

Do relative clauses in early English have their own word order patterns?¹

Cristina SUÁREZ-GÓMEZ

Universitat de les Illes Balears
cristina.suarez@uib.es

Recibido: diciembre, 2006

Aceptado: marzo, 2007

ABSTRACT

It is generally acknowledged that word-order patterns in earlier stages of the English language are more variable than those of Present-Day English. Two main word-orders compete in early English, namely VO and OV, which follow some principles in their distribution in the language. These two word-orders correlate with the degree of subordination of the clause, VO being associated with non-subordinate clauses and OV with subordinate ones. More recently, it has been observed that the above correlation does not match with the existing data and demonstrated that there are other linguistic factors intervening in the non-random distribution of word-order patterns, as is the case of the presence of object pronominal items or negative constituents. Regarding relative clauses in early English, word-order has been generally associated with the relativizer used to introduce the relative clause, ultimately linked to the status of the clause, with relative clauses introduced by a pronominal item showing a tendency for VO and those introduced by an indeclinable relativizer for OV. The aim of this paper is to show an alternative explanation to account for word-order patterns in relative clauses in early English, and illustrate how the word-order patterns of these clauses in particular are more influenced by the type of relative clause, whether restrictive or non-restrictive, than by the word used to introduce the relative clause.

Key words: word order patterns, relative clauses, early English.

¿Tienen las oraciones de relativo en inglés temprano un orden de palabras propio?

RESUMEN

De forma general, se admite que el orden de palabras en las etapas tempranas del inglés es más variable que el del inglés actual. Dos órdenes de palabras compiten en inglés temprano, a saber VO y OV, que siguen unos principios en su distribución en el idioma. Estos dos órdenes de palabras están en correlación con el grado de subordinación de la proposición, VO se asocia con proposiciones no

¹ I am grateful for generous financial support to the following institutions: Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and European Regional Development Fund (grant no. HUM2007-60706/FILO); Autonomous Government of Galicia (Directorate General of Scientific and Technological Promotion, grant no. 2006/14-0; Directorate General for Research, Development and Innovation, INCITE grant no. 08PXIB204016PR). Thanks are also due to the anonymous reviewers of this paper for their valuable comments. Needless to say, any remaining shortcomings are own responsibility.

subordinadas y OV con las subordinadas. Más recientemente, se ha observado que dicha correlación no coincide con los datos existentes y se ha demostrado que hay otros factores lingüísticos que intervienen en la distribución no arbitraria del orden de palabras, como es el caso de la presencia de elementos pronominales objeto o constituyentes negativos. Respecto a las oraciones de relativo en inglés temprano, el orden de palabras se ha asociado en líneas generales con el relativizador utilizado para introducir la oración de relativo, en última instancia vinculado al estatus de la proposición. Las oraciones de relativo introducidas por un elemento pronominal muestran una tendencia al VO y las introducidas por un relativo indeclinable tienden al OV. El objetivo de este artículo es mostrar una explicación alternativa del modelo de orden de palabras de estas oraciones en inglés temprano e ilustrar cómo el orden de palabras de estas oraciones en particular está más influenciado por el tipo de oración de relativo, tanto restrictiva como no restrictiva, que por la palabra utilizada para introducir la oración de relativo.

SUMMARY: 1. Introduction. 2. Description of the corpus. 3. Word order in relative clauses. 4. Analysis of word order patterns. 4.1. Relativization strategies. 4.2. Type of relative clause. 5. Conclusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is generally acknowledged that the word order patterns observed in earlier stages of the English language, especially Old English, are more variable than those of Present-day English. As is well-known, Present-day English has a basic or unmarked SVO word order, as illustrated by (1).

(1) I like Old English syntax.

Additionally, in Present-day English there are other non-basic or unmarked word orders whose prime motivating factors are discourse-based, as in (2) (see Downing and Locke (2006) for a complete list of all the sentences or syntactic alternatives to the basic word order SVO).

(2) Most sitcoms, I don't like.

