

Elly van Gelderen  
Arizona State University  
English Department  
Tempe, AZ 85287-0302  
ellyvangelder@asu.edu

### The Introduction of the Split CP

Since Rizzi (1997), a split CP has been argued to provide some structure to the left-edge of the clause. The split, or expanded, CP contains topic and focus positions as well as the possibility of two complementizers, a high and a low one. In this paper, I will argue that not all languages use a split CP to the same extent, and that in Old English, there is no evidence for it. For instance, there is at most one complementizer, there are no noun complements (e.g. *the fact that*), and the topics seem not integrated in the sentential structure, not surprising considering earlier Indo-European paratactic stages.

In Middle English, there is a sudden 'explosion' of new double complementizers, as in (1) and (2) from early Middle English, and an incorporation of topics, as in (3) and (4) from later Middle English. This can be accounted for by means of a split CP:

1. *Anan till patt itt cumenn wass* (Ormulum, Introduction l. 3)
2. *for þat he hadde isleh3e moche of hire cunne*  
`because he had slain many of their people'. (*Brut*, Otho 5453)
3. *For frenshippe we haue founne*  
`because we have found friendship'. (*York Plays*, 10,12)
4. *And I told him that, as for such mony that shuld ..., I wold*  
... (*Paston #75*).

Initially *that* in (1) and (2) occur in the lower C head (Fin in Rizzi's system) but then, through grammaticalization, occur in the higher one (ForceP), as in e.g. (3). This will also be examined.

Thus, the paper aims to look at the distribution of a split CP cross-linguistically, and argues that Old English does not have an expanded CP, but that it is introduced in Middle English in finite clauses (but not in non-finite ones). The grammaticalization of the complementizers will also be looked at.