Linguistica Silesiana nr 44/1, 2023
ISSN 0208-4228
DOI: 10.24425/linsi.2023.144821

ARTUR BARTNIK
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
bartnikart@kul.pl

LEFT-DISLOCATED FREE RELATIVES IN OLD ENGLISH [*]

This paper investigates left-dislocated free relatives in Old English. On the theoretical level, it contributes to the ongoing discussion on the syntax of free relatives. It confirms a sharp distinction between *wh-* free relatives and demonstrative free relatives. The former type favours the Comp analysis, whereas the latter class is amenable to both the Comp and Head analyses. On the empirical level, it provides evidence that the Comp analysis with *wh-* pronouns is selected mainly on the basis of pied piping/stranding facts, while case marking regulates the choice of an appropriate analysis with demonstrative free relatives with *þe*. This corpus-based study also offers some quantitative information on the frequent patterns and cases commonly found in them.

Keywords: free relative, left-dislocation, case, relative clause, Old English

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on Old English (OE) structures presented in (1a) and (1b) below. They are sometimes labelled 'free' relatives because they have no external nominal head (Allen 1980, Harbert 1983, Taylor 2014). They are also analysed as left-dislocations, as the fronted constituent, normally very complex in the form of a relative clause, is resumed by a pronominal element in the following matrix clause (Traugott 2007 and also Allen 1980, who uses the term "free relatives in a left-dislocated position"). The structures in (1a) and (1b) are contrasted with pronominally headed free relatives in which demonstratives (2a) and *wh-* pronouns (2b) function as heads. In the latter structures there is neither

[*] Many thanks to two anonymous *Linguistica Silesiana* reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Of course all the remaining errors are my own responsibility.

left-dislocation nor resumptive elements (for some discussion, see Allen 1980: §2.2):[1]

(1a) þone þe þu nu hæfst, nis **se** þin wer.
him-ACC that you now have not-is he-NOM your husband
'and him who you now have, he is not your husband'
(coaelhom,ÆHom_5:35.705); Harbert (1983: 550); Allen (1980: 282)

(1b) swa hwæs swa hie rihtlice biddaþ for þinum naman & for þinum geearningum hig **hyt** onfoð.
so what-GEN as they rightly ask for your name and for your merit they it-ACC receive
'whatever they ask rightly, for your name and your merit, they receive it'
(cochristoph,LS_4_[Christoph]:121.69); Allen (1980: 280)

(2a) ðæt is, ðæt man for-gife, ðam ðe wið hine gegylte.
that is that one forgive him-DAT that against him sins
'that is, that one$_2$ forgive him$_1$, who sins against him$_2$'
(Ver.III. 170); Allen (1980: 276)

(2b) Soðes ic ðe sylle swa hwæt swa ðu me byddest.
truly I thee give so what-ACC as you me ask
'Truly I will give you whatever you ask of me'
(St.Mark 290); Allen (1980: 278)

One of the major problems has always been the correct syntactic analysis of constructions like (1a) and (1b) (cf. Allen 1980, 2020, Gisborne and Truswell 2017, Taylor 2014: 743-476, among others). In particular, the question is whether the relative pronoun is an external head to the relative clause or whether it resides in the specifier position within the relative clause. In section 2 we sketch two scenarios proposed in the literature to account for the structural position of relative pronouns. The same complication occurs in the parsing of free relatives in the corpus. Although the corpus parsing is not intended as a syntactic analysis and, in fact, shows certain inconsistencies, we use it to corroborate the fact that left-dislocated free relatives with demonstratives and *wh-* relatives behave differently.

Another problem which has been the object of intensive research concerns case assignment in these structures. In particular, the head of the fronted relative can get its case from within the relative clause. For example, the accusative case of *þone* in (1a) is assigned by the verb *hæfst* residing in the relative clause. Sometimes, however, the fronted head matches the case of the resumptive in the main clause, which is the source of case for relative heads (cf. section 5.2). There are also instances in which it is not immediately obvious what mechanism assigns

[1] In the examples below, with the exception of (2a) and (2b) where only the relatives are underlined, the left-dislocated material is underlined and the resumptives are in bold.

case. The discussion about case in OE free relatives is part of a bigger picture that divides European languages into 'matching' and 'non-matching' languages. Essentially, in 'matching languages' like Italian and Polish, the case of the relative pronoun located in Spec,CP matches the case of the external head; if, however, there is a conflict between the internal and external case, we have a non-matching pattern in languages like Classical Greek, Gothic or some varieties of German. In 'non-matching languages', the conflict can be resolved either in favour of the internal case or external case (cf. Cinque 2020, Van Riemsdijk 2006, Grosu 1994, Harbert 1983, Pittner 1991, 1995, among others). In this paper we will identify the sources of case for OE left-dislocated free relatives.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of two primary approaches to free relative examples sketched in (1a) and (1b): the Comp analysis and the Head analysis. Section 3 presents the procedure and methodology of data collection from the corpus as well as the research questions addressed in this paper. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to examination of particular types of free left-dislocated relatives: *wh-* relatives (section 4), demonstrative relatives without *þe* (section 5.1) and with *þe* (section 5.2). This division is necessary, as these types exhibit different syntactic properties. Section 6 summarizes the most important points. Because this is a corpus study, evidence has been collected from Taylor et al.'s (2003) *York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE) unless otherwise noted.

