the ASC A main clause V2 word orders is enriched by 16 additional V2 word orders, out of which 15 are SV2 and one is XV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, in the total number of the ASC A main clause VO and OV word order configurations there are 5 additional VO word orders with a nominal object and 12 additional OV word orders, in which 3 objects are nominal and 9 are pronominal. Additionally, the immediately preceding clauses gain 20 additional pronominal direct objects in their final position, which means that we get 20 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object in the total number of the ASC A main clauses. If the MIPH clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses grows by 33 additional dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders increases by 16 V2 word orders, out of which 15 are SV2 and one is XV2. As far as the position of the object with respect to the verb is concerned, in the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO and OV word order configurations there are 5 additional VO word orders with a nominal object and 12 additional OV word orders, among which 3 objects are nominal and 9 are pronominal. Additionally, the immediately preceding clauses loses the 20 additional pronominal direct objects in their final position, and the 20 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object together with them, because they function as dependent clause connectives then.

The most active explicit MIPH element in the ASC A is *do/con** which appears in 21 MIPH clauses. In the second place is the *x/con** MIPH element and it appears in 10 MIPH clauses. In the third place is the *s/con** element which appears only in 1 MIPH clause. As regards the *io/con** MIPH element, there are no elements of this type in the ASC A. Table 4.10 presents the whole situation:

Table 4.9. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC A MIPH clauses

Paratactic approach							Hypotactic approach						
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses		total			unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses		total		
X		33		X + 33			Y		33		Y + 33		
Word order configurations													
PH clauses		total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**	PH clauses		total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
		33	**1**	**10**	**1**	**0**	**21**			**33**	**1**	**10**	**1**	**0**	**21**
V2	XV2 clauses	**1**	0	1	0	0	0	V2	XV2 clauses	**1**	0	1	0	0	0
	SV2 clauses	**15**	0	5	1	0	9		SV2 clauses	**15**	0	5	1	0	9
VO word order		**5**	0	3	0	0	2	VO word order		**5**	0	3	0	0	2
Vo word order		**0**	0	0	0	0	0	Vo word order		**0**	0	0	0	0	0
OV word order		**3**	1	1	0	0	1	OV word order		**3**	1	1	0	0	1
oV word order		**9**	0	1	0	0	8	oV word order		**9**	0	1	0	0	8
Immediately preceding clauses*								Immediately preceding clauses							
Vo word order				21 – 1 = 20				Vo word order				0			

* We do not include *XV2*, *SV2*, *VO*, *OV* or *oV* word orders of the immediately preceding clauses here because in our analysis these word orders will not be affected after the addition of MIPH clauses (treated as main) to the unambivalent main clauses of the ASC A; the same refers to the ASC E.

Table 4.10. Participation of explicit and implicit MIPH elements in all of the ASC A MIPH clauses

PH clauses	Types of MIPH elements					
	Total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	33	1	10	1	0	21
Per cent	100.00	3.03	30.30	3.03	0.00	63.63

As far as the MIPH clauses with implicit MIPH elements are concerned, there is only one of them here, in which the MIPH element is *do/con**:

Table 4.11. Participation of implicit MIPH elements in the ASC A *PH-miph=0]/[0** clauses

PH-miph=0]/[0* clauses	Types of MIPH elements				
	total	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**
Number	1	0	0	0	1
Per cent	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00

We will now discuss the maximum ambivalence corridor obtained for the ASC E MIPH clauses.

4.7. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E MIPH clauses

Table 4.12 on the following page presents the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor that we obtained for the MIPH clauses of the ASC E. In the ASC E there are 218 MIPH clauses. If we approach them from the paratactic point of view, there are 218 additional main clauses in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Moreover, the total number of the ASC E main clause V2 word orders increases by 132 additional V2 word orders, out of which 120 are SV2 and 12 are XV2. As regards the position of the object with respect to the verb, in the total number of the ASC E main clause VO and OV word orders there are 88 additional VO word order configurations, out of which 61 have nominal objects and 27 have pronominal objects. Furthermore, there are 48 additional OV word order configurations, in which 19 objects are nominal and 29 are pronominal. Additionally, the immediately preceding clauses gain 110 additional pronominal direct objects in their final position, which means that there are 110 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object in the total number of the ASC E main clauses. On the other hand, if the MIPH clauses in question are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses increases by 218 additional

Table 4.12. The maximum range of the ambivalence corridor produced by the ASC E MIPH clauses

Paratactic approach							Hypotactic approach						
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses		total			unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses		total		
X		218		X + 218			Y		218		Y + 218		
Word order configurations													
PH clauses		total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	*do/con**	PH clauses		total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	*io/con**	do/con*
		218	**37**	**50**	**3**	**0**	**128**			**218**	**37**	**50**	**3**	**0**	**128**
V2	XV2 clauses	**12**	1	9	0	0	2	V2	XV2 clauses	**12**	1	9	0	0	2
	SV2 clauses	**120**	7	31	1	0	81		SV2 clauses	**120**	7	31	1	0	81
VO word order		**61**	9	15	0	0	37	VO word order		**61**	9	15	0	0	37
Vo word order		**27**	6	9	0	0	12	Vo word order		**12**	2	0	0	0	10
OV word order		**19**	6	4	2	0	7	OV word order		**19**	6	4	2	0	7
oV word order		**29**	4	7	0	0	18	oV word order		**29**	4	7	0	0	18
Immediately preceding clauses							Immediately preceding clauses								
Vo word order					128 – 3 – 15 = 110		Vo word order						0		

dependent clauses. Moreover, the total number of the dependent clause V2 word orders would increase by 132 additional V2 word orders, out of which 120 are SV2 and 12 are XV2. As to the position of the object with respect to the verb, in the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO and OV word order configurations there are 73 additional VO word order configurations, out of which 61 have nominal objects and 12 have pronominal objects. Moreover, there are 48 additional OV word order configurations, out of which 19 have nominal objects and 29 have pronominal objects. Additionally, the immediately preceding clauses lose the 110 additional pronominal direct objects in their final position, and the 110 additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object together with them, because they then function as dependent clause connectives.

The most active explicit MIPH element in the ASC E is *do/con**, which appears in 128 MIPH clauses. In the second place is the *x/con** MIPH element, and it appears in 50 MIPH clauses. In the third place is the *s/con** MIPH element, which appears only in 3 MIPH clauses, and there are no *io/con** MIPH elements. Table 4.13 presents the whole situation:

Table 4.13. Participation of explicit and implicit MIPH elements in all of the ASC E MIPH clauses

PH clauses	Types of MIPH elements					
	Total	*0/0**	*x/con**	*s/con**	io/con*	do/con*
Number	218	37	50	3	0	128
Per cent	100.00	16.97	22.93	1.37	0.00	58.71

As regards the ASC E MIPH clauses with implicit MIPH elements, there are 37 of them, and the most frequent implicit MIPH element is *do/con**. In the second place is the *x/con** MIPH element, in the third place is the *s/con** MIPH element, and there are no implicit *io/con** MIPH elements, as presented in the table below:

Table 4.14. Participation of implicit MIPH elements in the ASC E *PH-miph=0]/[0** clauses

PH-miph=0]/[0* clauses	Types of MIPH elements				
	total	*x/con**	s/con*	io/con*	do/con*
Number	37	11	2	0	24
Per cent	100.00	29.72	5.40	0.00	64.86

It needs to be noted that in the table presenting the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor obtained for the MIPH clauses in the ASC E, unlike in the ASC A, the data obtained for the VO word order configurations with a pronominal object in the paratactic approach differ from the data obtained for the VO word order configurations with a pronominal object in the hypotactic

approach. While in the paratactic approach there are 27 such VO word orders, in the hypotactic approach there are 12 of them. So the difference amounts to 15 VO word order configurations (4 in *0/0**, 9 in *x/con**, and 2 in *do/con**). The reason for this difference is that 15 MIPH clauses are sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses, which means that they are immediately preceded by PH clauses. Since the immediately preceding clauses, all of which are initial in fact, are also PH clauses, they are introduced/preceded by different ambivalent PH elements, and when we analysed these clauses from two different perspectives, their word orders went once to the total number of main clause word orders, and once to the total number of dependent clause word orders.

However, depending on the approach (i.e. paratactic or hypotactic), they displayed different word order configurations because of the immediately following sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses, which, on the one hand, would be treated as main when the immediately preceding PH clauses were treated as main, or as dependent when the immediately preceding PH clauses were treated as dependent. Since in our analysis we are concerned only with the maximum ranges of the ambivalence corridors, and we do not take into account any intermediate stages, it means that when we treat all the immediately preceding PH clauses (which are usually the initial PH clauses in PH sequences) as main, all the following sequence PH clauses are also treated as main, whereas when we treat all the immediately preceding PH clauses as dependent, all the following sequence PH clauses are also treated as dependent. Moreover, when we were analysing initial PH clauses according to their kind, we did not concentrate upon the sequence PH clauses that followed them, because they were analysed separately according to their kind later on. This resulted in that certain VO word orders with a pronominal direct object in the initial PH clauses, which the sequence PH clauses were capable of producing when they were approached from the point of parataxis later on, were counted when the individual kinds of the initial PH clauses were discussed. In this sense certain immediately following sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses were not capable of producing additional VO word orders with a pronominal direct object in the initial PH clauses when the sequence PH clauses in question were approached from the paratactic point of view later on. For illustration, below we present a PH sequence in which *he geseah* is an initial *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clause and *he þær þes wintres mare don ne mihte* is a sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clause. When we analysed *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses, the initial clause in question received the following annotation pattern:

> [150700 (1095.38)E]
> *…& se cyng þa hamweard gewende,* ***forþam*** *he geseah* ***þet*** *he þær þes wintres mare don ne mihte.*
> H-miph+(con*)+s+V+,+con*+…,

PH-miph}=x]/[con*
…+x+,P-miph+(=)+s+V+do+,+=+…

It can be noticed that in the paratactic annotation (i.e. P-miph) there is a VO word order configuration with a pronominal direct object. This word order configuration was therefore counted when *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses were analysed; in the annotation pattern it can also be noticed that we anticipate a sequence PH clause after this clause, as in H-miph we use the tag *…+,+con*+...,* which in P-miph has the form *…+do+,+=+...* . However, when we analysed sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses, the sequence clause in question received the following annotation pattern:

[150700 (1095.38)E]
…& se cyng þa hamweard gewende, ***forþam*** *he geseah* ***þet*** *he þær þes wintres mare don ne mihte.*
H-miph+(con*)+s+X+DO+inf+X+V+,
Seq PH-miph}=do]/[con*
P-miph+(=)+s+X+DO+inf+X+V+,

Although the sequence PH clause is introduced/preceded by a *do/con** MIPH element *þet*, in the paratactic annotation (P-miph) there is no additional ordinary pronominal direct object in the immediately preceding clause. It is because this direct object was counted when *PH-miph}=x]/[con** clauses were discussed and the initial clause in question was approached from the point of view of parataxis. Otherwise, the sequence PH clause in question would have had the following annotation pattern:

[150700 (1095.38)E]
…& se cyng þa hamweard gewende, ***forþam*** *he geseah* ***þet*** *he þær þes wintres mare don ne mihte.*
H-miph+(con*)+s+X+DO+inf+X+V+,
Seq PH-miph}=do]/[con*
…+do+,P-miph+(=)+s+X+DO+inf+X+V+,

Therefore, the 15 VO word orders with a pronominal direct object of the initial PH clauses in question were already counted when we discussed the different kinds of these clauses in the previous sections concerning the paratactic approach; the 15 direct objects in question become dependent clause connectives when the PH sequences are approached from the hypotactic point of view. So that is why we need to subtract 15 pronominal direct objects from the number 128, which stands for the number of pronominal direct objects in the final position of the immediately preceding clauses. As regards the ASC A,

the problem discussed above does not exist there because there are no sequence *PH-miph}0=do]/[0=con** clauses and, as a result of this, there is no difference between the paratactic approach and the hypotactic approach to the ASC A MIPH clauses as far as the number of VO word orders with a pronominal direct object is concerned. Additionally, in the ASC E it is necessary to subtract 3 from the number 128 because 3 immediatelly preceding clauses are implicit and they do not count in our analysis. Therefore the 15 VO word order configurations in question will in fact be subtracted from 125 VO word order configurations, and not from 128 VO word order configurations. By applying the subtraction of the 15 VO word orders from the 125 ones, we avoided counting the same word order configurations twice and the PH clauses, together with their word orders, are ready to be processed further, which will be of our concern in Chapter 6. In the meantime, however, we will discuss Extended-Para-Hypotaxis.

Chapter 5

Extended-Para-Hypotaxis in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and implications for further study

5.1. EPH clauses

In the previous chapters we discussed SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis and in this chapter we will concentrate upon a kind of para-hypotaxis that we term *Extended-Para-Hypotaxis* (*EPH-taxis* or *PH-eph*). In fact we hinted upon this type of para-hypotaxis in the previous chapter, namely while discussing the doublets under the section devoted to *PH-miph}=do]/[con**, but here we will discuss it in more detail.