On the contrary, there is no agreement on which the unmarked word order of early English was, especially Old English. Traditionally, two basic word orders were distinguished, namely 'verb-second word order' (SVO), intimately associated with main clauses (see example (3)), and 'verb-final word order' (SOV), linked to subordinate clauses, as illustrated in (4) (Traugott 1992: 274-275).

(3) He gefor mid firde ongean Aristonocuse þæm cyninge
He went with army against Aristonocusus the king
'then he went with an army against King Aristonocusus'

[Orosius 5.4.118.1]

- (4) Eower Fæder wat hwæs eow þearf biþ
 Your Father knew what your necessity is
 ‘your Father knows what is necessary for you’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 2: 103]

According to Denison (1993: 28), “whether Old English should be labelled SVO (as in example (3)) or SOV (as in example (4)) is far less clear”. For some scholars, it is clearly verb-final (Traugott 1992: 274), of the SOV type, as that reflected in example ((4)).² For other scholars, Old English is an asymmetric verb-second language (Kemenade 1987), with a different deep structure and syntax for main and subordinate clauses, like Modern German or Dutch.³ Pintzuk (1995), however, demonstrates that Old English is a symmetric language with respect to word order, like Modern Yiddish or Icelandic, in the sense that both main and subordinate clauses have the same word order as underlying basic word order. In other words, constructions may show an underlying structure with the inflected verb (I) in final position or in non-final position (Pintzuk 1995: 229), irrespective of the status of the clause, as illustrated in the phrase markers included below (1995: 230). The surface manifestation is then derived by different syntactic movements.

INFL-medial: [_{CP} SpecCP [_C C [_{IP} SpecIP [_I I VP]]]]

INFL-final: [_{CP} SpecCP [_C C [_{IP} SpecIP [_I VP I]]]]

What seems to be clear is that, although variable and with several possibilities, word order in Old English was not free. In fact, after a thorough analysis of Old English prose, Mitchell distinguished 3 basic word order types, namely SV, VS and S...V, all of them inherited from ancient Germanic word orders. These basic word orders showed the following basic tendencies:

S.V and sometimes V.S. occur in subordinate clauses, while V.S. with initial verb can occur in principal clauses which are statements, not questions. Pronoun objects and certain adverbs can precede the verb in principal clauses, but the resulting order is a variation of S.V. rather than a type of S...V. However, S...V does not occur in principal clauses with and noun object and is common after *ond* and *ac* (Mitchell 1988: 225).

² Additional arguments in favour of the consideration of Old English as an OV language can also be found in the fact that modifiers tend to precede their heads. This pattern of premodification of nouns by adjectives is still kept in Present-day English NPs (e.g. *a black cat*), a pattern which is considered a remnant of an earlier OV basic word order. Following Traugott (1992: 274), this means that the diachronic evolution of English from a verb-final language to a verb-non-final-language has not yet reached its end. According to Trask, Old English is only one stage of the transformation that “English has developed over thousands of years from a rather consistent OV language to a rather consistent VO language” (1996: 150).

³ Following this analysis, movement to verb-second position occurs in main clauses only. Verb-second in subordinate clauses is justified resorting to other processes.

From this distribution we can conclude that SV can occur not only in main but also in subordinate clauses. Similarly, although S...V word order is most common in subordinate clauses, according to Mitchell, it also occurs in main clauses. Finally, the inverted word order (illustrated in (5)) can be observed in main clauses introduced by an adverbial or prepositional phrase, and also in some subordinate clauses. Hence, what we can infer from this distribution is that word order does not necessarily determine whether a clause is main or subordinate.

- (5) On ðam dæge worhte God leoht, and merigen, and æfen
 On that day made God light and morning and evening
 ‘On that day God made light, and morning and evening’
 [*Ælfric Catholic Homilies* I: 18.250.12]

In his *Old English Syntax* (1985: chapter IX), Mitchell also concluded that there are of course certain tendencies which regulate word order in Old English, but he also recognizes that there are so many possibilities of word order that the scholar is finally left without a clear idea of what Old English word order was like.