2. The structure of free relatives

In principle, there are two possible analyses of relative structures illustrated in (1a) and (1b) above. The first proposal assumes that *ðone* and *swa hwæs* are external heads of the relative clauses, which are then modified by the relative clauses with *ðe* or the second *swa* in the complementizer position. Example (1a) is illustrated in (3a) and this analysis is referred to as the Head Hypothesis (Groos and Van Riemsdijk 1981, Bresnan and Grimshaw 1978). The other possibility is that relative clauses lack an overt head. Then *swa hwæs* and *ðone* reside in the specifier of CP. On this scenario, example (1a) is sketched in (3b), which is labelled as the Comp Hypothesis:

(3a) [DP [ðone [CP ø [C ðe [TP ðu nu hæfst]]]]] Head Hypothesis
(3b) [DP [ø [CP ðone$_i$ [C ðe [TP ðu nu hæfst t$_i$]]]]] Comp Hypothesis

Allen (1980: §2.2.2) argues that, in contrast to other free relatives, the structures presented in (1a) and (1b) should be analysed as headless relatives (structure 3b). The first argument in favour of this analysis is that these constructions can involve pied piping. Then, *wh*-pronouns (*hw-* in OE) or

demonstratives are moved to the surface position from within the relative clause. This movement is illustrated in (3b), where *t* stands for a trace. However, it must be noted that pied piping facts are only convincing with respect to *wh-* pronouns. Allen (1980: 283, footnote 24) admits that she found only one example of pied piping with demonstrative free relatives, which is a direct translation from Latin (see section 5.2 for more details). Furthermore, she does not find stranding in this type of relatives, which would argue in favour of the Head analysis. Allen's second argument concerns case assigned to the fronted relative pronoun. It turns out that it is dictated by the lower, i.e., relative clause. This fact is easily explained if we assume structure (3b). Finally, Allen observes that left-dislocated relatives always involve resumption. Since this is not the case with ordinary free relatives like (2a) and (2b), she concludes that the former are accounted for by structure (3b), whereas the latter must involve heads and structure (3a) is the correct one.

Harbert (1983) argues that Allen's analysis is not correct. In particular, he contends that in example (1a) *ðone* is actually in the head position. For one thing, this is a more elegant explanation, since both ordinary and left-dislocated free relatives are amenable to the same analysis in (3a). Second, case marking facts can be easily explained, according to Harbert, if we assume the mechanism of inverse case attraction attested in a number of other languages. Specifically, the relative pronoun in the head position can occasionally be assigned case of the pronoun residing in the specifier of CP. In other words, the pronoun is 'attracted' into the lower clause case. Harbert (1983: 553, footnote 4) does not discuss pied piping/stranding facts because he leaves out of consideration *wh-* pronouns. He only briefly mentions that even in such cases relative pronouns might be heads because they are similar to comparative structures, which do not have an empty head position (his footnote 4).

Taylor (2014: §8.7.6) tries to reconcile the two stances represented by Allen (1980) and Harbert (1983), claiming that both *wh-* and demonstrative free relatives have externally headed constructions and relative pronouns residing in the specifier position of CP. She claims that free relatives exhibit both pied piping and stranding, and the relative pronoun can take the case required by the verb in the main clause or the lower clause. When there is a clash between the case required by the main clause and that dictated by the function in the lower clause, a case hierarchy (NOM<ACC<DAT/GEN) is employed to regulate its use (Harbert 2007: 468). In other words, Taylor postulates that the choice of case is not random and Harbert's generalization, which is used to explain Gothic examples, holds for OE free relatives, too. It means that a less oblique case, say accusative, is attracted into a more oblique case, say genitive, according to the role of the relative clause in the main clause (ACC->GEN).[2] It must be added, though,

[2] Taylor's suggestion probably refers to *wh-* free relatives only, as she does not consider examples with demonstratives. In this paper we will extend her claim to demonstrative free

that her conclusions seem to be reached on the basis of examples with ordinary free relatives like (2a) and (2b), as she does not illustrate her points with left-dislocated constructions. However, the possibility of employing simultaneously both analyses should be at least considered with respect to left-dislocations.

Similarly, Allen (2020) is also open to both analyses illustrated in (3). She claims that case marking facts give no final answer as to which analysis in (3) should be favoured because case attraction, which is optional in OE, can be involved in the examples of lower clause case. In other words, case can be assigned either internally within the relative clause (the relative pronoun in the specifier position) or 'attracted' into the case expected of the lower clause (the relative pronoun as a head). Allen additionally shows that Taylor's suggestion that the case of the pronoun in free relatives is determined by the case hierarchy does not always hold. Therefore Allen's litmus paper for testing the two structures in (3) remains stranding/pied piping. Although she does not examine left-dislocated free relatives either, she draws a clear line between demonstrative and *wh-* pronouns in ordinary free relatives, which is important in left-dislocated free relatives as well. On the basis of a very meticulous investigation, she concludes that *wh-* free relatives normally involve relative pronouns which belong to the lower clause because pied piping is available in these constructions. Crucially, however, she finds a few stranding cases in these constructions. This fact suggests that analysis (3a) should be at least available for *wh-* free relatives, too. By contrast, demonstrative free relatives exhibit a number of stranding cases, which offers strong evidence for the Head analysis. Interestingly, Allen (2020) does not find convincing examples of pied piping with demonstratives. Those that she does find (her section 6.2.2) are explained away by Latin influence. However, she is very cautious in her judgments, saying that the possibility that demonstratives are internal to free relatives "cannot be entirely ruled out".