Both SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis belong to the type of para-hypotaxis that we call *Intrinsic-Para-Hypotaxis* (*IPH-taxis)*. What we mean by this term is the phenomenon whereby a given PH clause (together with its PH element, namely *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** or *do/con**) can be analysed either from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view. No matter how it is analysed we deal with one and the same PH element and one and the same PH clause which is intrinsically both main and dependent. Therefore, both the PH clause and its PH element are intrinsically ambivalent. On the other hand, what we mean by the term *Extended-Para-Hypotaxis* is the phenomenon whereby there are no intrinsically ambivalent PH clauses, as all clauses (both main and dependent) that participate in this type of para-hypotaxis are unambivalent, unlike in IPH-taxis. For EPH-taxis to occur there must be at least two clauses, one of which is unambivalently main and the other is unambivalently dependent. The dependent clause in EPH-taxis is connected with the immediately preceding (or sometimes following) main clause by means of an *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** or *do/con** EPH element which partly belongs to the main clause and partly

to the dependent one. This EPH element can entirely belong to the dependent clause, but it can never entirely belong to the main clause, as otherwise there would be no EPH-taxis. However, no matter if this EPH element entirely belongs to the dependent clause, or partly to the main clause and partly to the dependent one, the status of the two clauses participating in EPH-taxis is unalterable. As a matter of fact, an EPH element in EPH-taxis, unlike a SIPH element and a MIPH element in SIPH-taxis and in MIPH-taxis respectively, has no power to determine the status of the clauses (and vice versa), which it immediately precedes or immediately follows. Therefore, while we can say 'a SIPH clause' and 'a MIPH clause', and what we mean by each of the terms is that an individual clause is intrinsically ambivalent, we cannot say 'an EPH clause' because nothing like that exists, and thus when talking about EPH-taxis, we must always say 'EPH clauses'. Nevertheless, whereas there is nothing like an 'EPH clause', there is something like an 'EPH element', and it is exactly the EPH element that matters in EPH-taxis. Moreover, an EPH element can be intrinsically para-hypotactic (i.e. intrinsically ambivalent). However, it is not intrinsically para-hypotactic in the same sense as a SIPH element or a MIPH element is. While both the entire SIPH element and the entire MIPH element are always intrinsically ambivalent and can be considered either from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view, an EPH element can be considered partly from the point of view of parataxis and partly from the point of view of hypotaxis, or entirely from the point of view of hypotaxis, but never entirely from the point of view of parataxis. Moreover, whereas SIPH and MIPH elements determine (change) the status of the following PH clauses depending on the approach (and vice versa), EPH elements never determine (change) the status of the clauses involved in EPH-taxis because their status is unambivalent. We distinguish two kinds of EPH elements:

1. An EPH element that belongs partly to the immediately preceding unambivalent main clause and partly to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause. It can also entirely belong to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause. The unity of EPH elements is not interrupted. There are two variants of this type of EPH elements:

— uninterrupted EPH doublets (e.g. *swa swa*),
— uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublets (e.g. *forþan þe*).

2. An EPH element that belongs partly to the immediately preceding unambivalent main clause and partly to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause. It can never entirely belong to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause. The unity of EPH elements is interrupted by some other elements. There are two variants of this type of EPH elements:

— interrupted EPH doublets (e.g. *swa… …swa*),
— interrupted quasi-EPH doublets (e.g. *forþan… …þe*).

It is only the first kind of EPH elements that can influence the results obtained from word order analysis of EPH clauses, because it is sometimes difficult to draw a clear dividing line between the two constituents of such uninterrupted doublets and one has to decide if both constituents of a given doublet function as a dependent clause connective or just the second one. If one draws a dividing line between the two constituents of a given uninterrupted doublet and says that the first constituent belongs to the immediately preceding main clause and the second constituent is a dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following dependent clause, the word order configuration in the immediately preceding main clause will be enriched by an additional ordinary *s*, *do*, *io* or *x* element, namely by a pronominal subject, a direct object, an indirect object or an adverbial respectively. The following sections present how it all works in practice.

5.2. Uninterrupted EPH doublets

In EPH-taxis the notion of para-hypotaxis is present in the sense that there are two co-existing clauses, one of which is always an unambivalent main clause and the other is always an unambivalent dependent clause. Together they form an EPH sequence. Oftentimes this sequence is articulated by means of an uninterrupted EPH doublet consisting of two constituents. The first of the two constituents is often ambivalent, as it can be treated as part of dependent clause connective or as an ordinary element (a pronominal subject, a pronominal direct object, a pronominal indirect object or a pronominal adverbial). Take the uninterrupted EPH doublet *þet þet* for example, in which the first *þet* can be regarded as belonging to the immediately preceding main clause, provided that it can occupy the place of the direct object there, whereas the second *þet* will be regarded as a dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following dependent clause. Such a distinction would have an influence upon the data obtained for the main clauses because in an annotated corpus the immediately preceding main clauses would gain a pronominal direct object in the final position, which fact at the same time would mean more main clause VO word order configurations with a pronominal direct object. However, if the direct object position in the immediately preceding main clauses were already occupied by some direct object, the entire *þet þet* EPH doublet would need to be treated as a dependent clause connective, in which case the immediately preceding main clauses would lose a pronominal direct object in the final position. Therefore, the first of the two constituents of *þet þet* elements (and of other uninterrupted EPH doublets) often being ambivalent, perhaps the best idea

is to classify them as ambivalent and give them two tags, analyse them from two different perspectives, and then compare the results. Below we present an example that contains a *þet þet* uninterrupted doublet:

> [052200 (910.8)A]
> *Þa geascade se cyng **þæt þæt** hie ut on hergað foron,…*
> H-eph+=+X+V+S+,+con*+s+X+V+,…
> PH-eph}=do][con*/[con*
> P-eph+=+X+V+S+do+,+con*+s+X+V+,…
> 'When the king heard **that** they were gone out to ravage[1]… .'

It can be observed in the annotation pattern of this example that when the first constituent of the *þet þet* EPH element is approached from the paratactic point of view (P-eph), the immediately preceding main clause receives an ordinary pronominal direct object in its final position. On the other hand, if the first constituent of the *þet þet* EPH element is approached from the hypotactic point of view (H-eph), the immediately preceding main clause loses this ordinary pronominal direct object because it is treated as part of a reinforced dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following dependent clause then. In the ASC there are other examples of this kind:

> [039800 (755.30)E]
> *…ða cwædon hi **þet þet** hi þæs ne gemundon þonne ma þe heora geferen þe mid þam cininge wæron ofslagene.*
> 'They said **that** they were as regardless of the result as their comrades who with the king were slain.'

> [106900 (1048.17)E]
> *& com þa Eustatius fram geondan sæ sona æfter þam biscop & gewende to ðam cynge & spæc wið hine **þet þet** he þa wolde & gewende þa hamweard.*
> 'And then came Eustace from beyond sea soon after the bishop, and went to the king, and spoke with him **that which** he then would, and went then homeward.'

As a matter of fact, we found only one example with the *þet þet* EPH doublet in the ASC A and two examples in the ASC E. It means that if the first element *þet* in the three *þet þet* doublets is looked at from the paratactic point of view, we obtain two additional main clause VO word order configurations with a pronominal direct object in the ASC E and one in the ASC A, whereas

[1] Translation from Bosworth and Toller (1898).

if it is looked at from the hypotactic point of view, these additional word orders disappear from the main clauses because the whole doublet is then treated as a dependent clause connective. Therefore, EPH clauses with *þet þet* doublets can also have an influence upon the data obtained for word order analysis depending on whether we approach the first constituent of the doublets from the paratactic point of view or from the hypotactic point of view.

We also found some examples of the use of *þet þet* in which the second *þet* functions as a demonstrative pronoun, or as a definite article, in which case we cannot speak of EPH doublets:

> [039800 (755.30)E]
> *& hi cwædon **þet þet** ilce heora geferum geboden wære þe ær mid þam cininge wæron… .*
> 'They replied **that the** same request was made to their comrades that were formerly with the king… .'

> [110500 (1052.17)E]
> *Ða geaxode Godwine eorl þet & teah þa up his segl & his lið & gewendon heom þa west on an to Wiht & eodon þær up & hergodon swa lange þær **þet þet** folc geald heom swa mycel swa hi heom on legden… .*
> 'When Earl Godwin understood that, he drew up his sail and his ship: and they went west at once to the Isle of Wight; and landing there, they plundered so long **that** the people gave them as much as they required of them… .'

> [128500 (1083.22)E]
> *…& eodon inn & ofslogon sume þa munecas to deaðe & mænige gewundedon þærinne swa **þet ðet** blod com of ðam weofode uppon þam gradan & of ðam gradan on þa flore… .*
> '…and came in, and slew some of the monks to death, and wounded many therein so **that the** blood came from the altar upon the steps, and from the steps on the floor… .'

In the two manuscripts of the ASC that we are concerned with here, apart from the *do/con** EPH doublets *þet þet*, one can also come across other kinds of EPH doublets, namely *swa swa*, *þa þa*, and *þær þær*, all of which are *x/con** EPH elements. We will start with the discussion of the *swa swa* doublet. We found 27 examples with this doublet: 3 in the ASC A and 24 in the ASC E. Below we present two of them and we provide the annotation only in the first one for illustration:

[051500 (905.2)A]
& on þæm ilcan gere mon fæstnode þone frið æt Yttingaforda ***swa swa*** *Eadweard cyng gerædde, ægðer wið Eastengle ge wið Norðhymbre.*
H-eph+cj=+X+S+V+DO+X+,+con*+S+V+,…
PH-eph}=x][con*/[con*
P-eph+cj=+X+S+V+DO+X+x+,+con*+S+V+,…
'And the same year was concluded the peace at Hitchingford, **as** King Edward decreed, both with the Danes of East Anglia, and those of Northumberland.'

[116600 (1066.4)E]
& Harold eorl feng to Englalandes cynerice ***swa swa*** *se cyng hit him geuðe, & eac men hine þærto gecuron, & wæs gebletsod to cynge on twelftan mæssedæg.*
'And Harold the earl succeeded to the kingdom of England, **even as** the king had granted it to him, and men also had chosen him thereto; and he was crowned as king on twelfth-day.'

If the *swa swa* doublets are approached from the paratactic point of view, the immediately preceding main clauses in the ASC A gain 3 pronominal adverbials in the final position, whereas in the ASC E they gain 24 of them. On the other hand, if they are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the pronominal adverbials from the immediately preceding main clauses wander to the immediately following dependent clauses and become part of reinforced dependent clause connectives there.

As regards *þa þa* EPH doublets, they behave in a similar way to *swa swa* EPH doublets. We found three types of clauses containing these EPH doublets. In the first type of clauses the first clause is main and the following one is dependent, and the *þa þa* doublet finds itself in between:

[015300 (626.2)A]
& Penda hæfde XXX wintra rice & he hæfde L wintra ***þa þa*** *he to rice feng.*
'And Penda reigned thirty winters. He had seen fifty winters **when** he began to reign.'

[011900 (565.6)E]
Þær se Columba getymbrade mynster, & ðær <he> wæs abbot XXXII wintra & þær
forðferde ***ða ða*** *he wæs LXXVII wintra.*
'There Columba built a monastary. There he was abbot two and thirty winters; and there he died, **when** he was seventy-seven years old.'

[128220 (1083.12)E]
Sume urnon into cyrcean & belucan þa duran into heom, & hi ferdon æfter heom into þam mynstre & woldon hig ut dragan, ***þa ða*** *hig ne dorsten na ut gan.*
'Some ran into the church, and locked the doors after them. But they followed them into the minster, and resolved to drag them out, **so that** they durst not go out.'

In the ASC A there are 2 examples of such EPH clauses, and in the ASC E there are 3 of them. If the *þa þa* doublets are approached from the paratactic point of view, the main clauses immediately preceding them gain ordinary pronominal adverbials in their final positions, whereas if they are approached from the hypotactic point of view, the immediately preceding main clauses lose these ordinary pronominal adverbials, because they then function as part of reinforced dependent clause connectives introducing the immediately following dependent clauses. In the second type of clauses with a *þa þa* doublet, the first clause is dependent and the immediately following one is main, whereas the *þa þa* doublet finds itself at the beginning of the dependent clause. We found 6 examples of this type of EPH clauses, 5 in the ASC E and 1 in the ASC A. Below we present three examples for illustration:

[063100 (1070.10)A]
Ða ða *Landfranc crafede fæstnunge his gehersumnesse mid aðswerunge,* ***þa*** *forsoc he & sæde þæt he hit nahte to donne.*
'**When** Landfranc craved confirmation of his obedience with an oath, **then** he refused and said, that he ought not to do it.'

[144700 (1091.25)E]
Ða þa *se cyng Willelm into Normandige þis gehyrde,* ***þa*** *gearcode he his fare & to Englelande com… .*
'**When** the King William in Normandy heard this, **then** prepared he his departure, and came to England… .'

[145000 (1091.33)E]
Ða þa *se cyng Willelm mid his fyrde genealehte,* ***þa*** *ferdon betwux Rodbeard eorl & Eadgar æðeling… .*
'**When** the King William came near with his army, **then** interceded between them Earl Robert, and Edgar Etheling… .'

Even though in this type of clauses we approached the *þa þa* doublets from the paratactic point of view, the immediately following main clauses did not gain an additional ordinary pronominal adverbial *þa* in their initial positions

because this adverbial is already present there. In order for the main clauses to gain an additional pronominal adverbial *þa* we would have to reverse the order of clauses.

There is also a third type of EPH clauses with the *þa þa* doublet. Here the first clause is dependent and the following one is main, and the *þa þa* doublets appear at the beginning of the dependent clauses. While in the second type of EPH clauses with the *þa þa* doublet the immediately following main clauses started with an ordinary adverbial *þa* and did not receive additional ordinary pronominal adverbials in their initial positions in parataxis, in the third type they receive them. We found 5 examples of this type of clauses in the ASC E and none in the ASC A. Below are 3 examples for illustration:

> [146600 (1093.24)E]
> ***Ða þa*** *seo gode cwen Margarita þis gehyrde, hyre þa leofstan hlaford & sunu þus beswikene,* ***heo*** *wearð oð deað on mode geancsumed… .*
> '**When** the good Queen Margaret heard this, her most beloved lord and son thus betrayed, **she** was in her mind almost distracted to death… .'

