

## HOW ENGLISH ARE OLD ENGLISH RELATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS?

LILLO MOESSNER

*University of Freiburg i. Br.*

OE relative clauses are introduced by the relative particle *þe* or by an element of the *se, seo, þæt* paradigm or by a combination of both. As *se* (and all the other forms of the paradigm) is also used as a demonstrative pronoun, it has been argued that the clauses introduced by *se* realize not hypotactic, but paratactic constructions. After reviewing and dismissing the criteria put forward for the distinction of the two construction types (word-order, metre, punctuation, syntactic structure of the foreign model text, style), Mitchell (1985: § 2122) comes to the conclusion: "it seems reasonable to claim that forms of *se* ... are used as relatives". This establishes *se* as a relative marker, but does not answer the question how we distinguish a relative *se* from a demonstrative *se*. He admits that many occurrences of *se* are syntactically ambiguous: "when any form of *se* is used alone..., we cannot be sure ... whether it is a demonstrative or a relative" (Mitchell 1985: § 2109).

Another unsettled question is the distribution of the introductory elements. It is quite plausible that the case-coding forms *se* and *þe se* are used to establish a clear link between the relative clause and its antecedent. Where syntactic transparency is not at stake, the invariant form *þe* can be used. In a recent article dealing with the distribution of the relative markers in the OE translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Dekeyser (1989: 393) points out that the complex relative marker occurs significantly more often in the syntactically more complex Bede text. His percentage figures for complex relatives in this text are very close to Mitchell's for the first 20 homilies of Ælfric. As the simple case-coding relative markers occur with about the same frequency in the syntactically simple and in the syntactically complex text, Dekeyser concludes that there must be an additional factor which favours the complex relative marker in the Bede text; and he finds it in the distance between the antecedent and the relative clause.

Other controversial issues in connection with the introductory element of relative clauses are the zero-introduced clauses and those where the relative marker is taken up again by a personal pronoun in the relative clause. With respect to the zero-introduced relative clauses, the essential distinction between OE and PDE is that in OE the relative marker is optional even in subject position<sup>1</sup>. Especially with a missing relative pronoun in subject case the syntactic structure is ambiguous. The construction can be analysed as a relative clause or as an interpolated main clause. Even the occurrence of the same sentence in one MS *with* and in another *without* the relative marker is not sufficient evidence of a relative clause for Mitchell:

"But the fact that two constructions are, or appear to be, interchangeable does not certify that they are syntactically identical. My own feeling, at least about examples like 'There's a man at the door wants to see you', is that the two elements are equal in weight, that there is no sense of a missing 'who' and that its insertion completely changes the relationship" (1985:§ 2309).

As the second construction (=relative marker + personal pronoun) occurs most frequently with the invariant form *þe*, the explanation is plausible that the case-coding personal pronoun is added in order to establish a close link between the antecedent and the relative clause. In his *Altenglische Grammatik*, Pilch (1970) describes this type of relative construction as typical for OE<sup>2</sup>. Mossé (1945) notes that this construction type is restricted to poetic texts, and he considers it as archaic<sup>3</sup>.

All aspects of OE relative clauses which relate to the inventory of relative markers and their distribution are presented in more or less detail in OE grammars and hand-books. Yet none of those which I consulted (Campbell 1959, Dürmüller/Utz 1977, McLaughlin 1983, Mossé 1945, Pilch 1970, Pinsker 1976, Quirk/Wrenn 1955, Rot 1982, Weimann 1982) mentions the relative construction which is illustrated by the following example:<sup>4</sup>

(1a) *þæt halige gewrit þæt cyðeð, þæt me nis tweo þæt þu gearwe const* (OE Eccl. Hist., 64)

The relative clause *þæt me nis tweo þæt þu gearwe const* modifies the deictic pronoun *þæt*, from which it is separated by the verb form *cyðeð*.

<sup>1</sup> Erdmann (1980) points out that the construction still exists in PDE, but that it is restricted to special syntactic environments.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. §49, where he stresses the exocentric relation between the relative marker and the relative clause. He compares the OE relative constructions to the (rather marginal) German constructions like *ich, der ich nichts verstehe, rede*. He adds, however, that some OE examples have the same syntactic structure as PDE relative constructions.