To sum up, in the literature we find arguments for either of the two analyses presented in (3) on the basis of investigations of free relatives (Allen 1980 and Harbert 1983). More recent accounts (Taylor 2014, Allen 2020), however, claim that both analyses can be found simultaneously in these relatives. Crucially, they do not investigate left-dislocated free relatives.

3. Methodology and scope

In the previous section we have seen that the same data (example 1a) can be examined either in terms of the Head Hypothesis (Harbert 1983) or the Comp Hypothesis (Allen 1980). Other accounts (Taylor 2014, Allen 2020) argue that

---

relatives and show that these constructions observe the case hierarchy proposed by Harbert (2007).

two types of OE relatives are amenable to both analyses. However, their conclusions are based on ordinary free relatives rather than left-dislocated structures. Consequently, it is necessary to see if the data from a large corpus suggest that one of the options from (3) is viable or, perhaps, we can find evidence in favour of both structures in left-dislocated structures just like in the case of ordinary free relatives.

Another problem concerns case. Taylor suggests that the case that is lower on the case hierarchy (Harbert 2007) is used in OE free relatives when there is a conflict between the case assigned by the verb in the main clause and that dictated by the function in the relative clause. Allen (2020) argues that this generalization does not always hold. This study will determine how case is assigned in both types of left-dislocated relative clauses and what preferences in the choice of cases in particular constructions are. Additionally, the investigation will show that Harbert's hierarchy is observed in left-dislocated structures when there is a case conflict in attested examples.

The data collection was conducted electronically with the assistance of the search program attached to the YCOE. Since the corpus has a separate tag for left-dislocated free relatives, the query *CP-FRL-LFD* exists* with the node set for IP* yielded 364 structures. In this way, *wh*-free relatives (shown in 1b), demonstrative free relatives with *þe* (exemplified in 1a) and demonstrative free relatives without *þe* illustrated in (4) below were gathered:

(4) Dæt God gesamnode ne syndrige **þæt** nan man.
that-ACC God joined not should-separate that-ACC no man
'what God joined together let no man separate that'
(cowsgosp,Mk_[WSCp]:10.9.2933)

However, in the course of the manual check of the data, it turned out that there are certain inconsistencies in the parsing of superficially the same constructions. By way of illustration, let us compare example (1a) with example (5) below:

(5) ðone ðe Drihten lufað. **þone** he ðreað.
whom-ACC that Lord loves him-ACC he chastens
'whom the Lord loves, he chastens him'
(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_21:188.247.4154)

Example (5) is treated as an ordinary *se þe* relative, in which - according to the parsing principles set out in the manual - when there is no possible antecedent, *se* is taken as the antecedent, and the relative pronoun is an empty *wh*-operator. By contrast, in (1a) *þone* is within the CP clause and the construction is labelled as a left-dislocated free relative clause (CP-FRL-LFD-SPE).

Therefore, the second step was to retrieve all potential left-dislocated free relatives like (5), which are parsed as headed structures in the corpus, with the following queries: *GEN-LFD* exists/ DAT-LFD* exists/ ACC-LFD* exists* (the node set for IP*). This procedure yielded the following additional number of examples to consider: 65 accusative left-dislocations, 45 dative left-dislocations and 4 genitive left-dislocations. Out of 114 examples, we had to filter out those cases that cannot be taken as free relatives because they have nominal heads, even though they are interesting for case assignment reasons. Consider:

(6) þone stan þe ða wyrhtan awurpon, **þes** is geworden on
the-ACC stone-ACC that the builders rejected this-NOM is become on
þære hyrnan heafod.
the corner head
'the stone that the builders rejected, it has become the cornerstone'
(cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp]:20.17.5298)

(7) ðæm monnum ðe we for geðylde hwæt forberan sculon, ðæt we
he-DAT men-DAT that we for patience that bear should that we
hie sculon eac milde mode lufian.
them-ACC should also mild-DAT heart-DAT love
'the men that we should bear that with out of patience, we should also love them with mild heart'
(cocuraC,CP_[Cotton]:33.222.5.65)

(8) Ðara iglanda þe man hæt Ciclades **þara** sindon þreo
the-GEN islands-GEN that one calls cyclades them-GEN are three
& fiftig,
and fifty
'of the islands which are called cyclades, there are 53 of them'
(coorosiu,Or_1:1.20.32.408)

Some further exclusions involve locative examples like those in (9) because locatives are often treated as a separate category (cf. Allen 1980):

(9) & swa hwær swa he com, & swa hwilce swa he geseah, swa rice
and so where as he came and so which as he saw as rich
swa heane, ðonne cyrde he to **þam**.
as lowly then turned he to them
'and wherever he came and whomsoever he saw, rich or lowly, he turned to them'
(cobede,Bede_3:3.160.18.1548)

Next, some examples of free relatives appear in the YCOE files in different versions in several texts. Perhaps the most common repetitions are given in (10) and (11). Naturally, such instances should be counted once.