> [148500 (1094.37)E]
> *Ac* ***þa ða*** *hi towardes Ou faran sceoldan þær se cyng wæs,* ***hi*** *foran to Englelande & up coman æt Hamtune on ealra halgena mæsseæfne & her syððon wunedon & to Cristesmæssan wæron on Lunden.*
> '**When** they should have gone towards Ou where the king was, **they** went to England, and came up at Hamton, on the eve of the feast of All Saints, and here afterwards abode and at Christmas they were in London.'

> [153700 (1097.13)E]
> *Ac* ***þa ða*** *se cyng geseah þet he nan þingc his willes þær geforðian ne mihte,* ***he*** *ongean into þison lande for, & hraðe æfter þam he be þam gemæron castelas let gemakian.*
> 'And **when** the king saw that he could do nothing in furtherance of his will, **he** returned again into this land, and soon after that he let his men build castles on the borders.'

On the one hand, if here the *þa þa* doublets are approached from the point of view of parataxis, their initial constituents are treated as ordinary pronominal adverbials occupying the initial positions of the immediately following main clauses. On the other hand, if the *þa þa* doublets are approached from the hypotactic point of view, their initial constituents become part of reinforced dependent clause connectives introducing the immediately preceding dependent clauses.

Altogether in our corpus there are 16 EPH clauses with the *þa þa* doublet: 5 of the first type (2 in the ASC A and 3 in the ASC E), 6 of the second type (1 in the ASC A and 5 in the ASC E), and 5 of the third type (0 in the ASC A and 5 in the ASC E). Therefore, if the EPH doublets in question are approached from the paratactic point of view, 5 main clauses (2 in the ASC A and 3 in the ASC E) receive an ordinary pronominal adverbial in the final position, 5 main clauses (5 in the ASC E and 0 in the ASC A) receive a pronominal adverbial in the initial position, and there are no consequences in 6 main clauses (1 in the ASC A and 5 in the ASC E).

And finally we will concentrate upon *þær þær* uninterrupted doublets. Below we present two examples for illustration:

> [042800 (893.7)A]
> *Þa gegaderade Ælfred cyning his fierd & for þæt he gewicode betwuh þæm twam hergum* ***þær þær*** *he niehst rymet hæfde for wudufæstenne ond for wæterfæstenne, swa þæt he mehte ægþerne geræcan gif hie ænigne feld secan wolden.*
> 'Upon this King Alfred gathered his army, and advanced, so that he encamped between the two armies **at** the nearest point he could find defended by wood and by water, that he might reach either, if they would seek any field.'

> [031600 (679.1)E]
> *Her man ofsloh Ælfwine be Trentan* ***þær ðær*** *Egferð & Æðelred gefuhton.*
> 'This year Elwin was slain, by the river Trent, **on the spot where** Everth and Ethelred fought.'

Altogether we found 6 *þær þær* EPH elements in the two manuscripts of the ASC: 2 in the ASC A and 4 in the ASC E. If these doublets are approached from the point of view of parataxis, the immediately preceding main clauses in the ASC A obtain 2 additional ordinary pronominal adverbials in their final positions, whereas the ASC E main clauses obtain 4 of them. On the other hand, if these EPH doublets are approached from the hypotactic point of view, they are entirely treated as dependent clause connectives introducing the immediately following dependent clauses, in which case the immediately preceding main clauses lose the ordinary pronominal adverbials in their final positions.

So far we have discussed uninterrupted EPH doublets, and now we will discuss uninterrupted quasi EPH-doublets.

5.3. Uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublets

There are different kinds of uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublets, namely *x/con**, *s/con**, *io/con** and *do/con**, and we will start the discussion with the *s/con** doublet. These doublets are the ones in which the two constituents are not identical, unlike in uninterrupted doublets. The first constituent is an *s* and it can be approached from two different perspectives, whereas the second constituent is an ordinary dependent clause connective *con** and it can only be treated as a dependent clause connective introducing a dependent clause. If the first constituent is approached from the point of view of parataxis, it is treated as an ordinary pronominal subject in the final position of the immediately preceding main clause. However, if it is approached from the point of view of hypotaxis, it will entirely belong to the immediately following dependent clause and will function as a reinforced dependent clause connective in it. Below we present an example of an *s/con** uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublet:

> [043600 (893.30)A]
> *…þa gegaderedon **þa þe** in Norþhymbrum bugeað & on Eastenglum sum hund scipa & foron suð ymbutan… .*
> 'Then collected together **those that** dwell in Northumbria and East-Anglia about a hundred ships, and went south about… .'

What we said about the *s/con** doublet, can also be said about the remaining doublets, namely *x/con**, *io/con** and *do/con**. If the first constituent of these doublets, namely *x*, *io* or *do*, is approached from the point of view of parataxis, it functions as an ordinary pronominal adverbial, pronominal indirect object or pronominal direct object respectively in the final position of the immediately preceding main clause. Below are two examples of *x/con** doublets:

> [006200 (409.2)A]
> *Þæt wæs embe XI hund wintra & X wintra **þes þe** heo getimbred was.*
> 'This was about eleven hundred and ten winters **after** it was built.'

> [006700 (443.1)A]
> *Her sendon Brytwalas to Rome & heom fultomes bædon wiþ Piohtas, ac hi þar næfdan nanne, **forþan ðe** hi fyrdedon wið Ætla Huna cyningæ, & þa sendon hi to Anglum & Angelcynnes æðelingas ðæs ylcan bædan.*
> 'This year sent the Britons to Rome, and begged assistance against the Picts; but they had none, **for** the Romans were at war with Atila, king of the Huns. Then sent they to the Angles, and requested the same from the nobles of that nation.'

And below we present two examples of *do/con** doublets:

[009800 (491.1)E]
Her Ælla & Cissa ymbsæton Andredesceaster & ofslogon ealle ***þa ðe*** *þærinne eardedon; ne wearð þær forþen an Brit to lafe.*
'This year Ella and Cissa besieged the city of Andred, and slew all **that** were therein; nor was one Briten left there afterwards.'

[030500 (675.55)E]
…& ic bletsie ealle ***þa þe*** *hit healden.*
'…and I bless all **that** hold it.'

Unfortunately, we did not find any examples of *io/con** doublets.

Although there is some ambiguity about uninterrupted EPH doublets and uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublets, the dual approach to some of them does not have any influence upon the state of word order configurations of a given text. This observation refers especially to the uninterrupted doublets that always belong entirely to the immediately following dependent clause no matter if their first constituent, be it *x*, *s*, *do*, or *io*, in parataxis is treated as an ordinary pronominal adverbial, pronominal subject, pronominal direct object or pronominal indirect object, respectively, or as an integral part of a complex dependent clause connective in hypotaxis. For example, even though in the entry below the constituent *se* of the uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublet *se þe* is treated as an ordinary pronominal subject in parataxis, it cannot move to the immediately preceding main clause and physically occupy the subject position in it. It is because the subject position is already occupied by the noun *Herodes*:

[003500 (45.1)A]
Her Herodes aswalt, ***se þe*** *Iacobum ofslog ane geare ær his agnum deaþe.*
'This year died Herod, **who** slew James one year ere his own death.'

However, the state of word order configurations of a given text could be influenced significantly if there were a lot of uninterrupted EPH doublets and uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublets whose first constituent, depending on the approach, moved ones to the immediately preceding unambivalent main clause, and once to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause, as in the example with the *do/con** uninterrupted quasi-EPH doublet presented below:

[030500 (675.55)E]
…& ic bletsie ealle ***þa þe*** *hit healden.*
'…and I bless all **those who** hold it.'

Here the constituent *þa* becomes an ordinary pronominal direct object that occupies the final position of the immediately preceding unambivalent main clause when the *þa þe* EPH doublet is approached from the point of view of parataxis, whereas when the same doublet is approached from the hypotactic point of view it becomes part of a reinforced dependent clause connective introducing the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause. Therefore, depending on whether the first constituent of an EPH doublet is able to move from one clause to another, we could distinguish two types of EPH-taxis by following the criteria distinguishing SIPH-taxis from MIPH-taxis. On the one hand, going along the tracks of the typology concerning SIPH-taxis, the EPH doublets which always belong to the immediately following clause, no matter what the approach, could be termed *SEPH elements* in some kind of *Static Extended-Para-Hypotaxis* (or *SEPH-taxis*), and the clauses involved could in turn be called *SEPH clauses*. On the other hand, going along the tracks of the typology concerning MIPH-taxis, the EPH doublets whose first constituent in parataxis belongs to the immediately preceding unambivalent main clause and in hypotaxis to the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause could be termed *MEPH elements* in some kind of *Mobile-Extended-Para-Hypotaxis* (or *MEPH-taxis*). Furthermore, if in MEPH-taxis, unlike in SEPH-taxis, the first constituent of MEPH doublets is approached from the paratactic point of view, in the total number of the immediately preceding unambivalent main clauses of a given text we obtain additional word order configurations, namely …VS, …VO, …VX, …OX, and others, with a pronominal subject, pronominal direct object, pronominal indirect object, and pronominal adverbial. However, if the first constituent of MEPH doublets is approached from the point of view of hypotaxis, it functions as a dependent clause connective together with its second constituent and both introduce the immediately following unambivalent dependent clause in the form of a reinforced dependent clause connective. In this situation all the …VS, …VO, …VX, etc. main clause word order configurations, which were obtained in the paratactic approach, have to disappear then. Moreover, both SEPH and MEPH elements can function as explicit and implicit. Theoretically speaking, it is also possible to introduce the notion of explicit/implicit EPH elements which appear in EPH sequences articulated by means of explicit/implicit coordinating conjunctions. In order to achieve that it would be necessary to follow step by step the criteria that apply to SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis. However, we are not going to develop the problem of EPH clauses and their classification further because in our book we are basically concerned with SIPH and MIPH clauses. Otherwise, we would end up employing the whole theoretical apparatus utilised in the previous chapters, which would of course need to be adjusted to the exigencies of EPH-taxis. Such a procedure, however, would be beyond the scope of this book.

And finally, we would like to say a few words about EPH doublets in which the first constituent unambivalently belongs to the immediately preceding main clause and the second constituent unambivalently belongs to the immediately following dependent clause. These EPH doublets cannot undergo the dual analysis because their constituents and the clauses in which they occur are unambivalent. There are two variants of this type of EPH doublets, namely interrupted EPH doublets and interrupted quasi-EPH doublets.

5.4. Interrupted EPH doublets

As regards the first variant of these EPH doublets, below we present some examples for illustration. There are different kinds of them, namely *x…/con**, *s…/con**, *io…/con** and *do…/con** and we will start with *x…/con**:

[066500 (963.20)E]
…macede ***þær*** *munecas* ***þær*** *ær ne wæs nan þing*
'…and **there** made monks, **where** before was nothing.'

[085500 (1011.25)E]
Þær *man mihte þa geseon earmðe* ***þær*** *man ær geseah blisse on þære ærman byrig þanon us com ærest Cristendom & blisse for Gode & for worulde.*
'**There** might be seen great wretchedness, **where** before great bliss was seen, in the fated city, whence first to us came Christendom, and bliss 'fore God and 'fore the world.'

[113100 (1054.1)E]
Her on þisum geare forðferde Leo se halga papa on Rome, & on þisum geare wæs ***swa*** *mycel orfcwealm* ***swa*** *man ne gemunde fela wintrum ær.*
'This year died Leo the holy pope, at Rome, and in this year was **so** great loss of cattle **as** was not remembered for many winters before.'

[075100 (998.1)E]
Her gewende se here eft eastweard into Frommuðan & þær æghwær up eodon ***swa*** *wide* ***swa*** *hi woldon into Dorsætan.*
'This year coasted the army back eastward into the mouth of the Frome, and went up everywhere, **as** widely **as** they would, into Dorsetshire.'

[008100 (449.7)E]
*Heo þa fuhton wið Pyhtas & heofdon sige **swa** hwer **swa** heo comon.*
'They then fought against the Picts and they obtained the victory **wheresoever** they came.'

In these EPH doublets the first element will always be annotated as an ordinary adverbial, and will be given the tag *x*, whereas the second element will always be treated as a dependent clause connective and it will be given the tag *con**. Both constituents, however, are formally identical. Below we present an example of a *do…/con** interrupted doublet:

[039300 (755.20)E]
*Þa on morgen gehyrdon **þet** þes ciniges þegnas þe him bæfton wæron **þet** se cining ofslagen wæs, þa ridon þider… .*
'When the king's thanes that were behind heard in the morning **that** the king was slain, they rode to the spot… .'

Here the first constituent of the doublet *þet … þet* will be annotated as an ordinary pronominal direct object and the second constituent will be annotated as a dependent clause connective.

We did not find any examples of *s…/con** or *io…/con** interrupted doublets. By analogy we can say that in the former case the doublet consists of two formally identical constituents interrupted by some elements. The first constituent of that doublet will be annotated as an ordinary pronominal subject (if possible), whereas the second one will be annotated as a dependent clause connective. In the latter case, the doublet also consists of two formally identical elements interrupted by some elements. While the first constituent of this doublet will be annotated as an ordinary pronominal indirect object (if possible), the second one will be annotated as a dependent clause connective.

5.5. Interrupted quasi-EPH doublets

As far as interrupted quasi-EPH doublets are concerned, below are some examples for illustration. There are different kinds of them, namely *x…/con**, *s…/con**, *io…/con** and *do…/con**, and first we will present *x…/con**:

[093200 (1016.34)E]
& þa æfter his ende ealle þa witan þe on Lundene wæron & se burhwaru gecuron Eadmund to cynge, & his rice he heardlice werode ***þa*** *hwile* ***þe*** *his tima wæs.*
'After his decease, all the peers that were in London, and the citizens, chose Edmund to be king, and he bravely defended his kingdom **while** his time was.'