Very succinct, but at the same time very illustrative is the picture presented by Traugott (1992). She agrees that there are several word order patterns in Old English and that their distribution is not free. There are two contrasting word order patterns within the clause, those which are verb-final and those which are verb-non-final (1992: 273), the former “most easily observed in subordinate clauses” (1992: 274-275), and the latter used “in most main clauses” (1992: 275).

From Mitchell and Traugott we can conclude that there are indeed certain tendencies which regulate word order in Old English; however these tendencies are not always reflected in the texts as there is a good deal of variation. Although there are basic word orders, the distribution of these basic word orders is far from being clearly established, since all three basic types of word order mentioned above can be used in any type of clause, whether subordinate or not.⁴

From late Old English onwards, the English language evolved towards a strict SVO order, as in Present-day English. The traditional view sees this word order rigidification as a gradual process whose prime motivating force was the loss of inflections from late Old English onwards. As a result, by Middle English we are already in front of “an almost purely SVO language” (Fischer 1992: 371). Other scholars contend that if this had been the case, verb final word order would cease to exist from Middle English onwards, and such examples have been recorded up to the 16th century, as clearly put by Fischer et al. (2000: 161), and illustrated by example (6):

⁴ Alternative accounts link word order variation in Old English (and word order change from Old English to Middle English) to pragmatic strategies, arguing that “the same (pragmatic) principles responsible for historical change are also responsible for synchronic reordering” (Bernárdez and Tejada 1995: 218).

- (1) and al his progenye in this world, [_{RC} that in thilke man synneded]
 and all his progeny in this world rel in such man sinned
 ‘and all his progeny in this world, who sinned against such man’
 [Chaucer *The Parson’s Tale* 296.C2]

In the following pages, we will deal with the word order shown by relative clauses in early English, more precisely in late Old English (950-1050) and early Middle English (1150-1250). First, we will provide some background information on word order in relative clauses. Then we will give our approach to this topic by analyzing word order in our selected corpus. For this analysis, the following two variables have turned out relevant for the word order of the relative clause; namely the relativization strategy used to introduce the relative clause; and also the type of relative clause, whether restrictive or non-restrictive.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE CORPUS

The data for the present study have been drawn from *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal*. Only prose texts from the O3 and M1 periods of *The Helsinki Corpus* have been included in the analysis, which corresponds to late Old English and early Middle English and comprise texts written between 950-1050 and 1150-1250 respectively. The classification of the texts has strictly followed the corresponding codification provided by *The Helsinki Corpus*. The same text types have been maintained for both periods, in order to keep the corpus as homogeneous as possible. As a consequence, texts written between 1050-1150 –corresponding to O4 from *The Helsinki Corpus* –had to be left out because there were no available texts representing all the text types selected for the other two periods. Poetry has also been excluded, as it was thought that word order could be affected by constraints of rhythm (e.g. alliteration, stress, etc.) and meter, and the results obtained from poetical texts were likely to be biased.

Text Type	Period	Text Title	Nr of RCs	Nr of words
Medicine Handbooks	LOE	<i>Lacnunga</i>	7	2720
		<i>Quadrupedibus</i>	40	4270
	EME	<i>Peri Didaxeon</i>	79	7350
Homilies	LOE	<i>Wulfstan’s Homilies</i>	131	6950
		<i>The Blicking Homilies</i>	170	10670
		<i>Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies</i>	108	4850
		<i>Bodley Homilies</i>	78	5880
		<i>Trinity Homilies</i>	110	5070
	EME	<i>Lambeth Homilies</i>	177	9900
		<i>Vespasian Homilies</i>	46	5880
		<i>Sawles Warde</i>	62	3820

‘There is a very famous city nearby towards the sea (...) set in the hill Garganus, which is called Sepontus.’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 17:18]

From this perspective, relative clauses should then be expected to alternate between verb-final and verb-non-final word order.

Within studies of relativization, we observe that word order is variable and variation is regulated by different parameters. In Bean’s opinion (1983), the most important aspect is the relativizer used to introduce the relative clause. She observes that relative clauses introduced by the invariable relativizer *þe* –the most common relativizer in the periods under analysis– are verb-final, as opposed to relative clauses introduced by deictic elements such as *se*, which are rather verb-non-final. Similar conclusions were previously obtained by McIntosh (1947-48: 79) and Dowsing (1979: 293-294) and later confirmed by Dekeyser (1986: 94).