<sup>3</sup> "Une forme archaïque du relatif, qu'on trouve encore en poésie est *de* suivi d'un pronom personnel". (Mossé 1945:157)

<sup>4</sup> For better reference, the examples are numbered. The letter <a> after a number indicates the OE, the letter <b> the Latin version of the example.

The introductory element of the relative clause (= *þæt*) realizes two functions, namely to indicate that what follows is a relative clause,<sup>5</sup> and that of a non-verbal constituent in the relative clause. For the fact that one element realizes more than one syntactic function I take over Jan Mulder's term 'functional amalgamation' (Moessner 1984:60ff). It is a characteristic feature of relative pronouns in PDE relative constructions, e.g. *the book that I bought yesterday was expensive*. The relative pronoun *that* introduces the relative clause, and it functions as the object in the relative clause.

In (1a), the nominal constituent which is realized by the relative *þæt* is embedded on a lower level of the relative clause. It is the object of *const* in the clause which depends on *tweo*. For relative pronouns which realize the function of lower-level constituents I coined the term 'relative push-down element'<sup>6</sup>.

All three features, i.e. functional amalgamation, a relative push-down element, and intervening elements between the nucleus of the antecedent and the relative clause, also characterize the corresponding construction of the Latin original of (1a):

(1b) *Sacra scriptura testatur, quam te bene nosse dubium non est* (Lat. Ecc. Hist., 80)

The antecedent is the substantival syntagm with the nucleus *scriptura*. It is separated from the relative clause by the verb form *testatur*. The relative marker *quam* is linked to the antecedent by number and gender concord. The subject *dubium* of the relative clause governs an A.c.I. construction (= [*quam*] *te bene nosse*), in which *quam* functions as object.

Whereas the range of syntactic functions which can be realized by relative push-down elements is virtually restricted to the functions subject and object in object clauses, no such restrictions hold in the earlier periods of English:

(2a) *het þa sona blinnan fram ehtnyse cristenra manna, 7 ongan arweorþian ða þrowunge þara haligra martyra, þurh ða he ær wende þæt he hi acyrran meahthe fram æfestnyse þæs cristenan geleafan* (OE Eccl. Hist., 40)

The relative clause is a modifier of the substantival syntagm with the nucleus *þrowunge*; it is separated from the relative clause by the genitival modifier *þara haligra martyra*. The constituent which contains the relative marker is the prepositional syntagm *þurh ða* with the inflected form *ða* conditioned by the preposition. The relative clause is realized by complex sentence, in which the verb form *wende* governs a *þæt*-clause as object. In this subordinate clause *þurh ða* realizes an adverbial complement.

<sup>5</sup> Relative pronouns with this function will be referred to as 'relative markers' in the following.

<sup>6</sup> I used this term for the first time in my article *Some English Relative Constructions*, which was published in 1984. It was only recently that Nadine van Eynden drew my attention to the fact that the same term is used in the *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, first published in 1985.

-The OE relative construction is a successful imitation of the Latin original:

- (2b) *cessari mox a persecutione praecepit, honorem referre incipiens caedi sanctorum, per quam eos opinabatur prius a Christianae fidei posse deuotione cessare* (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 34)

The relative clause, introduced by *per quam* is even further removed from its antecedent *persecutione* than in the OE text. The syntagm *per quam* functions as relative marker and as a non-verbal constituent in an infinitive construction governed by the verb form *opinabatur*.

Latin relative constructions in which the relative pronoun is so far removed from its antecedent that one would expect a demonstrative or a personal rather than a relative pronoun are usually called 'relativer Anschluß', 'relativische Anknüpfung', or 'relativische Satzverknüpfung' in German. Reuter, who challenges the widely held belief that the construction arose in Early Modern English or in the last centuries of the Middle English period, uses the expression 'continuative relative clauses' (1938:1). For the OE period he quotes some examples from interlinear versions and translations.

If it should turn out that this type of relative construction were restricted to OE translations, it would be legitimate to ask whether it merits the attribute 'English', or whether it would not be more appropriate to refer to it as a Latin construction couched in English words.