[018500 (634.6)E]
And Oswold eac her feng to Norðanhymbran rice, & he rixade IX winter; man getealde him þet nigonðe ***for þan*** *heðenscipe* ***þe*** *hi drugon þe hi þet an gear rixodon betwix him & Eadwine.*
'Oswald also this year succeeded to the government of the Northumbrians, and reigned nine winters. The ninth year was assigned to him on account **of the** heathenism **in which** those lived who reigned that one year betwixt him and Edwin.'

However, here the first constituent of the *x…/con** doublet will be annotated the way it forms an integral part of a nominal adverbial (in this case *þa hwile* and *for þan heðenscipe*), whereas the second constituent will be treated as a dependent clause connective. Unlike was the case with interrupted doublets, the two constituents are not formally identical here. In this sense these doublets are not true EPH doublets in the sense that the EPH doublets that we have discussed so far are. We also found an example of *do…/con** doublets:

[011600 (565.2)E]
…& heora cyning him gesealde ***þet*** *egland* ***þe*** *man nemnad Ii, þær sindon V hida ðæs þe men cweðaþ.*
'And their king gave him **the** island **that** is called Hii, consisting of five hides, as they say.'

In this example the first constituent, together with the noun *egland*, will be annotated as an integral part of a nominal object and the other element as a dependent clause connective. We did not find any examples of *s…/con** or *io…/con** interrupted quasi-EPH doublets. Nevertheless, by analogy we can say that these doublets also consist of two formally different constituents interrupted by some nominal elements and they form an integral part of these nominal elements.

We have given a very general and vague presentation of EPH-taxis and it needs to be investigated further in order to classify the EPH elements in a more systematic way. However, as can be observed, the EPH-taxis is of minor importance and, unlike SIPH-taxis and MIPH-taxis, it is not capable

of influencing significantly the data obtained from the analysis of word order configurations. Moreover, EPH clauses are not true PH clauses because their status does not change depending on whether they are approached from the paratactic or hypotactic point of view. Therefore, in the context of EPH-taxis we should rather speak of EPH-elements and not of EPH clauses because it is the EPH elements, and more specifically the initial constituents of these elements, that change their status when they are approached from two different perspectives. The EPH elements that are especially worth taking into account in the analysis of VO and OV word order configurations are the *þet þet* uninterrupted EPH doublets, which are capable of producing additional main clause VO word order configurations with a pronominal direct object when their first constituent is annotated as an ordinary pronominal direct object in parataxis. As far as the remaining uninterrupted EPH doublets are concerned, they are not capable of influencing the data obtained from word order analysis in any significant way. Having generally discussed EPH-taxis, we will now move to the last chapter of the book.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

6.1. Introduction

In the previous chapters we discussed different types of para-hypotactic clauses without incorporating the data obtained from their dual analysis into the total number of unambivalent main and dependent clauses of the ASC. We already observed that both SIPH and MIPH clauses, depending on whether one approaches them from the hypotactic or from the paratactic point of view, are capable of changing significantly the results obtained in the analysis of word order configurations. We also observed that EPH-taxis is of minor importance because EPH clauses do not have any significant influence upon the word order configurations when the initial constituents of their EPH elements are approached from two different perspectives. In this chapter we are going to calibrate[1] the data and discuss the actual influence that the two different approaches, namely paratactic and hypotactic, to SIPH and MIPH clauses can have upon the whole picture of word order configurations in the ASC A and the ASC E main and dependent clauses. However, before we do that we need some information, namely we need to add the data obtained for all the ASC A SIPH clauses (see Table 3.11) to the data obtained for all the ASC A MIPH clauses (see Table 4.9), and we also need to add the data obtained for all the ASC E SIPH clauses (see Table 3.14) to the data obtained for all the ASC E MIPH clauses (see Table 4.12). In this way we will obtain a full picture (i.e. the maximum ranges of the ambivalence corridors) of all the PH clauses (both SIPH and MIPH) in the two manuscripts of the ASC, as so far we discussed SIPH and MIPH clauses separately (for both manuscripts), in chapters 3 and 4, respectively:

[1] We adopted the terms ‘calibrate’ and ‘calibration’ from the nomenclature applied in methods of dating, such as radiocarbon dating, potassium-argon dating, dendrochronology and a number of others, which are used in archeology and geology. In short, generally speaking, calibration is a method of correcting for the results.

Table 6.1. The maximum ranges of the ambivalence corridors produced by the ASC A SIPH and MIPH clauses taken together, and by the ASC E SIPH and MIPH clauses taken together

Paratactic approach						Hypotactic approach					
Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses		total		unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses		total	
ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E
1478	4190	77 + 33 = 110	263 + 218 = 481	1478 + 110 = 1588	4190 + 481 = 4671	303	1353	77 + 33 = 110	263 + 218 = 481	303 + 110 = 413	1353 + 481 = 1834

Word order configurations							
Overall PH clauses		ASC A	ASC E	overall PH clauses		ASC A	ASC E
		77 + 33 = 110	263 + 218 = 481			77 + 33 = 110	263 + 218 = 481
V2	XV2 clauses	9 + 1 = 10	49 + 12 = 61	V2	XV2 clauses	5 + 1 = 6	41 + 12 = 53
	SV2 clauses	41 + 15 = 56	147 + 120 = 267		SV2 clauses	15 + 15 = 30	32 + 120 = 152
VO word order		6 + 5 = 11	18 + 61 = 79	VO word order		6 + 5 = 11	18 + 61 = 79
Vo word order*		1 + 0 = 1	2 + 27 = 29	Vo word order		1 + 0 = 1	1 + 12 = 13
OV word order		1 + 3 = 4	2 + 19 = 21	OV word order		1 + 3 = 4	2 + 19 = 21
oV word order		6 + 9 = 15	28 + 29 = 57	oV word order		1 + 9 = 10	10 + 29 = 39
Vo word order in the immediately preceding clauses		20	110	Vo word order in the immediately preceding clauses		0	0

* In the tables to follow, to these word orders we also add the VO word orders with a pronominal object from the immediately preceding clauses, which are presented in the last line of this table.

For further calculations we also need to provide the data that we obtained for the unambivalent (i.e. non-PH) main and dependent clauses. For this reason we repeat Table 2.1 here, whose sequence number is now 6.2:

Table 6.2. Unambivalent (i.e. non PH) main and dependent clauses, with their word order configurations, and PH clauses in the ASC A and the ASC E

Word order configura-tions	Unambivalent main clauses		Unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses	
	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E	ASC A	ASC E
Total	1478	4190	303	1353	110	481
XV2	548	1329	70	249	—	—
SV2	272	839	69	398	—	—
VO	284	946	14	150	—	—
OV	141	351	45	150	—	—
Vo	39	217	2	33	—	—
oV	83	277	21	132	—	—

We are now ready to perform the calibration of the data in order to see the actual influence that the two different approaches, namely paratactic and hypotactic, to PH clauses (i.e. both SIPH and MIPH) can have upon the general state of word order configurations in the ASC A and the ASC E main and dependent clauses.

6.2. Calibration of the data for the ASC A — proportions

Here we will discuss what is the situation in the ASC A after the addition of the PH clauses to the unambivalent clauses (main and dependent) in order to see what the proportions are. First we will discuss the proportion of the PH clauses to the unambivalent clauses without including the PH clauses into the unambivalent clauses (i.e. not shared percentages), and then we will discuss the proportion of PH clauses to the unambivalent clauses after including the PH clauses into the unambivalent clauses so as to form one total (i.e. shared percentages). We will concentrate upon the main clauses first.

If we treat all the ASC A PH clauses as main and place them next to the unambivalent ASC A main clauses, we will obtain the following proportions.

As can be seen in the Table 6.3, the additional main clauses (i.e. PH clauses treated as main) constitute 7.44 per cent against the total number of the ASC A unambivalent main clauses. The additional XV2 word orders constitute 1.82 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause XV2 word

Table 6.3. Proportion of the ASC A PH clauses treated as main to the ASC A unambivalent main clauses: not shared percentages

Word order configurations		PH clauses (number)	Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses/unambivalent main clauses ratio
			per cent	number	
Total		**110**	**100**	**1478**	**110 × 100% : 1478 = 7.44%**
V2	XV2 clauses	10	100	548	10 × 100% : 548 = 1.82%
	SV2 clauses	56	100	272	56 × 100% : 272 = 20.58%
VO word order		11	100	284	11 × 100% : 284 = 3.87%
OV word order		4	100	141	4 × 100% : 141 = 2.83%
Vo word order		21	100	39	21 × 100% : 39 = 53.84%
oV word order		15	100	83	15 × 100% : 83 = 18.07%

orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 20.58 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 3.87 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 2.83 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 53.84 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 18.07 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

Somewhat lower percentages will be obtained if we treat the unambivalent main clauses together with the PH clauses treated as main as if they formed 100 per cent together. If we follow this path, we obtain the following results:

Table 6.4. Proportion of the ASC A unambivalent main clauses to the ASC A PH clauses treated as main: shared percentages

Word order configurations		Unambivalent main clauses		+	PH clauses		=	Overall clauses	
		number	per cent		number	per cent		number	per cent
Total		**1478**	**93.07**	**+**	**110**	**6.92**	**=**	**1588**	**100.00**
V2	XV2 clauses	548	98.20	+	10	1.79	=	558	100.00
	SV2 clauses	272	85.26	+	56	17.07	=	328	100.00
VO word order		284	96.27	+	11	3.72	=	295	100.00
OV word order		141	97.24	+	4	2.75	=	145	100.00
Vo word order		39	63.93	+	21	35.00	=	60	100.00
oV word order		83	84.69	+	15	15.30	=	98	100.00

There are 1,478 unambivalent main clauses in the ASC A. If we add the 110 PH clauses to this number, we will obtain 1,588 main clauses. In this situation the additional main clauses constitute 6.92 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clauses. The additional XV2 word orders constitute 1.79 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 17.07 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 3.72 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 2.75 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 35.00 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 15.30 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

We will now move on to the discussion of the ASC A dependent clauses. First, we will discuss the percentages that are not shared. If we treat all the ASC A PH clauses as dependent and place them next to the unambivalent ASC A dependent clauses, we obtain the following proportions:

Table 6.5. Proportion of the ASC A PH clauses treated as dependent to the ASC A unambivalent dependent clauses: not shared percentages

Word order configurations		PH clauses (number)	Unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses/unambivalent dependent clauses ratio
			per cent	number	
Total		**110**	**100**	**303**	**110 × 100% : 303 = 36.30%**
V2	XV2 clauses	6	100	70	6 × 100% : 70 = 8.57%
	SV2 clauses	30	100	69	30 × 100% : 69 = 43.47%
VO word order		11	100	14	11 × 100% : 14 = 78.57%
OV word order		4	100	45	4 × 100% : 45 = 8.88%
Vo word order		1	100	2	1 × 100% : 2 = 50.00%
oV word order		10	100	21	10 × 100% : 21 = 47.61%

According to our calculations, the additional dependent clauses constitute 36.30 per cent against the total number of the ASC A unambivalent dependent clauses. The additional XV2 word orders constitute 8.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 43.47 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 78.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional

OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 8.88 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 50.00 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 47.61 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object. Additionally, the immediately preceding main clauses lose the pronominal objects, which they obtained when the PH clauses in question were treated as main.

A little lower percentages will be obtained if we treat the unambivalent dependent clauses together with the PH clauses treated as dependent as if they formed 100 per cent together. If we follow this procedure, we will obtain the following results:

Table 6.6. Proportion of the ASC A unambivalent dependent clauses to the ASC A PH clauses treated as dependent: shared percentages

Word order configurations		Unambivalent dependent clauses		+	PH clauses		=	Overall clauses	
		number	per cent		number	per cent		number	per cent
Total		**303**	**73.36**	**+**	**110**	**26.63**	**=**	**413**	**100.00**
V2	XV2 clauses	70	92.10	+	6	7.89	=	76	100.00
	SV2 clauses	69	69.69	+	30	30.30	=	99	100.00
VO word order		14	56.00	+	11	44.00	=	25	100.00
OV word order		45	91.83	+	4	8.16	=	49	100.00
Vo word order		2	66.66	+	1	33.33	=	3	100.00
oV word order		21	67.74	+	10	32.25	=	31	100.00

There are 303 unambivalent dependent clauses in the ASC A. If we add the 110 PH clauses treated as dependent to this number, we will obtain 413 dependent clauses in the ASC A. In this situation the additional dependent clauses constitute 26.63 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses. Moreover, the additional XV2 word orders constitute 7.89 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 30.30 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 44.00 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 8.16 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitutes 33.33 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with

a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 32.25 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

And now we will discuss what is the situation in the ASC E after the addition of the PH clauses, first to the unambivalent main clauses and then to the unambivalent dependent clauses. We will first discuss the percentages that are not shared and afterwards the percentages that are shared.