(10) swa hwæt swa hi bindað ofer eorþan **þæt** bið gebunden
so what-ACC as they bind over earth that-NOM is bound
on heofenum.
in heaven
'whatever they bind on earth, that shall be bound in heaven'
(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_36:488.64.7181)

(11) swa hwæt swa hi unbindað ofer eorþan **þæt** bið unbunden
so what-ACC as they unbind over earth that-NOM is unbound
on heofenum.
in heaven
'whatever they unbind on earth, that shall be unbound in heaven'
(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_36:488.64.7182)

Having established the aims and the procedure of the research, let us turn to the corpus data.

4. *Wh-* free relatives

Out of all the *wh-* free relatives annotated in the corpus, most examples contain the combination of nominative/accusative relative pronouns and nominative/accusative resumptives. The parsing of such examples is consistent: they are all treated as CP-FRL-LFD, i.e., as specifiers within the relative clause. Typical examples are illustrated in (10) and (11) above and in (12)-(14) below:

(12) for ðan swa hwæt swa læsse bið þonne God. **þæt** ne bið na
for that so what-NOM as less is than God that-NOM not is no
God.
God
'for whatever is less than God, that is not God'
(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_20:339.125.3966)

(13) swa hwylcne swa he gemet butan soþre lufe, **ðæne** he befrinð
so what-ACC as he finds without true love him-ACC he questions
mid graman.
with wrath
'whomsoever he finds without true love, him he questions with wrath'
(cocathom1,ÆCHom_I,_35:481.162.7032)

(14) swa hwylcne swa ic cysse **he** hit is.
so what-ACC as I kiss he-NOM it is
'whoever I kiss he is the man'
(cowsgosp,Mk_[WSCp]:14.44.3363)

As shown by examples (10)-(12), there is a lot of case syncretism in these structures because the same forms are used in the nominative and accusative. Other forms are unambiguous but relatives and resumptives have the same case (example 13). These two groups form the majority. We have found 170 such instances. The rest consists of instances in which the two forms are clearly different, as illustrated in (14).[3] There are only 39 such examples in our data.

Allen (1980: §2.2.2.1.) already argued that the *wh-* pronoun in such examples belongs to the lower clause, which suggests the Comp analysis. According to her, this is supported by the fact that left-dislocated *wh*-relatives are found with pied-piping. Whereas neither pied-piping nor stranding examples are available with the nominative and accusative cases in the corpus, the situation is different with the dative and genitive case. In fact, all four instances of datives (one is controversial, see example 18 below) contain pied-piping, as shown in examples (15) and (16).[4] There is also one genuine example of pied piping with the genitive case (example 17). Consider:[5]

(15) And to swa hwilcere leode swa we cumaþ we cunnon **ðære** gereord.
and to so which-DAT people as we come we know their-GEN language
'to whichever people we come we know their language'
(cocathom2,ÆCHom_II,_37:275.103.6195); Allen (1980: 280)

---

[3] A separate group are examples in which resumptives are not pronominal. Consider:

(i) swa hwylc man swa et gebyrmed on ðam forman dæge oðde on þone seofoðan, **se man**
so what-NOM one as eats leavened on the first day or on the seventh the man
forwyrð of Ysrahela folce
denies from Israel people
'whoever eats anything with yeast in it from the first day through the seventh must be cut off from Israel'
(cootest,Exod:12.15.2854)

[4] Allen (1980: 280) discusses another example of dative pied piping along with other left-dislocated structures:

(i) Ond on swa hwelcre stowe swa min ðrowunge awriten sy ond man ða mærsige,
and in so which-DAT place as my passion written is and one it celebrates
afyrr ðu drihten from **ðære stowe** blindness.
drive you Lord from that place blindness
'And whatever place my passion is written in and is celebrated, drive, O Lord, blindness from that place.'
(Mart. p.116.8)

The search did not return this example because it is tagged as a free relative with a locative pronoun (FRL-LOC*) and *þære stowe* is not tagged as resumptive (-RSP), which is indispensable in left-dislocation.

[5] As pointed out by a reviewer, examples (15) through (17) resemble examples (6) through (8) ruled out from our investigation. Note, however, that the latter group contains nominal heads which cannot occupy a position within the relative clause. In contrast, the relatives in the former set must be analysed as specifiers in the relative clause because they all exhibit pied piping (cf. Allen 1980). Consequently, we deal with two different sets of data.