King Alfred's translations are indeed a rich source of relative constructions of this type (=with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element). When they are introduced by the invariable relative marker *þe*, the equivalence between the Latin and the OE construction is not complete:

- (3b) *coeperunt illi mox idolatriae, quam uiuente eo aliquantulum intermisisse uidebantur, palam seruire* (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 152)

The relative marker *quam* is linked by number and gender concord to the antecedent *idolatriae*. In the relative clause it realizes a nominal constituent in the N.c.I. construction depending on *uidebantur*.

Number and gender concord between the antecedent and the relative marker are not overtly expressed in the corresponding OE construction:

- (3a) *þa ongunnon heo sona openlice deofolgildum þeowian, þe monnum þuhte þæt heo hwæthwugu forlæten hæfde bi þæm fæder lifendum* (OE Eccl. Hist., 112)

Yet the Latin original and the OE translation share the features 'functional amalgamation' and 'relative push-down element'. The relative marker *þe* realizes the object of *forlæten hæfde* in the *þæt*-clause depending on *þuhte*<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> The personal pronoun *heo* cannot serve the purpose, because the antecedent *deofolgildum* is neuter.

We find the same (minor) difference between the Latin and the OE version in the following example:

- (4a) *Eardædon Bryttas binnan þam dice to suðdæle, þe we gemynegodon þæt Seuerus se casere het þwyras ofer þæt ealond gedician* (OE Eccl. Hist., 44)
- (4b) *Habitabant autem intra uallum, quod Seuerum trans insulam fecisse commemorauimus* (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 40)

Whereas the Latin relative marker *quod* is in number and gender concord with the antecedent *uallum*, this concord cannot be overtly marked in the OE text, because relative marker *þe* is invariable.

When *þe* combines the functions 'relative marker' and 'subject (of a subordinate construction)', the syntactic structure of the relative construction becomes ambiguous:

- (5a) *þonne wæs Biise Eastengla biscop, þe we sægdon þætte in þæm foresprecenan seonoðe wære* (OE Eccl. Hist., 280)

There is no means of telling whether *þe* is only used as relative marker or whether it also functions as a relative push-down element, i.e. as the subject of the *þætte*-clause. This ambiguity stems from the fact that the subject is an optional constituent in OE.

It could be argued that this is an intentional imitation of the construction in the Latin original:

- (5b) *Bisi autem episcopus Orientalium Anglorum, qui in praefata synodo fuisse perhibetur* (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 352)

The verb form *perhibetur* of the relative clause governs an N.c.I. construction. As the nominal constituent of this construction has the same referent as the inflectional ending of the governing verb, this referent need not be expressed overtly. If we assume that it is not expressed, the relative pronoun *qui* functions only as relative marker, and the relative construction is characterized by the features 'lack of functional amalgamation' and 'lack of a relative push-down element'. If we assume that the relative pronoun functions as relative marker and as the nominal constituent in the N.c.I. construction, the relative construction belongs to the type with functional amalgamation and with a relative push-down element.

The hypothesis of an intentional structural ambiguity of OE relative construction is rather weak, because ambiguous constructions can also be found where the Latin original has a completely unambiguous construction with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element:

- (6a) *þe þæm monnum ðe wit ær cwædon þæt unc ðuhte þæt wæren wildiorum gelicran þonne monnum* (OE Boeth., 122)

- (6b) *hisne accedamus quos beluis similes esse monstrauius* (Lat. Boeth., 103)

The relative marker *þe* can, but need not also function as the subject of the conjunctive clause *þæt wæren wildiorum gelicran ðonne monum*, which depends on the verb form *ðuhte*. In the Latin version the relative marker *quos* functions as the accusative constituent in the A.c.I. construction depending on *monstrauimus*.

This evidence together with the unambiguous examples (1) – (4) suggests that even when the second function of the relative marker *þe* is that of an (optional) subject, the relative construction belongs to the type with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element. All OE examples quoted so far can be analysed as instances of a Latin construction type realized by English words. This analysis is not adequate for the following example:

(7a) Ac hit wearð þurh þa ameldad þe he geþoht hæfde þæt him to þære dæde fylstan sceolde (Oros., 166)

This is the same construction as in (1) – (6), but it is not an imitation of the Latin original, which is expanded considerably in the OE version:

(7b) Quae res per ministros prodita, sine ultione vitata est. (Oros., 167)

Examples like (7) indicate that the construction type with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element in OE texts is not a Latin construction with English words, but an English construction type fully integrated in the syntactic structure of OE.