6.3. Calibration of the data for the ASC E — proportions

We will now concentrate upon the main clauses first. If we treat all of the ASC E PH clauses as main and place them next to the unambivalent ASC E main clauses, we will obtain the following proportions:

Table 6.7. Proportion of the ASC E PH clauses treated as main to the ASC E unambivalent main clauses: not shared percentages

Word order configurations		PH clauses (number)	Unambivalent main clauses		PH clauses/unambivalent main clauses ratio
			per cent	number	
Total		**481**	**100**	**4190**	**481 × 100% : 4190 = 11.47%**
V2	XV2 clauses	61	100	1329	61 × 100% : 1329 = 4.58%
	SV2 clauses	267	100	839	267 × 100% : 839 = 31.82%
VO word order		79	100	946	79 × 100% : 946 = 8.35%
OV word order		21	100	351	21 × 100% : 351 = 5.98%
Vo word order		139	100	217	139 × 100% : 217 = 64.05%
oV word order		57	100	277	57 × 100% : 277 = 20.57%

All PH clauses treated as main constitute 11.47 per cent against the total number of the ASC E unambivalent main clauses. Moreover, the additional XV2 word orders constitute 4.58 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 31.82 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 8.35 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 5.98 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 64.05 per cent

against the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 20.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

A little lower percentages will be obtained if we treat the unambivalent main clauses together with the PH clauses treated as main as if they constituted 100 per cent together. If we follow this procedure, we will obtain the following results:

Table 6.8. Proportion of the ASC E unambivalent main clauses to the ASC E PH clauses treated as main: shared percentages

Word order configurations		Unambivalent main clauses		+	PH clauses		=	Overall clauses	
		number	per cent		number	per cent		number	per cent
Total		**4190**	**89.70**	**+**	**481**	**10.29**	**=**	**4671**	**100.00**
V2	XV2 clauses	1329	95.61	+	61	4.38	=	1390	100.00
	SV2 clauses	839	75.85	+	267	24.14	=	1106	100.00
VO word order		946	92.29	+	79	7.70	=	1025	100.00
OV word order		351	94.35	+	21	5.64	=	372	100.00
Vo word order		217	60.95	+	139	39.04	=	356	100.00
oV word order		277	82.93	+	57	17.06	=	334	100.00

According to our calculations, there are 4,190 unambivalent main clauses in the ASC E. If we add the 481 PH clauses, treated as main, to this number, we will obtain 4,671 main clauses in the ASC E. In this situation the additional main clauses constitute 10.29 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Moreover, the additional XV2 word orders constitute 4.38 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 24.14 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 7.70 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 5.64 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 39.04 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 17.06 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

And now we will focus on the ASC E dependent clauses. We will first discuss the percentages that are not shared. If we treat all the ASC E PH clauses

as dependent and place them next to the total number of the unambivalent ASC E dependent clauses, we will obtain the following proportions:

Table 6.9. Proportion of the ASC E PH clauses treated as dependent to the ASC E unambivalent dependent clauses: not shared percentages

Word order configurations		PH clauses (number)	Unambivalent dependent clauses		PH clauses/unambivalent dependent clauses ratio
			per cent	number	
Total		**481**	**100**	**1353**	**481 × 100% : 1353 = 35.55%**
V2	XV2 clauses	53	100	249	53 × 100% : 249 = 21.28%
	SV2 clauses	152	100	398	152 × 100% : 398 = 38.19%
VO word order		79	100	150	79 × 100% : 150 = 52.66%
OV word order		21	100	150	21 × 100% : 150 = 14.00%
Vo word order		13	100	33	13 × 100% : 33 = 39.39%
oV word order		39	100	132	39 × 100% : 132 = 29.54%

We can see that the additional dependent clauses constitute 35.55 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. The additional XV2 word orders constitute 21.28 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 38.19 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 52.66 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 14.0 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 39.39 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 29.54 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object. Additionally, the immediately preceding main clauses lose the pronominal objects, which they would have obtained had the PH clauses in question been treated as main.

Somewhat lower percentages will be obtained if we treat the unambivalent dependent clauses together with the PH clauses treated as dependent as if they constituted 100 per cent together. According to this procedure we will obtain the following proportions:

Table 6.10. Proportion of the ASC E unambivalent dependent clauses to the ASC E PH clauses treated as dependent: shared percentages

Word order configurations		Unambivalent dependent clauses		+	PH clauses		=	Overall clauses	
		number	per cent		number	per cent		number	per cent
Total		**1353**	**73.77**	**+**	**481**	**26.22**	**=**	**1834**	**100.00**
V2	XV2 clauses	249	82.45	+	53	17.54	=	302	100.00
	SV2 clauses	398	72.36	+	152	27.63	=	550	100.00
VO word order		150	65.50	+	79	34.49	=	229	100.00
OV word order		150	87.71	+	21	12.28	=	171	100.00
Vo word order		33	71.73	+	13	28.26	=	46	100.00
oV word order		132	77.19	+	39	22.80	=	171	100.00

There are 1,353 unambivalent dependent clauses in the ASC E. If we add the 481 PH clauses, treated as dependent, to this number, we will obtain 1,834 dependent clauses in the ASC E. In this situation the additional dependent clauses constitute 26.22 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. Moreover, the additional XV2 word orders constitute 17.54 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause XV2 word orders, the additional SV2 word orders constitute 27.63 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause SV2 word orders, the additional VO word orders with a nominal object constitute 34.49 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, the additional OV word orders with a nominal object constitute 12.28 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, the additional VO word orders with a pronominal object constitute 28.26 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, and the additional OV word orders with a pronominal object constitute 22.80 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

6.4. Comparison of the ASC A and the ASC E after calibration

If we gather together all the data so far obtained for the ASC A and the ASC E, we will obtain the following picture:

Table 6.11. Comparison of the proportion of the unambivalent main/dependent clauses to the PH clauses treated as main/dependent in the ASC A and the ASC E

Word order configurations	Non PH clauses (number)		PH clauses (number)		Not shared percentages		Shared percentages			
					PH clauses (per cent)		non PH clauses (per cent)		PH clauses (per cent)	
	ASC		ASC		ASC		ASC		ASC	
	A	E	A	E	A	E	A	E	A	E
Main clauses										
Total	1478	4190	110	481	**7.44**	**11.47**	93.07	89.70	**6.92**	**10.29**
XV2	548	1329	10	61	**1.82**	**4.58**	98.20	95.61	**1.79**	**4.38**
SV2	272	839	56	267	**20.58**	**31.82**	85.26	75.85	**17.07**	**24.14**
VO	284	946	11	79	**3.87**	**8.35**	96.27	92.29	**3.72**	**7.70**
OV	141	351	4	21	**2.83**	**5.98**	97.24	94.35	**2.75**	**5.64**
Vo	39	217	21	139	**53.84**	**64.05**	65.00	60.95	**35.00**	**39.04**
oV	83	277	15	57	**18.07**	**20.57**	84.69	82.93	**15.30**	**17.06**
Dependent clauses										
Total	303	1353	110	481	**36.30**	**35.55**	73.36	73.77	**26.63**	**26.22**
XV2	70	249	6	53	**8.57**	**21.28**	92.10	82.45	**7.89**	**17.54**
SV2	69	398	30	152	**43.47**	**38.19**	69.69	72.36	**30.30**	**27.63**
VO	14	150	11	79	**78.57**	**52.66**	56.00	65.50	**44.00**	**34.49**
OV	45	150	4	21	**8.88**	**14.00**	91.83	87.71	**8.16**	**12.28**
Vo	2	33	1	13	**50.00**	**39.39**	66.66	71.73	**33.33**	**28.26**
oV	21	132	10	39	**47.61**	**29.54**	67.74	77.19	**32.25**	**22.80**

We will first concentrate upon the percentages that are not shared; the percentages that we compare have been bold-typed. As regards main clauses, according to our calculations the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC A that are treated as main amounts to 7.44 per cent against the total number of the unambivalent ASC A main clauses, whereas the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC E that are treated as main amount to 11.47 per cent against the total number of the unambivalent ASC E main clauses. Moreover, in the ASC A the XV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 1.82 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause XV2 word orders, while in the ASC E they amount to 4.58 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause XV2 word orders. In the ASC A the SV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 20.58 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause SV2 word orders, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 31.82 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause SV2 word orders. As far as the position of the verb with respect to the object in main clauses is concerned, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a nominal

object of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 3.87 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they amount to 8.35 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 2.83 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 5.98 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 53.84 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 64.05 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as main amount to 18.07 per cent against the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object, while in the ASC E they amount to 20.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object. In dependent clauses, on the other hand, the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC A that are treated as dependent amount to 36.30 per cent against the total number of the ASC A unambivalent dependent clauses, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 35.55 per cent against the total number of the ASC E unambivalent dependent clauses. Moreover, in the ASC A the XV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 8.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause XV2 word orders, while in the ASC E they amount to 21.28 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause XV2 word orders. In the ASC A the SV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 43.47 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause SV2 word orders, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 38.19 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause SV2 word orders. As far as the position of the verb with respect to the object in dependent clauses is concerned, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 78.57 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they amount to 52.66 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 8.88 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they amount to 14.00 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 50.00 per cent against the total number

of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they amount to 39.39 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent amount to 47.61 per cent against the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object, while in the ASC E they amount to 29.54 per cent against the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

And now we will move to the discussion of percentages that are shared; the percentages that we compare have been bold-typed. As far as main clauses are concerned, according to our calculations the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC A that are treated as main constitutes 6.92 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clauses, whereas the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC E that are treated as main constitute 10.29 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clauses. Moreover, in the ASC A the XV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 1.79 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause XV2 word orders, while in the ASC E they constitute 4.38 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause XV2 word orders. In the ASC A the SV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 17.07 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause SV2 word orders, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 24.14 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause SV2 word orders. As far as the position of the verb with respect to the object in main clauses is concerned, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 3.72 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they constitute 7.70 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 2.75 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they constitute 5.64 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 35.00 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 39.04 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as main constitute 15.30 per cent of the total number of the ASC A main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 17.06 per cent of the total number of the ASC E main clause OV word orders with a pronominal object. In dependent clauses, on the other hand, the total number of the PH clauses of the ASC A that are treated as dependent constitute 26.63 per cent of

the total number of the ASC A dependent clauses, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 26.22 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clauses. Moreover, in the ASC A the XV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 7.89 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause XV2 word orders, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 17.54 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause XV2 word orders. In the ASC A the SV2 word orders of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 30.30 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause SV2 word orders, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 27.63 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause SV2 word orders. As far as the position of the verb with respect to the object is concerned, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 44.00 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, while in the ASC E they constitute 34.49 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a nominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 8.16 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 12.28 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a nominal object, in the ASC A the VO word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 33.33 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 28.26 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause VO word orders with a pronominal object, in the ASC A the OV word orders with a pronominal object of the PH clauses treated as dependent constitute 32.25 per cent of the total number of the ASC A dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object, whereas in the ASC E they constitute 22.80 per cent of the total number of the ASC E dependent clause OV word orders with a pronominal object.

Generally speaking, with almost no exceptions the differences between the percentages (both shared and not shared) of the ASC A PH clauses with their word order configurations and the ASC E PH clauses with their word order configurations both in main and dependent clauses do not exceed 10.00 per cent. Moreover, the total number of the ASC A and the ASC E PH clauses, with their word order configurations, treated as dependent constitutes much larger per cent in the total number of the dependent clauses than they do in the total number of the main clauses when they are treated as main; except the VO word order configurations with a pronominal object. It is the result of the fact that in both manuscripts there are fewer dependent clauses than there are main ones and that the number of the PH clauses is constant no matter if they are treated as main or dependent; what changes in the PH clauses, however, is the number of

the individual word order configurations depending on how the PH clauses are approached, but sometimes even here the numbers stay the same. In this sense the hypotactic approach to the PH clauses has a much greater impact upon the dependent clauses than the paratactic approach to the PH clauses has upon the main clauses; if the number of the dependent clauses was equal to the number of the main clauses, the differences would not be that great, provided that the word order configurations of the dependent clauses resembled those of the main ones, which often is not the case, however.

And now we will move to some final conclusions, remarks and implications that arise from the study that we have done so far.

6.5. Final conclusions, remarks and implications

By our study we attempt to draw the attention of linguists dealing with diachronic annotated corpus linguistics to the phenomenon of para-hypotactic clauses (i.e. PH clauses). The problem of PH clauses should not be neglected in the construction of annotated corpora of Old English because their widespread existence cannot be denied. The two different approaches, paratactic and hypotactic, to these clauses can lead to serious fluctuations in word order configurations because depending on whether the PH clauses are approached from the paratactic or hypotactic points of view, the general picture of the individual word order configurations in the main and in the dependent clauses of a given text will vary; and how it will vary depends on how many PH clauses there are in a given text, what kind of word order configurations they possess, and what kind of new word order configurations they are capable of producing in the immediately preceding clauses. Moreover, the two different approaches to PH clauses change significantly the general picture of the individual word order configurations in the main and in the dependent clauses of a given text not only because all the word order configurations of PH clauses either go to main clauses or to dependent ones, depending on whether they are approached from the points of view of parataxis or hypotaxis, but also because the total number of main or dependent clauses changes upon the addition of PH clauses treated as main or dependent. It has been demonstrated that the results of the analysis substantially differ depending on whether these clauses are treated as main or as dependent and therefore it is significant how they are approached.

Our study regarding the ambivalent PH clauses in the ASC A and the ASC E has the following implications:

1. Language theories should not be static. They must be dynamic.
2. A flexible diachronic corpus reflects the true nature of language.

3. Languages, written and spoken, young and old, should not be perceived statically in the construction of annotated diachronic corpora. Instead, they should be perceived dynamically and the annotators should respond to this fact accordingly.

4. The existence of ambivalent PH clauses is evident both in the ASC A and in the ASC E, and this fact has implications for other Old English texts, as well as for other Indo-European languages, both old and modern. Nevertheless, the division into PH and non-PH clauses is not practiced in the existing annotated corpora for word order analysis.

5. Depending on whether PH clauses are treated as main or dependent in a given text, the total number of main and dependent clauses, and of their word order configurations, changes accordingly.

6. On the basis of the total number of PH clauses it is possible to establish the maximum range of the ambivalence corridor for a given text. This corridor will be different for different languages and for different historical stages of these languages.