(16) On swa hwilcum sunlicum monðe swa swa se mona
On so which-DAT solar-DAT months-DAT as as the month
geenda, **se** bi his mona.
ends, that-NOM is his month
'on whatever months the moon ends, that is his month'
(cotempo,ÆTemp:4.34.157)

(17) þurh swa hwelces bene swa he gehæled sy, **ðisses** geleafa
through so which-GEN prayer as he healed is his-GEN belief
& wyrcnis seo lefed God onfenge.
and works be believed God acceptable
'through whoever's prayer he should be healed, let his belief and works be believed acceptable to God'
(cobede,Bede_2:2.98.30.924); Allen (1980: 280)

Importantly, there are no convincing examples with stranding, contra Allen (2020), who found such instances with ordinary *wh-* free relatives. The best we could find is the following example:

(18) mid swa hwam swa ic hit mid fynde, beo **he** min þeow.
with so whom-DAT as I it with find shall-be he-NOM my servant
'with whomever it is found he shall be my servant'
(cootest,Gen:44.10.1883)

This example is dubious because it contains two instantiations of the preposition *mid*. It is more likely to involve pied piping rather than stranding. Simply instead of the usual gap left by the movement of the prepositional phrase, the empty position is lexicalized by the preposition *mid*, giving the impression of stranding. Furthermore, this is the translation of the Latin sentence *apud quem fuerit inventum ipse sit servus meus*, which exhibits pied piping (*apud quem*). Consequently, this example cannot be taken as evidence that stranding is possible in left-dislocated *wh-* free relatives.

The case marking facts also indicate that the Comp analysis is correct because there is no example that would unambiguously demonstrate that the case of the relative pronoun is assigned outside the lower clause. With the datives and (partly) with the genitives, the pied piped preposition assigns case (examples 15–18). On other occasions, this job is done by the verb in the relative clause. The fact that the main clause and the relative clause can assign cases independently is especially noticeable in examples like (14), in which the resumptive pronoun is assigned case according to its role in the main clause (nominative), whereas the *wh-* pronoun is accusative, as might be expected from its grammatical function in the lower clause.

To sum up, *wh-* free relatives in left-dislocated structures show evidence in favour of the Comp analysis. Pied piping must involve the movement of the pronoun from within the relative clause. Case marking facts are also straightforwardly explained if we assume this hypothesis. Additionally, there is no convincing proof that stranding is possible with *wh-* free relatives in left-dislocations.

5. Demonstrative free relatives

5.1. Demonstrative free relatives without *þe*

Apart from *wh-* pronouns, in OE, demonstrative pronouns could be used in free relatives. Taylor (2014: 473) shows that they are equivalents of definite free relatives, irrespective of whether they are headed by demonstratives with or without *þe*. Let us first discuss left-dislocated examples with demonstratives that are not followed by *þe*. Consider:

(19) Đæt ic þær wrat, **þæt** sceal beon awriten.
that-ACC I there wrote that-NOM shall be written
'what I wrote there that shall be written'
(coverhomE,HomS_24.1_[Scragg]:309.291)

(20) Forþon of syndrigum ciricum gehwylcum þa ðu æfest & good
Thus from individual church each that-ACC you pious and good
& riht geceose, **þa** ðu togædre gesomna.
and right choose that-ACC you together gather
'Thus from individual churches whatever you choose that is pious and good and right, gather you that together'
(cobede,Bede_1:16.66.25.622)

(21) þæt on hire acenned ys **hyt** ys of þam halgan gaste.
that-NOM in her conceived is it-NOM is from the Holy Spirit
'what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit'
(cowsgosp,Mt_[WSCp]:1.20.49)

(22) Se þonne witodlice ne gelyfþ on God, þonne wunaþ he-NOM
He-NOM then truly not believes in God then will-live **he**
on blindnesse aa on ecnesse.
in blindness always in eternity
'He who truly does not believe in God, he will remain blind for ever and ever'
(coblick,LS_20_[AssumptMor[BlHom_13]]:155.298.1930)

(23) Đæt hie ealle heora sylfra eagon oforsegon & heora
that-ACC they all their-GEN self-GEN eyes saw and their-GEN

earon gehyrdon, **þyses ealles** hie sceoldon Drihtne gewita beon,
ears heard this-GEN all-GEN they should Lord-DAT witness be
'What they had all seen with their own eyes and heard with their own ears, of all this they were to be witnesses for our Lord'
(coblick,HomS_46_[BlHom_11]:121.79.1520)

This group, which comprises 66 instances, is rather homogeneous in the corpus, as there are only the following patterns: the accusative/nominative relative form *þæt(te)/þa* and the same accusative/nominative resumptive form *þæt/þa* (examples 19, 20). Occasionally, it is a pair of a demonstrative and personal pronoun, as illustrated in (21) and (22). Only three examples do not exhibit case syncretism with the genitive or dative resumptive pronoun (example 23). The parsing of these examples is the same as the ones discussed in section 4: since they are not accompanied by a relative particle, they are parsed as CP-FRL-LFD.

The parsing treatment is also reflected in the way Taylor (2014) classifies demonstratives without *þe*, i.e., as specifiers in the CP, thus non-heads. Allen (1980, 2020) too notes that in left-dislocated structures (she refers to both *wh*- and demonstrative types) the specifier rather than the external head position is filled by a pronoun because of the availability of pied piping and the fact that case is determined within the relative clause. Close examination of the data shows that demonstrative free relatives without *þe* are used with neither stranding nor pipe piping. Moreover, there are no dative or genitive forms that would favour pied piping as in *wh*- pronouns (section 4). However, it is true that in a few cases where the forms are different like in (23), cases seem to be assigned independently in the relative and main clause. Consequently, there is no reason to believe that these demonstratives should be ever analysed as external heads, though the evidence is rather scant and indirect.

Let us now turn to demonstrative free relatives with *þe*.