For the classification of word order patterns in relative clauses in my corpus, the reference works by Mitchell (1985) and Traugott (1992) for Old English and Fischer (1992) for Middle English will be taken as starting points. In relation to the particular studies dealing with relative clauses and paying attention to their word order, Bean’s work (1983) is of particular interest, as she devotes a whole chapter to the word order of relative clauses. Dekeyser’s analysis (1986) will be considered too, as he also studies word order in the relative clauses of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. Isolated notes on word order are also found in Kivimaa’s study (1966) of relativization in early English.

Following these studies, two main types of word order have been distinguished depending on the position. A third category of ambiguous examples has also been included in the classification summarized below:

- Verb-non-final position or cases in which the finite verb is non-final. This basic word order would include the following word order types (SVO, SXVO, (X)VS):

- (8) He gefor mid firde ongean Aristonocuse þæm cyninge, [_{RC} se wolde
he went with army against Aristonocus the king rel wanted
geagnian him þa læssan Asiam]
usurp to-himself the lesser Asia
‘Then he went with an army against King Aristonocus, who wanted to usurp
Asia Minor’

[*Orosius* 5.4.118.1]

- Verb final position, or cases in which the finite verb occupies final position, as is the case of SOV.

- (9) Eower Fæder [_{RC} se on heofenum is], wat hwæs eow þearf biþ
Your Father rel in heaven is knew what your necessity is
‘your Father who is in heaven knows what is necessary for you’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 2: 103]

- Examples SV, as illustrated by example (10):

(10) se [_{RC} þe wille]
 he rel wants
 ‘he who wishes’

[*Wulfstan Homilies* 10C: 112]

This category contains ambiguous examples which do not provide any relevant information on word order, as it is not clear whether the finite verb *wille* in (10) is verb-second or clause-finally placed. Thus examples such as (10) above have been ultimately discarded for the statistical analysis.

4. ANALYSIS OF WORD ORDER PATTERNS

In the following sections of data analysis, we will first study how word order behaves in relative clauses according to the relativization strategy selected to introduce the relative clause; then, we will also check the word order against the type of relative clause, whether restrictive or non-restrictive.

4.1. RELATIVIZATION STRATEGIES

As mentioned in a previous section, the word order of relative clauses in early English seems to be determined by the nature of the relativization strategy. In the data codification, I distinguished the following strategies:

- Pronominal relativization strategy: it was represented by a simple or a compound relativizer (*se* and *seþe*), which agrees in number and gender with the antecedent it resumes and in case with the syntactic function it realizes in the relative clause. From early Middle English onwards, *wh-* words start to be used as pronominal relativizers. This pronominal relativization strategy is represented by examples (11), (12) and (13), respectively:

(11) ðonne is þær on neaweste sum swiþe mære burh betwih þære
 then is there in nearness certain exceedingly famous city towards the
 sæ on þæm munte Garganus geseted, [_{RC} se is haten Sepontus].
 Sea in the mountain Garganus set rel is called Sepontus
 ‘there is a very famous city nearby towards the sea [...] set in the hill Garganus,
 called Sepontus’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 17: 18]

(12) ac þa men [_{RC} þa þe on woh lifiaþ], nabbap hie na Crist on heora heortan
 but those men rel in error live have not they no Christ in their hearts
 ‘but those men who live wickedly have no Christ in their hearts’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 6: 190-191]

- (13) Đurh ðesse hole mihti and đurh his gode ileauen was Abraham iblesced through this whole might and through his good faith was Abraham blessed of godd, and him behoten ðat on scolde cumen of his kenne [RC đurh hwam by god and him promised that one should come of his family through rel all mankenn scolde bien iblesced] all manking should be blessed
 ‘Abraham was blessed by God through his might and good faith and it was promised to him that one should not come of this family through whom all mankind should be blessed’

[*Vices and Virtues* 1: 109]