7. The range of the ambivalence corridor offered by the PH clauses of a given text might vary depending on the corpus compilers. Nevertheless, they should provide exact information concerning the number of PH clauses in their corpora and the range of the ambivalence corridors that they offer.

8. Consideration of PH clauses in the construction of annotated corpora for word order analysis can give new directions to contemporary corpus linguistics, as the diachronic study and comparison of the sizes of the ambivalence corridors of individual texts representing different periods of time may lead to interesting observations about when, how and at what rate para-hypotaxis was advancing or retreating.

One of the problematic things in our study was that we often had to be guided by the intuition in the isolation of PH clauses. Nevertheless, it remains to be hoped that intuition, as Curzan and Palmer (2006: 21) indicate, is an inevitable aspect of research. They say that "qualitative research relies on the intuitions of the researcher [and] quantitative results rely on research intuitions as well. The construction of corpus searches, not to mention of corpora themselves, is guided at least in part by research intuitions." Since the ranges of the individual corridors of ambivalence depended on the a priori selection of PH clauses, which is often based on intuition, it can be expected that the obtained results are not devoid of error. However, in the future construction of annotated corpora taking into account PH clauses, in order to objectivise the obtained data it would be useful to consult a number of experts, the more the better, about the collected PH clauses of a given text. These experts would be exposed to the total number of the collected PH clauses of this text, and they would be expected to decide about the status of these clauses. They would be asked to classify them as: 1 — 'unambivalently main', 2 — 'unambivalently

dependent', and 3 — 'still ambivalent'. The corpus compiler would then gather all the clauses with respect to which all the experts unanimously coincided and classified them as 'still ambivalent', and then on the basis of these clauses, which would be annotated both as main and dependent, the corridor of ambivalence would be established by following the adequate procedures. The same refers to choices 1 and 2. If all the experts unanimously coincided in classifying certain PH clauses as 'unambivalently main' or as 'unambivalently dependent', they would be annotated rigidly in one way only, namely as main and as dependent respectively. As regards the clauses about which the opinions of the experts differed, the corpus compiler could either include them in the set of clauses that the experts unanimously classified as 'still ambivalent', or he could classify them democratically, i.e. the majority of the choices performed by the experts would decide about the status of the PH clauses. Moreover, a degree of majority could be established (e.g. slight, fair, or overwhelming) and then the corpus compiler, with the help of the experts, would decide whether to take into account only the overwhelming majority or any kind of majority in the classification of the problematic clauses about which the experts' decisions differed. The whole process could be termed as *objectivisation via subjectivisation*, in which the data obtained with respect to PH clauses would be objectivised on the basis of the subjective choices of various experts, and the more experts the better because the probability that given clauses were classified correctly would be higher. The idea of *objectivisation via subjectivisation* could further be extended to the users of a given corpus taking into account PH clauses. Namely, the users analysing the ambivalent PH clauses would not have to analyse all of them either as main or dependent. They could consider only some of them as main and the remaining ones as dependent. Therefore, the corpus compiler would need to enable the users to unblock the paratactic and hypotactic tracks of the PH clauses. In this way, depending on the decision of the users, the computer would follow either the hypotactic tracks or the paratactic ones, and the PH clauses would be analysed as dependent or main respectively, together with the unambivalent main and dependent clauses. Therefore, the users would be able to create for themselves their own corridors of ambivalence within the maximum corridor of ambivalence established a priori by the corpus compiler in a given corpus and state how their ambivalence corridors differ from the pre-established corridor of ambivalence. Afterwards, the users' data could be compared and further conclusions drawn. Therefore, the data obtained in the analysis of PH clauses would further be objectivised on the basis of the subjective choices of the users, and the more choices there were, the better, because the probability that given PH clauses are main/dependent would perhaps be closer to the reality. The idea of *objectivisation via subjectivisation* is in line with what Meuerman-Solin (2004: 173—174) says about the construction of corpora when she discusses methodological considerations in variationist typology of clausal connectives.

She says that a corpus should be (1) *flexible*, allowing the user to select the valid and relevant parts from it to achieve as good a fit as possible between data and a specific theoretical and methodological approach, (2) *transparent*, allowing the user to assess the validity and relevance of each text as regards specific user-defined research questions, and (3) *multi-dimensional*, allowing the user to restructure it, recreating an appropriate frame of reference based on how the user conceptualises and defines language-external variables.

Bibliography

References

Aarts, B., and A. McMahon 2006. *The Handbook of English Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Adams, A. 1907. *The Syntax of Temporal Clauses in Old English Prose*. New York: H. Holt and co.

Aijmer, K., and B. Altenberg (eds.) 2013. *Advances in Corpus-Based Contrastive Linguistics. Studies in Honour of Stieg Johansson*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Alijev, U. 1957. *Бенгальско-русский словар*. Москва.

Andrew, S. O. 1940. *Syntax and Style in Old English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, P., A. Hardie and T. McEnry 2006. *A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Baker, P. S. 2012. *Introduction to Old English*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Baugh, A. C., and T. Cable 1993. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.

Battye, A., and I. Roberts (eds.) 1995. *Clause Structure and Language Change*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bean, M. C. 1983. *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Crown Helm.

Bednarczuk, L. 1966. „Zur Ellipse der indogermanischen Parataxe“. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 24: 163—171.

Bednarczuk, L. 1968. „Indo-europejskie podstawy słowiańskiej parataksy”. *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych* 3: *Językoznawstwo*: 121—129.

Bednarczuk, L. 1969. „Parataksa a hipotaksa”. *Sprawozdania Komisji Naukowych Oddziału PAN w Krakowie* 1: 54—56.

Bednarczuk, L. 1971. *Indo-European parataxis*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP.

Bednarczuk, L. 1980. “Origin of Indo-European parataxis.” In P. Ramat (ed.), *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V., pp. 145—154.

Bertinetto, P. M., and L. Ciucci 2011. "Parataxis, hypotaxis and para-hypotaxis in the Zamucoan languages." *Linguistic Discovery* 10: 89—111. Available online at: https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B15aGRFQy1vsNVFGSTIyZTV3eXM/edit.

Biber, D., S. Conrad and R. Reppen 1998. *Corpus Linguistics. Investigating Language Clause and Use*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bickel, B. 2011. "Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: a multivariate analysis." In I. Bril (ed.), *Clause-Hierarchy and Clause-Linking: The Syntax and Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 51—101.

Blake, N. (ed.) 1992. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blockley, M. 2001. *Aspects of Old English Poetic Syntax: Where Clauses Begin*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Blühdorn, H. 2008. "Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse: Evidence from the study of connectives." In C. Fabricius-Hansen and R. W. Wiebke (eds.), *'Subordination' versus 'coordination' in sentence and text.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 59—85.

Braunmüller, K. 1978. "Remarks on the formation of conjunctions in Germanic languages." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 1: 99—120.

Brill, I., and G. Rebuschi (eds.) 2006. ‹‹Coordination et subordination: typologie et modélisacion››. *Faits de langues, revue de linguistique* 28. Paris: Ophrys.

Brinton, L. J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions.* (Topics in English linguistics, 19). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bosworth, J., and T. N. Toller 1954. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buning, M. 1986. *T. F. Powys: A Modern Allegorist*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.

Butler, Ch. S. 2003. *Clause and Function. A Guide to Three Major Structural-Functional Theories*. Part 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Cameron, A., A. C. Amos and A. diP. Healey 2003: *The Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Claridge, C. 2003: *The Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts. Manual of Information*. Available online at: http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/LAMPETER/LC-manual.pdf.

Cristofaro, S. 2005. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1996. "Intonation and clause combining in discourse: The case of *because*." *Pragmatics* 6(3): 389—426.

Curzan, A., and C. Palmer 2006. "The importance of historical corpora, reliability and reading." In R. Facchinetti and M. Rissanen (eds.), *Corpus-Based Studies of Diachronic English*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 17—34.

Dash, N. S. 2005. *Corpus Linguistics and Language Technology*. New Delhi: Krishan Mittal for Mittal Publications.

Delbrück, B. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Denison, D. 1993. *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London and New York: Longman.

Desai, B. C., and L. Zhang 1991. "Multlevel interface to a distributed database system." In Z. W. Ras and M. Zemankova (eds.), *Methodologies for intelligent systems. 6th Intenational Symposium, ISMIS 91 Proceedings*, pp. 122—131.

Deutscher, G. 2007. *Syntactic Change in Akkadian: The Evolution of Sentential Complementation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dietzel, S. 2006. *Ambiguity Handling: Human vs. Machine*. Norderstedt Germany: GRIN Verlag.
Dik, S. C. 1968. *Coordination*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
Dik, S. C. 1972. *Coordination. Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics*. 2nd edn. Amsterdam: North Holland.
Donoghue, D., and B. Mitchell 1992. "Parataxis and hypotaxis: a review of some terms used for Old English syntax." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93: 163—183.
Elyse, A. 1991. "Why 'because'? The management of given/new information as a constraint on the selection of causal alternatives." *Text* 1(3): 323—339.
Endres, B., and F. Wagner 1992. "Synoptic report on the needs of corpus users." *Technical Report (II) prepared in the Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, December 1992, for the WP-miph of the project NERC, number 119.*
Enkvist, N. E. 1994. "Problems raised by Old English *þa*." In S. Čmejrková, F. Daneš and E. Havlová (eds.), *Writing vs. Speaking: Language, Text, Discourse, Communication* (=Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 392). Tübingen: Gunter Narr., pp. 55—62.
Ezquerra, M. A., and L. L. Hurtado 1996. "Las industrias de la lengua y las aplicaciones de los corpora." In *Scripta philological in memoriam Manuel Taboada Cid.* A Coruña: Servicio de publicaciones, Universidade da Coruña.
Fabricius-Hansen, C., R. W., and Wiebke (eds.) 2008. *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Facchinetti, R., and M. Rissanen (eds.) 2006. *Corpus-Based Studies of Diachronic English*. Bern: Peter Lang.
Fawcett, R. 2000. *A Theory of Syntax for Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
Field, J. 2004. *Psycholinguistics. The Key Concepts.* New York: Routledge.
Fischer, O., A. van Kemenade, W. Koopman and W van der Wurff 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fischer, O. C. M. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Franz, A. 1996. *Automatic Ambiguity Resolution in Natural Language Processing. An Empirical Approach.* Berlin: Springer.
Frazier, L., and K. Rayner 1982. "Making and Correcting Errors During Sentence Comprehension: Eye Movements in the Analysis of Structurally Ambiguous Sentences." *Cognitive Psychology* 14: 178—210.
Friedrich, P. 1975. "Proto-Indo-European Syntax." *Journal of Indo-European Studies*. Monograph 1.
Foley, W., and R. van Valin 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fortson, B. W. 2004. *Indo-European Language and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Givón, T. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
Givón, T. 2012. "Toward a diachronic typology of relative clause." In B. Comrie and Z. Estrada-Fernández (eds.), *Relative Clauses in Languages of the Americas: A Typological Overview.* John Benjamins, pp. 1—26.

Gohl, Ch. 2000. "Causal relations in spoken discourse: asyndetic constructions as a means of giving reasons." In E. Couper-Kohlen and B. Kortmann (eds.), pp. 83—110.

Grace, E. C. Jr, 1971. *The order of constituents in Indo-European*. Austin: University of Texas. Dissertation.

Greenberg, J. H. 1963. "Some universals of language with special reference to the order of meaningful elements." In J. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 73—113.

Günthner, S. 1996. "From subordination to coordination? Verb second position in German causal and concessive constructions." *Pragmatics* 6.3: 323—356.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Handford, S. A. 1947. *The Latin Subjunctive. Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Tacitus*. London: Metheuen.

Harris, A. C., and L. Campbell 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Haug, D. T. T., M. L. Jøhndal, H. M. Eckhoff, E. Welo, M. J. B. Herzenberg and A. Müth 2009. "Computational and linguistic issues in designing a syntactically annotated parallel corpus of Indo-European languages." *TAL* 2(50): 17—45. Available online at: http://www.atala.org/IMG/pdf/TAL-2009-50-2-01-Haug.pdf.

Haumann, D. 1997. *The Syntax of Subordination*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Hengeveld, K. 1998. "Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe." In J. van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial Constructions in the the Languages of Europe.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 335—419.

Higashiizumi, Y. 2006. "A history of *because*-clauses and the coordination-subordination dichotomy." Paper presented at ICEHL 15, Munich.

Hogg, R. M. (ed.) 1992. *The Cambridge history of the English language*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, P., and E. Traugott 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Höder, S. 2012. "Annotating ambiguity: insights fom a corpus-based study on syntactic change in Old Swedish." In T. Schmidt and K. Wörner (eds.), *Multilingual Corpora and Multilingual Corpus Analysis.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V., pp. 245—274.

Jespersen, O. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Jespersen, O. 1937. *Analytic Syntax*. Copenhagen.

Jucker, A. 1990. "Word order changes in Early Middle English. Some evidence against the conservatism of subordinate clauses." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 23: 31—42.

Jucker, A. H. 1991. "Between hypotaxis and parataxis. Clauses of reason in *Ancrene Wisse*." In Kastovsky D. (ed.), *Historical English syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 203—219.

Karolak, S. 1972. *Zagadnienia składni ogólnej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Kemenade, A. van 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dodrecht: Foris.

Kemenade, A. van, and L. Bettelou 2006. "Discourse adverbs and clausal syntax in Old and Middle English." In A. van Kemenade and L. Bettelou (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 224—248.

Kennedy, G. 1998. *An Introduction to corpus linguistics.* London: Longman.

Kida, I. 2007. "The construction of a tagged corpus and the investigation of the change from OV to VO in English." *Academic Papers of College of Foreign Languages 4*. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo WSL, pp. 77—86.

