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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 þæ 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 þæ 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.
The introductory element of the relative clause (= *paet*) realizes two functions, namely to indicate that what follows is a relative clause, 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 *paet* is embedded on a lower level of the relative clause. It is the object of *const* in the clause which depends on *tewo*. For relative pronouns which realize the function of lower-level constituents I coined the term "relative push-down element".

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, quan te bene nosse dubium non est (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 80)

The antecedent is the substantival syntagm with the nucleus *scriptura*. It is separated from the relative clause by the verb form *constaurat*. The relative marker *quaum* is linked to the antecedent by number and gender concord. The subject *dubium* of the relative clause governs an A.C.I. construction (= *quaum* te bene nosse), in which *quaum* 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 *pa* sona blinnan fram ethynesse cristenra manna, *onan* ar-woerpian *da* prowunge para hailgra martyra, *purh* da *sere* wende *paet* he *hi* acyrran meate fran aethnesse *paes* cristenana geleafan (OE Eccl. Hist., 40)

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

Relative pronouns with this function will be referred to as *relative markers* in the following.

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 praeceptit, honorem referre incipientis caecidit
sanctorum, per quam eos opinabatur prius a Christianae fidei posse
deuovere 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 ‘relativier 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 *pe*, the equivalence between the Latin and the OE construction is not complete:

(3b) coepersit elli mox idolatriae, quam uiuente eo aliquantulum
intermississe uidestibatur, palam seruui (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 *uidestibatur*.

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

(3a) pe ongunnon heo sona openlice deoligildum beowian, pe monnum
pulte pe heo hwæthiswe forlæten hæfde bi þæm læder 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 *pe* realizes the object of *forlæten hæfde* in the *pete*-clause depending on *pulte*.

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

(4a) Eardædon Bryttas binnan þam dice to suðdele, þe we gemynegodon
þet Seucer us casere het þywys ofer þet ealond gedician
(OE Eccl. Hist., 44)

(4b) Habitabant autem intra ullum, quod Seucerum trans insulam fecisse
commemoravimus (Lat. Eccl. Hist., 40)

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

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

(5a) bonne wes Biise Eastengla bishop, pe we saegdon þette in þam
forsprecanen sceonode ware (OE Eccl. Hist., 280)

There is no means of telling whether *pe* is only used as relative marker or whether it also functions as a relative push-down element, i.e., as the subject of the *pete*-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 infinitival 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) pe þæm monnum de wit æwædon þeow unc þæte þæt wæren wildorum
gelicran bonne monnum (OE Boeth., 122)

(6b) Hisne accedamus quos beluis similis escse monstrauimus (Lat. Boeth., 103)

7 The personal pronoun *heo* cannot serve the purpose, because the antecedent *deofoligildum* is
neuter.
The relative marker *he* can, but need not also function as the subject of the conjunctional clause *pat waren wildiorum gelicran donne monum*, which depends on the verb form *dathic*. In the Latin version the relative marker *quos* functions as the accusative constituent in the A.C.I. construction depending on *monstravimus*.

This evidence together with the unambiguous examples (1) - (4) suggests that even when the second function of the relative marker *he* 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 werd purh þa ameldad þe he gæpht hælde þæt him to þære deode yfstan sæolde* (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 prodata, 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) *pa men he onget, þat heo on Cristes geleafan gelered waron, þata weorc þæs geleafan habban ne wolde* (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* pronominizes 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 *he* 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, pronominizing the antecedent *pa 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 seon gewunede hire gebiddan, þe we ze cwædun þat heo Cristen were* (OE Eccl. Hist., 62)

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

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

The introductory *he* in (9a) is only a relative marker. The antecedent *seon* is pronominized by the personal pronoun *heo* in the *pat*-clause depending on *cwædun*. The characteristic features of this construction type are lack of functional amalgamation, lack of a relative push-down element, pronominization 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) *sibban he for to þem hearege he Egypti sedon þat he were Amones heora gedes* (Oros., 126)

The antecedent *hearege* is pronominized by the personal pronoun *heo*, the subject of the *pat*-clause which functions as the object of *sedon*. 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 unnumetum weordo, þaem he gealp, þat him nowiht wiðstan dan meahet, ofstæg, acowealde* (OE Eccl. Hist., 154)
(11b) infundus Brettonum dux cum immensis illis copis, quibus nihil resistere posse iactabat, interemptus 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 weord of (11a) is pronounized by the relative marker *pe* and by the personal pronoun *him*. The relative marker also functions as the object of the verbal syntagm *wichstan meahote* in the *het*-clause depending on the verb form *gealp*. The relative construction combines the features 'functional amalgamation', 'relative push-down element', and 'pronounization 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 ongíst þætte līgō on his licheman lusum (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. The younger Bodleian MS has *het* *he* instead of *þætte*, a relative construction without functional amalgamation, without a relative push-down element, but with pronounization of the antecedent by the personal pronoun *he* realizing subject function in the subordinate *het*-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 libidinis libinigratir? (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 pronounizes 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.

—*Admittedly, this is one of the ambiguous examples, where the relative marker *pe* may or may not additionally realize the subject function in the subordinate *het*-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 pronounizing 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) þer þet an on þam feorðam repse gesungen fram þam singendum þane onne ongım sona ealle mid arwurness ari sus (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 congruganti quam cum impeta esset eductes et scut litus sedentes elegerunt bonus in usua (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 congruganti*. 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 *ðu x þet*?

—*The abbreviation <x> stands for vel 'or'
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 eghwec ... fisca sommende* x geadrigende). 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 *mð ðy gefyllæd 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 *þæ* 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 *þæ* 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 implècta essènt* contains no overt subject, but the form *implècta* indicates that it refers to a singular subject of feminine gender. This information is absent from the corresponding OE form *gefflæd*.

10 Morphonologically, the form *implècta* is, of course, ambiguous. But the analysis 'nominative, plural, neuter' is ruled out by the context.

The relative clause is again introduced by *þæ*.

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) *þæ andswæ * *þæ me se goda agiæn þæcþ* (Bwfr, 354f.)

The relative clause is introduced by *þæ*, which functions as a relative marker and as the object in the infinitive construction [*þæ* me se goda agiæn] depending on the verb form *þæcþ*. 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 *þæ*, but by inflected forms of the se-paradigm:

(16) *þæ hy on þæ cænan seóð*,
    hu hi fore goddædom glæde blisstæð
    *þæ hy, unsæge, ar forhogydun*
    to donne (Christ, 1285f.)

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

(17) *hwilsum for duguðe dohter Hroðgares*
    *corum on ende ealu-wæge hær,*
    *þæ ic Freware flæt-sittende*
    nemnan hyrde (Bwfr, 2020f.)

The relative clause is again introduced by *þæ*. This time it 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 *þæ* realizes the object function.
Construction type B occurs less frequently in authentic OE texts. Visser quotes the following example:

\[\text{pa he faemnan he him Crist ar beboead pet hic wacedon} (\text{Blickl. Hom. 145, 31; quot. Visser 1963: §75})\]

The relative clause is introduced by *he*, which serves only as a relative marker. The antecedent *pa he faemnan* is pronominalized by the personal pronoun *him*, which functions as the subject of the *pet* -clause depending on the verb form *beboead*.*11*

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