5.2. Demonstrative free relatives with *þe*

Demonstrative free relatives with *þe* are interesting for a number of reasons. First, superficially similar structures are not parsed in the same way in the corpus. As already hinted at, example (1a) is parsed as a headless construction, whereas the fronted demonstrative in (5) is an external head. Note that both introductory demonstrative pronouns appear in the accusative case, they are followed by *þe* and the main clauses contain the resumptives referring back to them, though their cases are different. As already hinted at, the YCOE parsing is not meant to be taken as a syntactic analysis but rather as a tool to extract relevant data, yet it is interesting to consider why superficially similar structures are analysed differently. Second, some left-dislocated free relatives can be rather difficult to analyse. Let us consider example (24):

(24) Ðæra synna þe ge forgyfað **hig** beoð him forgyuene.
the-GEN sins-GEN that you forgive they-NOM are them-DAT forgiven
'whose sins you forgive, they are forgiven them'
(cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:20.23.7429)

At first glance this sentence should not be analysed as a free relative at all, as the head of the relative clause is nominal. Close examination, however, suggests that this is not a correct analysis. Rather, (24) is a free relative with the entire NP (*Ðæra synna*) located in Spec, CP. Note that the Latin equivalent reads *quorum remiseritis peccata remittuntur eis* (lit. 'whose you-remit sins, they-are-remitted unto-them'), with the genitival form *quorum* separated from the noun *peccata*. By contrast, in OE the genitive of the pronoun causes the fronting of the noun, which lands in the specifier position. This means that the Comp analysis is most likely in (24).

With this in mind, let us examine non-nominative, i.e., genitive, dative and accusative structures in order to determine which structural analysis is better with this type of free relatives by looking at pied piping and stranding.[6] Recall that *wh-* free relatives exhibit pied piping with datives and genitives, whereas there are no convincing pied piping/stranding examples with demonstrative free relatives without *þe*. The question is whether we can find similar evidence in demonstrative free relatives with *þe*. With respect to pied piping, the best we could find is the following:

(25) ofer ðæne þe ðu gesyhst nyðerstigendne gast & ofer hine
over him-ACC that you see descending spirit and over him-ACC
wuniendne þæt is se ðe fyllað on halgum gaste.
remaining that-NOM is he who baptizes on holy spirit
'he over whom you see the descending spirit and remaining on him, that is he who baptizes with the Holy Ghost'
(cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:1.33.5798)

Allen (1980: 283, footnote 24) claims that example (25) "cannot be taken seriously, because it is a literal translation from Latin *super quem videris spiritum descendentum*…". Another unconvincing example of a free relative structure that cannot be taken as pied piping is given below:

(26) [beseowa hire iii] on þon þe þu wille do on **þone**
[sew up them three] in that-DAT which you want do on the-ACC
mon þe him þearf. Sie.
man-ACC who him-DAT need should-be

[6] Nominative relative pronouns of the type *se þe* are always analysed as heads, hence the problem of the choice of the correct analysis does not arise.

'sew up three of them [stones] in whatever you want, put [them] on the man who needs them'
(colaece,Lch_II_[3]:1.1.10.3514)

In the corpus *on þon (þe)* is parsed as FRL-LFD, which might suggest a pied piping structure. For one thing, it does not have to be a free relative at all given the context. *Đon* could be just an ordinary head followed by a relative clause with the meaning along the lines: 'sew up three of them in that which you want to (…)'. Second, even if we assumed a free relative here, the underlined chunk and the resumptive do not correspond to the same entity: the fronted prepositional phrase probably refers to a bandage or clothe in which the stones could be sewn together, whereas *þone mon* is a possible place you can put the stones on. Thus (26) cannot be taken as a genuine example of pied piping. As for stranding, consider the following example:

(27) þam þe Dryhten mycel to forlæteð, myceles he **hine** eac eft
him-DAT that Lord much to grants much he him-ACC also after
manað.
admonish
'the one to whom Lord grants much, much he will also admonish him afterwards'
(coverhom,HomS_40.3_[ScraggVerc_10]:204.1538)

Example (27) looks like a stranding construction because *forlætan* is used with the preposition *to* in the sense of 'grant' (s.v. *forlætan* IIa, B&T). Interestingly, this is the only example in the corpus in which the left-dislocated *þam* is parsed as the specifier of CP, contrary to the stranding facts which require the Head analysis. However, there is one possibility that would rule out stranding here. In a different manuscript, Scragg (1992) registers *syleð* instead of *to forlæteð*, in which case the Comp analysis is completely natural because *syllan* can take a dative indirect object. Now if *to* and *forlæteð* could form one verb, *toforlætan*, then we would have a similar situation. Indeed, such a verb is registered by B&T but with the meaning 'dismiss'. Visser (1963–1973: §682), however, lists *toforlætan* among verbs "whose fundamental meaning is that of giving, bestowing, granting, imparting etc". These verbs take a direct object (the thing received) and an indirect object (the person who receives something). Consequently, *to* could be part of the verb, which would rule out stranding. This hypothesis is even more likely if we add the fact that this is the only dative example that strands a preposition.