Kida, I. 2009. "Syntactic differences between Gothic and Greek in Wulfila's translation of the Bible." In H. Fontański, R. Molencki and O. Wolińska (eds.), *W kręgu teorii. Studia językoznawcze dedykowane Profesorowi Kazimierzowi Polańskiemu 'in memoriam'*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, pp. 117—124.

Kida, I. 2010a. "The emergence of subordinate (hypotactic) clauses in Old English from paratactically conjoined structures." *Linguistica Silesiana* 31: 115—122.

Kida, I. 2010b. "Construction of an annotated corpus of Polish mediaeval texts for the analysis of word order configurations." *Research on Slavic Languages* 14(2). Korean Association of Slavic Linguistics (KASL): 157—166.

Kida, I. 2011a. "Hebrew, Latin and Greek word order of the Genesis in comparison." *Zeszyty naukowo-dydaktyczne.* Zabrze: Nauczycielskie Kolegium Języków Obcych, pp. 21—31.

Kida, I. 2011b. *Word Order Tendencies in Mediaeval English against the Indo-European Background*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kida, I. 2011c. "Objectivisation via subjectivisation in annotated corpus linguistics." *Studia Methodologica* 33: 33—36.

Kida, I. 2012. „Problem syntaktycznej ambiwalencji w anotowanym językoznawstwie korpusowym". *Linguistica Posnaniensia* 1(54): 57—63. DOI: 10.2478/v10122-012-0005-1.

Kim, T. 1992. *The Particle þa in the West-Saxon Gospels: Adiscourse Level Analysis.* European University Studies, Series XIV: Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature, Vol. 249. Berne: Lang.

Kiparsky, P. 1995. "Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax." In A. Battye and I. Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 140—169.

Klemensiewicz, Z. 1937. *Składnia opisowa współczesnej polszczyzny kulturalnej*. Kraków: PAU.

Klemensiewicz, Z. 1957. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Kohonen, V. 1978. *On the Development of English Word Order in Religious Prose around 1000 and 1200 A.D.* Åbo: Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation.

Kohnen, Th. 2007. "From Helsinki through the centuries: the design and development of English diachronic corpora." In P. Pahta, I. Taavitsainen, T. Nevalainen and J. Tyrkkö (eds.), *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English Volume 2. Towards Multimedia in Corpus Studies*. Helsinki: Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English (VARIENG), University of Helsinki. Available online at: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/02/kohnen/.

Koopman, W. F. 1991. "The order of dative and accusative objects in Old English and scrambling." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 25—27: 109—121.

Kortmann, B. 1997. *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kroch, A., and A. Taylor 2000. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2)*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, second edition, (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/).

Kroch, A., B. Santorini and L. Delfs 2004. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, first edition, (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/).

Kroch, A., B. Santorini, and A. Diertani 2010. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Modern British English (PPCMBE)*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, first edition, (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/).

Kuryłowicz, J. 1948. ‹‹Les structures fondamentales de la langue: groupe et proposition››. *Studia Philosophica* III: 203—209.

Kytö, M., M. Rissanen and S. Wright (eds.) 1994. *Corpora across the Centuries*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kytö, M. 1996. *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. 3rd edn. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki. Available online at: http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/HC/.

Kytö, M. 2010. "Data in historical pragmatics." In A. H. Jucker and I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Hstorical Pragmatics.* Berlin: Walter de Guyter, pp. 33—68.

Květoň, P., and K. Oliva 2002. "Achieving an almost correct PoS-tagged corpus." In *Text, Speech and Dialogue*. 5th international congress, TSD, Berlin: Springer, pp. 19—26.

Labov, W. 1969. "Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula." *Language* 45: 715—762.

Leech, G. 1991. "The state of the art in corpus linguistics." In K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg (eds.), *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartnik*. London: Longman.

Leech, G. 1993. "Corpus Annotation Schemes." In *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 4(8): 275—281.

Leech, G. 2004. "Adding linguistic annotation." In M. Wynne (ed.), *Developing Linguistic Corpora: A Guide to Good Practice.* Available online at: http://www.ahds.ac.uk/guides/ linguistic-corpora/index.htm.

Leech, G. 2007. "New resources, or just better old ones? The Holy Grail of representativeness." In M. Hundt, N. Nesselhauf and C. Biewer (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics and the Web*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V., pp. 133—150.

Lehmann, Ch. 1986. "On the typology of relative clauses." *Linguistics* 24: 663—680.

Lehmann, Ch. 1988. "Towards a typology of clause linkage." In J. Heiman and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 181—225.

Lehmann, Ch. 2002. "New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization." In I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1—18.

Lehmann, W. P. 1972a. "Contemporary linguistics and Indo-European studies." *PMLA* 5(87): 976—993.

Lehmann, W. P. 1972b. "Proto-Germanic syntax." In F. van Coetsem and H. L. Kufner (eds.), *Toward a Grammar of Proto-Germanic*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 239—268.

Lehmann, W. P. 1973. "A structural principle of language and its implications." *Language* 49: 47—66.

Lehmann, W. P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Lehmann, W. P. 1992. *Historical Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lenker, U., and A. Mauermann-Solin (eds.) 2007. *Connectives in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lenker, U. 2007. "*Forhwi* 'because': Shifting deictics in the history of English causal connection." In U. Lenker and A. Meurman-Solin (eds.), *Connectives in the History of English*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 283). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 193—227.

Lenker, U. 2010. "Argument and rhethoric. Adverbial connectors in the history of English." *Topics in English Linguistics* 64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lenker, U. 2011. "A focus on adverbial connectors: Connecting, partitioning and focusing attention in the history of English." In A. Meurman-Solin and U. Lenker (eds.), *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English, Volume 8. Connectives in synchrony and diachrony in European languages*. Available online at: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/08/index.html.

Lindquist, H. 2009. *Corpus linguistics and the description of English.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazzoleni, M. 2002. "La 'paraipotassi' con *ma* in italiano antico: verso una tipologia sintattica della correlazione." *Verbum* 4: 399—427.

McEnry, T., and A. Hardie 2012. *Corpus Linguistics: Methods, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McEnry, T., and A. Wilson 2001. *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

McEnery, T., R. Xiao, and Y. Tono 2006. *Corpus-Based Language Studies: An Advanced Resource Book*. New York: Routledge.

McGregor, W. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meier-Brügger, M., M. Fritz and M. Mayrhofer 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

Meillet, A. 1958. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa indoeuropejskiego*. Trans. T. Milewski. Warszawa: PWN.

Meuerman-Solin, A. 2004. "Towards a variationist typology of clausal connectives: methodological considerations." In M. Dossena and R. Lass (eds.), *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology.* Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 171—198.

Meurman-Solin, A., and P. Pahta 2006. "Circumstantial adverbials in discourse: a synchronic and a diachronic perspective." In A. Renouf and A. Kehoe (eds.), *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics.* Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, pp. 117.

Meurman-Solin, A., and U. Lenker (eds.), 2011. *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English*, Volume 8. Connectives in Synchrony and Diachrony in European Languages. An on-line publication accessible at: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/08/index.html.

Meyer, Ch. F. 2002. *English corpus linguistics*. *An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mitchell, B. 1988. *On Old English*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Mitchell, B., and F. C. Robinson 2007. *A Guide to Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Molencki, R. 1997. "Surface word order in subordinate clauses in early West Saxon prose." *Linguistica Silesiana* 18: 29—38.

Molencki, R. 2003. "The etymology and development of the conjunction *as* in Middle English." *Linguistica Silesiana* 24: 25—39.

Molencki, R. 2005. "On the syntactic and semantic development of *after* in medieval English." In M. Krygier and L. Sikorska (eds.), *Naked Words in English. Medieval English Mirror 2*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, pp. 47—66.

Molencki, R. 2007. "The evolution of *since* in medieval English." In U. Lenker and A. Mauermann-Solin (eds.), *Connectives in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 97—114.

Molencki, R. 2008. "The rise of *because* in Middle English." In M. Amano, M. Ogura and M. Ohkado (eds.), *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 201—216.

Molencki, R. 2011. "New prepositions and subordinating conjunctions of Romance origin in Middle English." In J. Fisiak and M. Bator (eds.), *Foreign Influences on Medieval English.* New York: Peter Lang, pp. 9—24.

Molencki, R. 2012. *Causal conjunctions in Mediaeval English. A Corpus-based study of grammaticalization.* Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski/Oficyna Wydawnicza.

Mukherjee, J. 2004. "The state of the art in corpus linguistics: three book-length perspectives." *English Language and Linguistics* 8(1): 103—119.

Nagucka, R. 1968. "An interpretation of the because construction in Middle English." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 1: 63—70.

Navigli, R. 2012. "A quick tour of word sense disambiguation, induction and related approaches." In M. Bieliková, G. Friedrich, G. Gottlob, S. Katzenbeisser and G. Turán (eds.), *38th Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science Proceedings*, pp. 115—129.

Nesselhauf, N. 2011. *Corpus Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. An electronic publication available online at: http://www.as.uni-heidelberg.de/personen/ Nesselhauf/ files/Corpus%20Linguistics%20Practical%20Introduction.pdf.

Olson, M. 1981. *Barai clause junctures: towards a functional theory of inter-clause relations*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University.

Pala, K., P. Rychlý and P. Smrž 1997. "DESAM — Annotated corpus for Czech." In F. Plášil, K. G. Jeffrey (eds.), *SOFSEM'97: Theory and Practice of Informatics*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 523—530.

Peterson, M. 1923. *Очерк синтаксиса русского язука.* Москва—Петроград.

Pintzuk, S. 1993. "Phrase structure variation in Old English." A paper presented at the Second Diachronic Generative syntax Workshop at University of Pennsylvania, 5—8 November 1992. MS.

Pintzuk, S. 1995. "Variation and change in Old English clause structure." *Language Variation and Change* 7: 229—260.

Pintzuk, S., and L. Plug 2002. *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*. Department of Linguistics, University of York. Oxford Text Archive, first edition, (http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.html).

Pintzuk, S. 2004. "Variationist approaches to syntactic change." In D. J. Brian and R. Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Blackwell Reference Online, pp. 1—15. DOI: 10.1111/b.9781405127479.2004.00017.x.

Pintzuk, S., and E. Haeberli 2008. "Structural variation in Old English root clauses." *Language Variation and Change* 20: 367—407.

Pisarkowa, K. 1974. „O stosunkach między parataksą a hipotaksą. Na przykładzie polskich zdań przeciwstawnych i przyzwalających". *Język Polski* 54: 81—93.

Polański, K. 1966. „Główne typy struktur zdaniowych w języku polskim". *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Katowicach, Prace językoznawcze* 3: 83—99.

Polański, K. 1968. „Parataktyczne połączenia zdaniowe w języku górnołużyckim". *Beiträge zur sorbischen Sprachwissenschaft*: 354—360.
Quiles, C. 2007. *A Grammar of Modern Indo-European*. European Union: Asociación Cultural Dnghu.
Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartnik 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
Rebuschi, G. 2001. "Coordination et subordination. Première partie: la co-jonction restreinte." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 96: 23—60.
Rebuschi, G. 2002. «Coordination et subordination. Deuxième partie: vers la co-jonction généralisée». *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 97: 37—96.
Renouf, A. 1987. "Corpus development." In J. Sinclair (ed.), *Looking up*. London: Collins.
Rissanen, M. 1989. "The conjunction *for* in Early Modern English." *Nowele* 14: 3—18.
Rissanen, M. 1998. "Towards an integrated view of the development of English: notes on causal linking." In J. Fisiak and M. Krygier (eds.), *Advances in English Historical Linguistics*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 389—406.
Rissanen, M. 1999. "Syntax." In R. Lass (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 187—331.
Rissanen, M., H. Raumolin-Brunberg, M. Nevala and A. Nurmi (eds.) 2002. "Variation Past and Present. VARIENG Studies on English for Terttu Nevalainen." (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 61). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
Rissanen, M. 2003. "On the development and grammaticalisation of borrowed conditional subordinators in Middle English." *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 18. Published by the Japan Society for Medieval English Studies. pp. 1—19.
Rissanen, M. 2007. "The development of adverbial subordinators in early English." In M. Rissanen, L. Kahlas-Tarkka, M. Hintikka and R. McConchie (eds.), *Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change: Studies in Semantics and Grammar from Old to Present-Day English*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, pp. 173—210.
Rissanen, M. 2009. "Grammaticalisation, contact and adverbial connectives: The rise and decline of *save*." In W. Shinichiro and Y. Hosoya (eds.), *English Philology and Corpus Studies: A festschrift in honour of Mitsunori Imai to celebrate his seventieth birthday*. Tokyo: Shohakusha, pp. 135—152.
Rissanen, M. 2011. "On the long history of English adverbial subordinators." In A. Meurman-Solin and U. Lenker (eds.), *Connectives in Synchrony and Diachrony in European Languages*. Helsinki: The Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English (VARIENG) (Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English).
Rissanen, M. 2012a. "Corpora and the study of English historical syntax." In M. Kytö (ed.), *English Corpus Linguistics: Crossing Paths*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 197—220.
Rissanen, M. 2012b. "Grammaticalisation, contact and corpora: on the development of adverbial subordinators in English." In I. Hegedűs and A. Fodor (eds.), *English Historical Linguistics 2010. Selected papers from the sixteenth international conference on English historical linguistics (ICEHL 16), Pécs, 23—27 August 2010*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 131—151.
Rizzo, C. R. 2010. "Getting on with corpus compilation: from theory to practice." *ESP World*, issue 1(27), vol. 9. Available online at: http://www.esp-world.info.
Roberts, I. 2007. *Diachronic syntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Romero-Trillo, J. (ed.) 2013. *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics. New Domains and Methodologies*. New York: Springer.