Latin relative constructions with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element can also be translated differently:

(8a) þa men þe he onget, þæt heo on Cristes geleafan gelærde wæron, 7 þa weorc þæs geleafan habban ne woldon (OE Eccl. Hist., 222)

(8b) eos, quos fide Christi inbutos opera fidei non habere deprehendit (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 280)

The syntactic structure of the Latin text is the same as in the examples before. The relative marker *quos* pronominalizes the antecedent *eos*, and the two constituents are linked by gender and number concord. The verb form *deprehendit* of the relative clause governs an A.c.I. construction, in which the relative pronoun functions as a nominal constituent.

The function of *þe* in the OE text is restricted to that of a relative marker. As a consequence, the OE relative clause is not only without functional amalgamation, but also without a relative push-down element. Instead, it contains the personal pronoun *heo*, which takes over part of the functions of the Latin relative pronoun, pronominalizing the antecedent *þa men* to which it is linked by number concord. In the relative clause it realizes the subject function. This translation strategy has the advantage that it preserves all the

information contained in the Latin relative pronoun *quos*, but it does so at the cost of changing the construction type.

The occurrence frequency of this construction type bears witness to the popularity of this translation strategy; it is also used in the next example:

(9a) in þære cirican seo cwen gewunade hire gebiddan, þe we ær cwædon þæt heo Cristen wære (OE Eccl. Hist., 62)

(9b) [Erat ... ecclesia ... facta] in qua regina, quam Christianam fuisse praediximus, orare consuerat (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 76)

In (9b) the antecedent *regina* is pronominalized by the relative pronoun *quam*, which functions as a nominal constituent in the A.c.I. construction depending on *praediximus*.

The introductory *þe* in (9a) is only a relative marker. The antecedent *cwen* is pronominalized by the personal pronoun *heo* in the *þæt*-clause depending on *cwædon*. The characteristic features of this construction type are 'lack of functional amalgamation', 'lack of a relative push-down element', 'pronominalization of the antecedent by a personal pronoun which realizes the function of a lower-level constituent'.

Like the construction type exemplified in (1) – (7), this second construction type also occurs not only as an imitation of a Latin construction, but also where the Latin original does not contain a relative clause at all:

(10a) siþþan he for to þæm hearge þe Egypti sædon þæt he wære Amones heora godes (Oros., 126)

The antecedent *hearge* is pronominalized by the personal pronoun *he*, the subject of the *þæt*-clause which functions as the object of *sædon*. The relative clause is without functional amalgamation and without a relative push-down element.

The corresponding Latin text consists merely of a main clause:

(10b) Inde ad templum Jovis Ammonis pergit (Oros., 127)

This is evidence in support of the hypothesis that this construction type, too, must be described as an English construction, not as a calque of a Latin type. Additional support comes from the observation that this construction type does not occur in Latin at all.

The two translation strategies must have existed side by side for a certain time, because we find (scarce) examples of hybrid constructions, which combine both construction types:

(11a) he þone manfullan Bretta cyning mid his unmætum weorode, þæm he gealp, þæt him nowiht wiðstandan mehte, ofslog, acwealde (OE Eccl. Hist., 154)

(11b) *infandus Brettonum dux cum inmensis illis copiis, quibus nihil resistere posse iactabat, interemtus est* (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 214)

The Latin text has the usual type of relative construction with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element.

The antecedent *weorode* of (11a) is pronominalized by the relative marker *þæm* and by the personal pronoun *him*. The relative marker also functions as the object of the verbal syntagm *wiðstandan meahste* in the *þæt*-clause depending on the verb form *gealp*. The relative construction combines the features 'functional amalgamation', 'relative push-down element', and 'pronominalization of the antecedent by a personal pronoun which realizes the function of a lower-level constituent'. Such a hybrid construction type stands, of course, little chance of becoming integrated into the syntactic structure of any language.