Since neither pied piping nor stranding provides strong corroboration for either structural analysis, let us now turn to case assignment facts, which might tell us more which analysis is preferred in a given context and why both analyses

are used in the YCOE parsing of demonstrative free relatives with *þe*. Table 1 below shows the numbers of the YCOE parsing of demonstrative free relatives with *þe* in the genitive, dative and accusative cases.

Table 1. The YCOE parsing with demonstrative free relatives with *þe* in the genitive, dative and accusative cases.

demonstrative free relatives with *þe*	**Head Hypothesis**	**Comp Hypothesis**
Genitive	-	6
Dative	21	1
Accusative	5	6

The data show that the genitives are located only in Spec, CP, as in (28) below, whereas datives strongly prefer the Head analysis, as shown in (29) below. The accusative examples are more balanced, as shown in (1a) and (5) above.

(28) ac ðæs ðe he wenð ðæt he gehelpan mæge, **ðæm** he
but him-GEN that he thinks that he help can him-DAT he
forwiernð swiðe feola ðæs ðe he wilnað.
refuses very much that-GEN that he wishes
'but him whom he thinks he can help, to him he refuses very much of what he desires'
(cocura,CP:50.391.23.2660)

(29) þam þe ge nellað forgifan, **þam** ne beoð forgifene.
those-DAT that you will-not forgive them-DAT not will-be forgiven
'those that you will not forgive, they will not be forgiven'
(coaelhom,ÆHom_7:53.1090)

The analysis of all the 'specifier' examples in the corpus suggests that the Comp Hypothesis is chosen because the case is assigned within the lower, relative clause. Syntactically, this seems to be the most natural explanation. Note that the case of the resumptive is normally different from that of the relative pronoun (cf. examples 1 and 28, for instance), which indicates that the cases are assigned independently according to their grammatical roles in the clauses.[7]

The Head analysis is applied in situations when there is no possible antecedent and the demonstrative pronoun is taken as the antecedent and the relative pronoun is an empty *wh*-operator (the parsing principles set out in the YCOE). The fact that the pronoun is external to the relative clause makes it easy

[7] There is only one genitival example in which the case of the relative pronoun and resumptive happens to be the same.

to correspond to the resumptive in the main clause in terms of case. Indeed we find practically only examples in which both elements are assigned the same case, as in (29).[8] Moreover, we find instances in which this correspondence is even stronger. Consider:

(30) þam ðe me his heafod to gebringð, ic gife **him**
him-DAT that me his head to will-bring I will-give him-DAT
c punda goldes.
100 pounds gold-GEN
'he who shall bring me his head, I shall give him 100 pounds'
(coapollo,ApT:7.23.113)

(31) þone þe me tocymð, ne drife ic **hine** fram me.
him-ACC that me comes not drive I him-ACC from me
'he who comes to me I do not drive him away from me'
(coeuphr,LS_7_[Euphr]:67.66)

In (30) and (31) the dative and accusative of the relative pronouns are not assigned case according to their grammatical role in the lower clause because *þam* and *þone* function as subjects in the relatives but they are not nominatives. Instead they are case-marked like the resumptive pronouns in the main clauses. In other words, the case of the demonstratives is that the left-dislocated NP would play in the main clause. Another point that strengthens the link between the two clauses is that left-dislocated free relatives in OE must obey the case hierarchy proposed by Harbert (2007): NOM<ACC<DAT/GEN. Thus if there is a clash between the case required by the main clause and that dictated by the function in the lower clause, it is always resolved in favour of the case that is lower in the case hierarchy. That is, the dative and accusative surface in (30) and (31), respectively, because they are lower on the scale than the nominative (cf. also Cinque 2020: §2.5.11).

In the corpus we also find two apparent exceptions because the fronted constituents, *þone* and *þam*, are parsed as heads but their case is different from the case of the resumptive pronoun. Consider:

(32) þone þe min mægþhad fægre and wel gehealdon hæfð:
him-ACC that my virginity fairly and well protected has
is **þæt** se þe þine yldran ahengan.
is that-NOM he that your father crucified
'he who has protected my virginity fairly and well, that is he who(m) your father crucified'
(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303]:6.8.79)

[8] With the dative case, the only example in which the relative pronoun is located in the specifier position is explained away in (27).

(33) þam þe butan andetnessa & butan dædbote heora lif geendiaþ
those-DAT that without confession and without repentance their life end
her on worulde, þonne ne becumaþ **heo** æfre to ængum life ne to
here on world then not will-come they-NOM ever to any life not to
ænigre reste.
any rest
'those without confession and without repentance end their life here on earth, they will never come to any life or to any rest'
(coverhomL,HomU_15.1_[Scragg]:175.91)

Just like in (30) and (31), there is a clash between the function in the relative clause and the case assigned to these forms. Both the grammatical function and the case of the resumptive in the main clause point to a nominative form of the relative pronoun, which is not there. An unusual form in (32) can be explained away if we look at the wider context. In particular, *þone* in (32) might be appositive to *God almihtigne* in the previous sentence, which reads: *Seo eadiga Margarete him þa geandswarede: Ic lufige God ælmihtigne, cwæð hi, and on him ic gelefa, þe is fæder and sunu and halig gast þone þe…*'then the holy Margaret answered him: I love God, she said, the Almighty God and put my faith in Him, who is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, whom/him…'. As for (33), the dative form might be simply a scribal error in this long sentence. Note that this version of the Vercelli homily is from a late MS and the dative might be a late addition. Moreover, impersonal verbs like *becuman*, which takes a dative human object, were undergoing a number of grammatical changes, so the resumptive might have been changed into the nominative with the dative form left unchanged in this manuscript.