Rotaetxe, K. 2006. «A mi-chemin entre la coordination et la subordination. L'enclitique basque -(e)ta». In I. Bril and G. Rebuschi (eds.), *Faits de Langues*. *Revue de Linguistique* 28. Paris: Ophrys, pp. 215—230.

Römer, U. 2005. *Progressives, Patterns, Pedagogy: A Corpus-Driven Approach to English Progressive Forms, Functions, Contexts and Didactics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.

Sánchez, A., P. Cantos, R. Sarmiento and J. Simón 1995. *Corpus lingüístico del español contemporáneo. Fundamentos, metodología y análisis*. Madrid: SGEL.

Scaglione, A. 1972. *The Classical Theory of Composition: From Its Origins to the Present: A Historical Survey*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Schleppegrell, M. J. 1991. "Paratactic *because*." *Journal of Pragmatics* 16: 323—337.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. 2004a. "Language and computing: past and present." In M. Rogers and K. Ahmad (eds.), *New directions in LSP studies. Proceedings of the 14th European Symposium on Language for Special Purposes*. University of Surrey, 18 August 2003.

Sinclair, J. 2004b. "Intuition and annotation — the discussion continues." In K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg (eds.), *Advances in Corpus Linguistics. Papers from the 23rd International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 23)*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, pp. 39—59.

Sinclair, J. 2005. "Corpus and text — basic principles." In M. Wynne (ed.), *Developing Linguistic Corpora: A Guide to Good Practice*. Oxford: Oxbow Books. Available online at: http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/chapter1.htm.

Smith, J. 1971: *Word Order in the Older Germanic Dialects*. University of Illinois dissertation. Urbana-Champaign.

Sorrento, L. 1929. "Il fenomeno della paraipotassi nelle lingue neolatine." *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 11(52): 449—463.

Sorrento, L. 1950. *Sintassi romanza: ricerche e prospettive*. Milano: Instituti Editoriale Cisalpino.

Stockwell, R. P., and D. Minkova 1991. "Subordination and word order change in the history of English." In Kastovsky, D. (ed.), *Historical English Syntax* (Topics in English Linguistics, 2). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 367—408.

Suárez-Gómez, C. 2006. *Relativization in Early English (950—1250): The Position of Relative Clauses*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Svartvik, J. (ed.) 1992. *Directions in corpus linguistics*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Tabossi, P., M. Spivey-Knowlton, K. McRae and M. K. Tanenhaus 1994. "Semantic effects on syntactic ambiguity resolution: evidence for a constraint-based resolution process." In C. Umiltá and M. Mocovitch, M. (eds.), *Attention and Performance XV. Conscious and Nonconscious Information Processing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 589—616.

Taylor, A., A. Warner, S. Pintzuk and F. Beths 2003. *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE)*. Department of Linguistics, University of York. Oxford Text Archive, first edition, (http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YcoeHome1.htm).

Taylor, A., Nurmi, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S. and Nevalainen, T. 2006: *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC)*. Department

of Linguistics, University of York. Oxford Text Archive, first edition, (http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/PCEEC-manual/index.htm).
Tognini-Bonelli, E. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tokarz, E. 1977. *Składnia zdań złożonych współrzędnie w języku słoweńskim*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
Traugott, E. C. 1996. "Grammaticalization and lexicalization." In K. Brown and J. Miller (eds.), *Conscise Encyclopedia of Linguistic Theories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 181—187.
Van Valin, R. D. 2005 *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Verstraete, J. Ch. 1976. *Rethinking the Coordinate-Subordinate Dichotomy: Interpersonal Grammar and the Analysis of Adverbial Clauses in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Virtanen, T. 1992. *Discourse Functions of Adverbial Placement in English: Clause-Initial Adverbials of Time and Place in Narratives and Procedural Place Descriptions*. Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press.
Visser, F. Th. 1963—1973. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Vols. 1—3. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Wårvik, B. 1995. "The ambiguous adverbial/conjunctions *þa* and *þonne* in Middle English: A discourse-pragmatic study of *then* and *when* in Early English Saints' Lives." In A. Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics. Pragmatic Developments in the History of English* (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 35). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 345—357.
Witkowski, S. 1936. *Historyczna składnia grecka na tle porównawczym*. Lwów.
Wynne, M. (ed.) 2005. *Developing linguistic corpora: a guide to good practice*. Oxford: Oxbow Books. Available online at: http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/index.htm.

Sources

Bately, J. M. (ed.) 1986. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*. Vol. 3: Manuscript A. Cambridge.
Bosworth, J., and T. N. Toller 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
Cameron, A., A. C. Amos, Sh. Butler and A. diP. Healey (eds.) 1981. *The dictionary of Old English corpus in electronic form*. Toronto.
Irvine, S. (ed.) 2004. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A collaborative edition.* Vol. 7: Manuscript E. Cambridge.
Ford, J. H. (ed.) 2005. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Translated from the Old English by Ingram James. El Paso, Texas: El Paso Norte Press.

Websites

(The following web pages were active as of 28.5.2014)

1. http://212.191.73.200/Enhig/glossary.jsp.
2. http://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/z.131/main.
3. http://corplinguistics.wordpress.com/2012/03/11/hwaet-old-english/.
4. http://corpora-engling.split.uni-bamberg.de/index.php?id=historical-corpora.
5. http://corpus.byu.edu/historical-syntax.asp.
6. http://courses.washington.edu/englhtml/engl560/corplingresources.htm.
7. http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/LAMPETER/LC-manual.pdf.
8. http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/NEWDIGAT/INDEX.HTM.
9. http://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/david.denison/lmode_prose.html.
10. http://robertjohnsonrogers.edublogs.org/2011/02/01/online-corpora-a-list/.
11. http://users.ox.ac.uk/~stuart/english/med/corp.htm.
12. http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/chapter1.htm.
13. http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/index.htm.
14. http://www.as.uni-heidelberg.de/personen/Nesselhauf/files/Corpus%20Linguistics.%20Practical%20Introduction.pdf.
15. http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/asintro2.html.
16. http://www.corpora4learning.net/resources/corpora.html.
17. http://www.corpora4learning.net/resources/corpora.html#AE.
18. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/index.html.
19. http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/about.html.
20. http://www.engelska.uu.se/Research/English_Language/Research_Areas/Electronic_Resource_Projects/A_Corpus_of_English_Dialogues/.
21. http://www.esp-world.info.
22. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/ARCHER/index.html.
23. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CEEC/pceec.html.
24. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CEEM/index.html.
25. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CLEP/index.html.
26. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/index.html.
27. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/YCOE/index.html.
28. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/domains/CEEC.html.
29. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/02/kohnen/.
30. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/08/index.html.
31. http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298896.
    http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298902.
32. http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm#_Toc92298937.
33. http://www.lancs.ac.uk/staff/xiaoz/papers/corpus%20survey.htm.
34. http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/0415286239/resources/corpa2.htm.
35. http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/cms/indexes/descriptions/mid_eng_comp.
36. http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/.
37. http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/annotation/index.html.
38. http://www.ling.upenn.edu/histcorpora/PPCEME-RELEASE-2/description.html.
39. http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCMBE-RELEASE-1/index.html.
40. http://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/projects/ica.

41. http://www.uow.edu.au/~dlee/corpora.htm.
42. http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.annotations.html.
43. http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.html.
44. http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/YcoeHome.htm.
45. http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~sp20/corpus.html.
46. https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B15aGRFQy1vsNVFGSTIyZTV3eXM/edit.
47. https://sites.google.com/site/helontheweb/corpora.

Ireneusz Kida

Dynamiczne korpusowe podejście do para-hipotaksy: implikacje dla diachronicznej korpusowej analizy języka

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Niniejsza książka przedstawia dynamiczne, oparte na analizie korpusowej podejście do zjawiska para-hipotaksy oraz implikacje tej metody badawczej. Celem pracy jest usystematyzowanie elektronicznej analizy para-hipotaksy. Proponowane podejście ma na celu ustalenie możliwego wpływu podwójnej (czyli dynamicznej) analizy ambiwalentnych para-hipotaktycznych zdań (zdań PH) na wyniki otrzymane z analizy różnych szyków składniowych, głównie takich jak VO, OV, SV2 i XV2. Owa dynamiczna analiza przeprowadzona została na podstawie ręcznie anotowanego komputerowego korpusu tekstowego zawierającego dwa rękopisy *Kroniki Anglosaskiej*, a mianowicie *Kronikę Parker* (czyli rękopis A) i *Kronikę Peterborough* (czyli rękopis E). Prezentację wyników badań poprzedza jednak szczegółowa klasyfikacja i opis ambiwalentnych zdań PH.

Książka zawiera wskazania praktyczne dotyczące tego, jak powinno się anotować zdania para-hipotaktyczne do celów analizy elektronicznej. Zdania PH są ambiwalentne w tym sensie, że z jednej strony można je traktować jako zdania główne, a z drugiej strony jako zdania podrzędne. Z tego też względu sugerujemy, żeby podchodzić do nich z dwóch różnych perspektyw, odpowiednio parataktycznej i hipotaktycznej. Takie podwójne podejścia do zdań PH znacząco zmienia całościowy obraz konfiguracji szyków składniowych w danym tekście. Dzieje się tak nie tylko dlatego, że ogólna liczba zdań głównych/podrzędnych zmienia się po dodaniu zdań PH traktowanych jako główne/podrzędne, lecz także dlatego, że wszystkie konfiguracje szyków składniowych zdań PH zaliczane są albo do zdań głównych, albo do zdań podrzędnych, w zależności od tego, czy podchodzimy do nich z parataktycznego czy hipotaktycznego punktu widzenia.

W niniejszej pracy wprowadzono rozróżnienie na dwa podstawowe rodzaje zdań PH: zdania SIPH oraz zdania MIPH, które należą odpowiednio do Statycznej Inherentnej Para-Hipotaksy (SIPH-taksa) oraz do Mobilnej Inherentnej Para-Hipotaksy (MIPH-taksa). Wprowadzamy również trzeci rodzaj zdań PH, które należą do tak zwanej Ekstensywnej Para-Hipotaksy (EPH-taksa), ale ten rodzaj para-hipotaksy nie ma większego wpływu na wyniki analizy konfiguracji szyków składniowych, dlatego też omawiamy go bardzo ogólnie, a następnie formułujemy tylko pewne sugestie dotyczące dalszej analizy.

Ireneusz Kida

L'approche dynamique à la para-hypotaxe en corpus : les implications pour l'analyse diachronique de la langue en corpus

R é s u m é

Le livre présente une approche dynamique, appuyée sur une analyse du corpus, du phénomène de para-hypotaxe, ainsi que les implications de cette méthode de recherche. L'objectif de la présente étude est de systématiser l'analyse électronique de la para-hypotaxe. L'approche proposée a pour but de déterminer une influence possible d'une double (c'est-à-dire dynamique) analyse des propositions ambivalentes para-hypotaxes (phrases PH) sur les résultats reçus de l'analyse de différentes syntaxes, surtout comme VO, OV, SV2 et XV2. Cette analyse dynamique a été effectuée à la base du corpus textuel électronique, annoté manuellement, qui comprend deux manuscrits de la *Chronique anglo-saxonne*, à savoir la *Chronique de Parker* (c'est-à-dire le manuscrit A) et *la Chronique de Peterborough* (c'est-à-dire le manuscrit E). La classification détaillée des propositions ambivalentes PH et leur description précède la présentation des résultats de recherches.

Le livre contient des conseils pratiques concernant l'annotation des phrases para-hypotaxes dans l'analyse électronique. Les propositions PH sont ambivalentes en ce sens que d'un coté on peut les traites comme des propositions principales, mais de l'autre — comme des propositions subordonnées. C'est pour cette raison l'auteur suggère de les examiner de deux perspectives, respectivement paratactique et hypotactique. Cette double approche aux propositions PH change considérablement l'image globale de la configuration des syntaxes dans un texte donné. Il en est ainsi non seulement à cause du changement du nombre global des propositions principales/subordonnées après l'addition des propositions PH, traitées comme principales/subordonnées, mais aussi à cause de la classification de toutes les configurations des syntaxes des propositions PH soit dans les propositions principales, soit dans les propositions subordonnées, selon que l'on les approche de point de vue paratactique ou hypotactique.

Dans l'étude suivante, l'auteur introduit la division entre deux types principaux des propositions PH : propositions SIPH et propositions MIPH, qui appartiennent respectivement à la Para-Hypotaxe Statique Inhérente (SIPH-taxe) et à la Para-Hypotaxe Mobile Inhérente (MIPH-taxe). L'auteur introduit également le troisième type des propositions PH, qui appartiennent à la Para-hypotaxe Extensive (EPH-taxe), mais ce type de para-hypotaxe a peu d'effet sur les résultats de l'analyse des syntaxes, c'est pourquoi l'auteur le décrit très généralement et ensuite formule seulement des suggestions concernant une analyse plus approfondie.

Copy editor
Krystian Wojcieszuk

Cover designer
Tomasz Gut

Technical editor
Barbara Arenhövel

Proofreader
Luiza Przełożny

Typesetting
Edward Wilk

ISSN 0208-6336
ISBN 978-83-226-2278-0
(print edition)

ISBN 978-83-226-2392-3
(digital edition)

Publisher
Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
ul. Bankowa 12B, 40-007 Katowice
www.wydawnictwo.us.edu.pl
e-mail: wydawus@us.edu.pl

First impression. Printed sheets: 15.0. Publishing sheets: 19.00.
Offset paper grade III, 90 g Price 30.0 zł (+ VAT)

Printing and binding: „TOTEM.COM.PL Sp. z o.o." Sp.K.
ul. Jacewska 89, 88-100 Inowrocław

More about this book

Price 30 zł (+ VAT)
ISSN 0208-6336
ISBN 978-83-226-2278-0