The hesitation of OE writers between the two construction types is also apparent in texts where in one MS one, and in another MS the other construction type is used:

(12a) *þæm þe ðu ongitst þætte ligð on his lichoman lustum* (OE Boeth., 115)

This is the text of the older Cotton MS; the relative clause belongs to the type with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element.<sup>8</sup> The younger Bodleian MS has *þæt he* instead of *þætte*, a relative construction without functional amalgamation, without a relative push-down element, but with pronominalization of the antecedent by the personal pronoun *he* realizing subject function in the subordinate *þæt*-clause.

The two versions of (12a) are also interesting from the point of view of the 'Englishness' of the two construction types. The corresponding passage of the Latin original does not contain any relative construction at all:

(12b) *foedis inmundisque libidinibus inmergitur?* (Lat. Boeth., 98)

The evidence presented so far can be preliminarily summarized. The relative constructions of the OE versions of (1) – (12) represent two construction types. One is characterized by functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element (=type A), the other by the absence of these features, and a personal pronoun which pronominalizes the antecedent and realizes the function of a lower-level constituent in the relative clause (=type B). Both construction types are used to translate Latin relative constructions in (1) – (6), (8), (9), and (11), but also in passages where the Latin models contain no relative construction at all. The latter fact establishes them as **English** construction types.

<sup>8</sup> Admittedly, this is one of the ambiguous examples, where the relative marker *þe* may or may not additionally realize the subject function in the subordinate *þætte*-clause.

The Latin relative constructions belong – with the exception of the syntactically ambiguous example (5) – to type A. If (5b) is not analysed as type A, it has none of the defining features of either construction type. It has no functional amalgamation, no relative push-down element, and no personal pronoun pronominalizing the antecedent and realizing the function of a lower-level constituent in the relative clause. The only feature which qualifies (5b) then as a relative construction is the relative pronoun which is linked to the antecedent by gender and number concord. Examples of this construction type (=type C) are very rare in Latin. Their occurrence in interlinear Latin/OE texts sheds some light on the status of the corresponding OE constructions:

(13b) *ubi tantum in quarto responsorio dicatur a cantante Gloria; Quam dum incipit. mox omnes cum reverentia surgant:* (S. Benet, 40)

The relative pronoun *Quam* is marked as 'singular, feminine, accusative', and it is linked by number and gender concord to its antecedent *Gloria*. Neither verb of the relative clause (*incipit*, *surgant*) governs an (accusative) object. The only function of the relative pronoun is that of a relative marker.

This construction type is faithfully imitated in the OE translation:

(13a) *þær þæt an on ðam feorðam repse gesungæn fram ðam singendum þane þonne onginð sona ealle mid arwurðnessa arison* (S. Benet, 40)

The relative clause is introduced by *þane*, the morphologically unambiguous form for 'masculine, singular, accusative'. Number and gender concord establish *repse* as the antecedent. As neither verb of the relative clause governs an (accusative) object, the relative marker has only one syntactic function.

The writer of the OE version of the interlinear text of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* must have been aware of the marginality of this construction type in Latin. It occurs in the following passage:

(14b) *iterum simile est regnum caelorum saginae missae in mare ex omni genere piscium congreganti quam cum impleta esset educentes et secut litus sedentes elegerunt bonos in uasa* (Matth. XIII, 47f.)

The antecedent is the substantival syntagm with the nucleus *saginae* and the two participial *missae in mare* and *ex omni genere piscium congreganti*. There is number and gender concord between the antecedent and the relative pronoun *quam*, but the relative pronoun has no syntactic function in the relative clause.

In the OE translation, the Latin relative pronoun *quam* corresponds to the choice *ðiu x þæt*.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The abbreviation <x> stands for *vel* 'or'

- (14a) *segne sende in sae of all x eghwælc cynn fisca somnende x geadrigende ðiu x þæt mið ðy gefylled was of-gelaedon x gebrohton, neh warðe geseton gecuron godo in fetelsum x in fatum x in sciopum (Matth. XIII, 47f.)*

The antecedent of the relative clause is the substantival syntagm with *segne* '(a) net' as nucleus and two participial constructions as expansions (*sende in sae* 'let down into the sea', *of all x eghwælc cynn fisca somnende x geadrigende* 'catching fish of every kind'). The hesitation concerning the appropriate relative marker is expressed by the alternative *ðiu x þæt*.