To sum up this section, neither pied piping nor stranding provides convincing evidence as to which structural analysis is preferred in demonstrative free relatives with *þe*. Case facts, however, shed more light on this point. The Comp Hypothesis is favoured whenever the case of the relative pronoun is assigned within the relative clause. The case of the resumptive is assigned independently in the matrix clause and is normally different from the one assigned to the relative pronoun. This option is prevalent with the genitives and almost half of the accusative cases. By contrast, the Head Hypothesis, found with the dative cases and the other half of accusatives, shows the link with the matrix clause because the fronted relative forms have the same case forms as the resumptives. Moreover, as illustrated for Gothic, the case hierarchy is observed in left-dislocated free relatives too. Some isolated unusual case forms of the relative heads can be explained away on other grounds, i.e., by an analysis of individual texts.

6. Conclusions

This paper is a modest contribution to the syntax of free relatives in OE. It examines one type of these structures, i.e., left-dislocated free relatives. The corpus investigation confirms certain facts known at least since Allen (1980). Specifically, the distinction made between *wh-* pronouns and demonstrative pronouns is valid on several levels. *Wh-* pronouns are amenable to the Comp analysis because they are specifiers of CP. This is confirmed by the existence of pied piping structures involving internal movement especially with the dative and genitive case. Case assignment facts with the nominative and accusative case, though do not directly confirm the Comp Hypothesis, are compatible with it. By contrast, the analysis of demonstrative free relatives cannot rely on pied piping and stranding because both subtypes (with and without *þe*) do not exhibit genuine examples of that sort. However, case marking facts shed more light on the syntactic structure of left-dislocated free relatives with *þe*. In particular, when the case of the relative element is assigned within the lower clause and is different from its resumptive counterpart in the main clause, the Comp analysis is preferred. If, in contrast, the case of the relative demonstrative matches the case of the resumptive, the Head analysis is favoured. Moreover, when there is a clash between the case required by the main clause and that dictated by the function in the lower clause, the case hierarchy proposed by Harbert (2007) is always observed. Demonstrative free relatives without *þe* probably follow the Comp analysis, though pied piping/stranding and case evidence is rather scant.

Quantitatively, the paper confirms natural tendencies in case distinctions in OE. There is noticeable case syncretism in the nominative and accusative forms both in *wh-* and demonstrative structures. The examples in which the relative and resumptive forms are clearly morphologically different are always in the minority. Therefore instead of the traditional four-pronged case distinction in OE, it is more reasonable to distinguish between ambiguous and non-ambiguous case forms. This is the strategy adopted in sections 4 and 5.

References:

Allen, C.L. 1980. Movement and deletion in Old English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 261-325.

Allen, C. L. 2020. Case and preposition stranding in Old English free relatives. *North Western European Language Evolution* 73(2): 185-211.

B&T=Bosworth, J. and T. N. Toller 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. 1921. Supplement by T. N. Toller. 1972. Enlarged addenda and corrigenda by A. Campbell. Oxford: Clarendon. https://bosworthtoller.com.

Bresnan, J., and J. Grimshaw 1978. The syntax of free relatives in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 331-91.

Cinque, G. 2020. *The syntax of relative clauses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gisborne, N., and R. Truswell 2017. Where do relative specifiers come from? In R. Truswell and É. Mathieu (eds.), *Micro-change and macro-change in diachronic syntax*, 25-42. (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics, 23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Groos, A., and H. Van Riemsdijk 1981. Matching effects in free relatives: a parameter of core grammar. In A. Beletti and L. Rizzi (eds.), *Theory of markedness in generative grammar*, 171-216. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Grosu, A. 1994. *Three studies in locality and case*. London: Routledge.

Harbert, W. 1983. A note on Old English free relatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14(3): 549-553.

Harbert, W. 2007. *The Germanic languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pittner, K. 1991. Freie Relativsaetze und die Kasushierarchie. In E. Feldbusch, R. Pogarell and C. Weiss (eds.), *Neue Fragen der Linguistik: Akten des 25. Linguistischen Kolloquiums in Paderborn*, 341-347. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Pittner, K. 1995. The case of German relatives. *Linguistic Review* 12: 197-231.

Riemsdijk, H. Van 2006. Free relatives. In M. Everaert and H. Van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Vol.2, 338-82. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scragg, D. 1992. *The Vercelli Homilies and related texts*. (Early English Text Society 300). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, A. 2014. Old English syntax. In D. Ringe and A. Taylor (eds.), *The development of Old English*, 392-509. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, A., A. Warner, S. Pintzuk and F. Beths 2003. *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE).
http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/YcoeHome.htm.

Traugott, E.C. 2007. Old English left-dislocations: their structure and information status. *Folia Linguistica* 41(3/4): 405-441.

Visser, F.T. 1963-1973. *An historical syntax of the English language*. Vol.1. Leiden: E.J. Brill.