The form *ðiu* is marked for number and gender as 'singular, feminine', and thus is in number and gender concord with the antecedent. As it is also marked for case as 'nominative', it realizes the subject function in the conjunctive clause *mið ðy gefylled was* which is subordinate to the rest of the relative clause. The choice of *ðiu* implies that the relative clause represents type A (with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element), whereas type C (without functional amalgamation and without a relative push-down element) is used in the Latin original.

In relative constructions without functional amalgamation, the relation between the relative marker and the relative clause is exocentric, like that between a subordinating conjunction and the following clause. The most frequent subordinating conjunction of OE is *þæt*, the second alternative proposed by the OE translator. It has the advantage over the first that the clause introduced by *þæt* is without functional amalgamation and without a relative push-down element. But is it a relative clause? The answer must be 'no', because it is not linked to an antecedent by gender and number concord.

The relative construction of the Latin version of (14) is characterized by the same properties as that of (13), and the OE translator of (13) managed to reproduce the Latin construction type. This should be possible for (14), too, when we use the form *þa*, the form for 'accusative, feminine, singular'. It is in gender and number concord with the antecedent *segne*, but it has no function in the relative clause. The required conditions are met. The clause introduced by *þa* is a relative clause without functional amalgamation and without a relative push-down element. Yet it is not a satisfactory solution, either. Both in Latin and in OE, the subject is an optional clause constituent. The Latin subordinate clause *cum impleta esset* contains no overt subject, but the form *impleta* indicates that it refers to a singular subject of feminine gender.<sup>10</sup> This information is absent from the corresponding OE form *gefylled*. If we want to include it in the OE text, two alternatives present themselves. One is the choice

<sup>10</sup> Morphologically, the form *impleta* is, of course, ambiguous. But the analysis 'nominative, plural, neuter' is ruled out by the context.

of the nominative form *ðiu*, the OE translator's first alternative, the other is the accusative form *þa* and the additional personal pronoun *hio* (nominative, singular, feminine). Both alternatives imply a change of the construction type. The predicament of the OE translator can be summarized as follows: The preservation of the information of the original text in the translation excludes the preservation of the construction type.

This problem only occurs when the Latin text contains construction type C. It is a marginal construction type in Latin, some realization of which can be imitated in OE (e.g. (13)) without loss of grammatical information. Where this is possible, it is not justified to speak of an English construction. This is really an instance of a (marginal) Latin construction type realized with English words.

By contrast, construction types A and B are established as English by the fact that they are used for the translation of passages where the Latin original contains no relative construction at all. If further proof of their 'Englishness' is needed, it comes from authentic OE texts:

- (15) *þa andsware ... þe me se goda agifan þenceþ (Bwf., 354f.)*

The relative clause is introduced by *þe*, which functions as a relative marker and as the object in the infinitive construction [*þe*] *me se goda agifan* depending on the verb form *þenceþ*. It is a relative construction of type A with functional amalgamation and a relative push-down element.

The next two examples of type A are perhaps even more convincing, because their relative clauses are not introduced by the invariable *þe*, but by inflected forms of the *se*-paradigm:

- (16) *þæt hy on þa clænan seoð,  
hu hi fore goddædum glade blissiað  
þa hy, unsælge, ær forhogdun  
to donne (Christ, 1285ff.)*

The relative clause is introduced by *þa*, which is linked to the antecedent *goddædum* by number concord (in the *se* paradigm the category gender is only marked in the singular). The verb form *forhogdun* of the relative clause governs an infinitive construction, in which *þa* realizes the object function.

- (17) *hwilum for duguðe dohter Hroðgares  
eorlum on ende ealu-wæge bæst,  
þa ic Freware flet-sittende  
nemnan hyrde (Bwf., 2020ff.)*

The relative clause is again introduced by *þa*. This time it is to be analysed as 'singular feminine', because the antecedent is *dohter Hroðgares*. The verb form *hyrde* of the relative clause governs an infinitive construction with subject, and in this infinitive construction *þa* realizes the object function.

Construction type B occurs less frequently in authentic OE texts. Visser quotes the following example:

þa þre fæmnan þe him Crist ær bebead þæt hie wacedon (Blickl. Hom. 145, 31; quot. Visser 1963: §75)

The relative clause is introduced by *þe*, which serves only as a relative marker. The antecedent *þa þre fæmnan* is pronominalized by the personal pronoun *hie*, which functions as the subject of the *þæt*-clause depending on the verb form *bebead*<sup>11</sup>.

The scarcity of examples of construction type B in authentic OE texts does not weaken the hypothesis of its Englishness, because it rests firmly on the fact that this construction type does not occur in Latin. Its frequency increases considerably in the ME period.

#### SOURCES

The examples were collected from the following OE and Latin sources. They are quoted in the form indicated in square brackets. Numbers refer to lines in poetic texts, to chapter and verse in the gospel text, otherwise to pages.

- Colgrave, B. and R. A. B. Mynors (eds.) 1969. *Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English people*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Lat. Eccl. Hist.]
- Krapp, G. Ph. and E. van Kirk Dobbie (eds.) 1963. *The Exeter Book*. New York and London: Columbia Univ. Press. [Christ]
- Logeman, H. (ed.) 1888. *The Rule of S. Benet*. London: N. Trübner & Co. (EETS. OS. 90): [S. Benet]
- Miller, Th. (ed.) 1890. *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English people*. (EETS. OS. 95) London: N. Trübner & Co. [OE Eccl. Hist.]
- Peiper, R. (ed.) 1871. *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii Philosophiae Consolationis Libri Quinque*, Leipzig: Teubner. [Lat. Boeth.]
- Schaubert, E. von (ed.) 1963<sup>18</sup>. *Heyne-Schückings Beowulf*, 1. Teil: Text. Paderborn: Schöningh. [Bwf.]
- Sedgefield, W. J. (ed.) 1968 [Oxford, 1899]. *King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. [OE Boeth.]
- Skeat, W. W. (ed.) 1970. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew and according to Saint Mark*, (Matthew: Cambridge, 1887; Mark: Cambridge, 1871). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. [Matth.]
- Sweet, H. (ed.) 1883. *King Alfred's Orosius*, London: N. Trübner & Co. (EETS. OS. 79): [Oros.]

#### REFERENCES

- Andrew, S. O. 1966. *Syntax and style in Old English*. New York: Russel and Russel.
- Bacquet, P. 1962. *La structure de la phrase verbale à l'époque Alfrédienne*. Paris: Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.
- Bourcier, G. 1977. *Les propositions relatives en Vieil-anglais*. Paris: Champion

<sup>11</sup> That the antecedent is additionally pronominalized by the personal pronoun *him* is irrelevant in the present context.

- Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dekeyser, X. 1989. "Adjacent and distant antecedents and the compound relative *seþe* in Old English prose". *Leuvense Bijdragen* 78. 385-99.
- Dürmüller, U. and H. Utz. 1977. *Altenglisch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Erdmann, P. 1980. "On the history of subject contact-clauses in English". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 1/1. 139-70.
- Johansen, H. 1935. *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der altgermanischen Relativsatzkonstruktionen*. Kopenhagen: Levin & Munsksqaard
- McLaughlin, J. 1983. *Old English syntax*. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Moessner, L. 1984. "Some English relative constructions". *La Linguistique* 20/1. 57-79
- Mossé, F. 1945. *Manuel de l'anglais du moyen âge I: Vieil-anglais*. Paris: Aubier.
- Pilch, H. 1970. *Altenglische Grammatik*. München: Hueber.
- Pinsker, H. 1976. *Altenglisches Studienbuch*. Ver. Düsseldorf: Bagel.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman
- Quirk, R. and Wrenn C. L. 1955. *An Old English grammar*. London: Methuen
- Reuter, O. 1938. *On continuative relative clauses in English*. Helsinki: Akademische Buchhandlung Helsingfors.
- Rot, S. 1982. *Old English*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó
- Visser, F. Th. 1963-73. *An historical syntax of the English language*. Leiden: Brill
- Weimann, K. 1982. *Einführung ins Altenglische*. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer
- Wülffing, E. 1894. *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen*. Bonn: Hanstein.