• Invariable relativization strategy: it was represented by *þe* and *þat* relative clauses, as the following examples illustrate:

- (14) on is þe selue lust. oðer is iuel lehtres. þe tridde flesliche lustes. and þese two one is the own lust other is evil vice the third fleshly lust and these two [RC þe ben leihter and lust]; uulsteð þe þridde þat is þe flesliche lust rel are vice and lust feed the third that is the fleshly lust
 ‘one is own desire, the other is vice and the third is the lust of the flesh, and these two, which are vice and desire, feed the third, which is the lust of the flesh’

[*Trinity Homilies* 5: 29]

- (15) We agen to understonden hwet boð þe wepne [RC þet adam wes mide forwunded] we ought to understand what is the weapon rel Adam was with wounded
 ‘we ought to understand what the weapons are that Adam was wounded with’

[*Lambeth Homilies* 8: 83]

Invariable *þe* is the unmarked invariable relativizer of Old English. From late Old English onwards, *þat* starts to be used as invariable relativizer and supplants *þe* during the Middle English period.

• Gap relativization strategy, represented by zero relative clauses, as in (16):

- (16) godes luue beteð ower sunnen þa wile [RC Ø ge beon heren on þisse scorte liue] God’s love repent our sins the while rel you are here in this short live
 ‘God’s love compensate for your sins while you are here in this short life.’

[*Lambeth Homilies* 3: 29]

Relativizer *zero* was included when doing the search but finally excluded from the statistical analysis, because this relativizer is very scarcely used in early English and in very restricted contexts.⁷

⁷ Only 8 examples were found in the whole corpus, 1 corresponding to Old English and 7 to early Middle English.

Table 2 contains the distribution of word order in relative clauses of late Old English according to the relativization strategy that introduces them. We have grouped together the pronominal relativizers *se* and *seþe*, and invariable relativizers *þe* and *þat*, as they show a similar distribution with respect to word order.⁸

	Invariable	Pronominal	TOTAL
Non-final	244 (59.9)	82 (20.1)	326 (80.1)
Final	248 (60.9)	34 (8.3)	282 (69.3)
TOTAL	492	116	608

Table 2: Distribution of relativizers according to word order in late Old English (normalized frequencies per 10,000 words)

In agreement with Dowsing (1979: 293-294), Bean (1983: 92) or Dekeyser (1986: 94), we expect that relative clauses introduced by an invariable relativizer will be verb-final. Unlike the results obtained by Bean, Dowsing and Dekeyser, the results of the analysis of my late Old English corpus show that the balance is almost perfectly distributed between verb-final and verb-non-final word order, that is, the results reveal almost no difference between *þe*-relative clauses with verb-final (the expected option) (60.9) and verb-non-final (59.9). On the contrary, relative clauses introduced by pronominal relativizers show a stronger tendency to introduce verb-non-final relative clauses (20.1) than verb-final relative clauses (8.3).

In Middle English, verb-final word order becomes gradually less frequently used, in agreement with the progressive rigidification towards SVO as the unmarked word order. For the Middle English period under analysis, the same classification of word orders was applied as for Old English, taking into account that, although less frequently, there is still word order variation, as has been seen in section 1. The results from my corpus are included in Table 3.

⁸ Only those cases of relativizer *þat* which show gender and number agreement with the antecedent or those in which the relativizer functions as complement of a preposition have been included in the statistical analysis. Gender and number agreement and/or complement of a pied-piped preposition (see example below) are indicative features of the pronominal nature of the relativizer:

Sire ich wes þe biginnunge hwi swuch þing hefde forþgong. [_{RC} burh þt ich com i swuch
 Sir I was the beginning why such thing had happened through rel I came in such
 stude & I swuch time]
 place & in such time
 ‘Sir, I was the cause why such thing had happened, by which I came to this place at that time.’
 [Ancrene Wisse 164]

Conversely, complements of a stranded preposition (see example (15)) are indicative features of the invariable nature of the relativizer.

	Invariable	Pronominal	TOTAL
Non-final	710 (93.7)	37 (4.9)	747 (98.5)
Final	380 (50.1)	15 (2.0)	395 (52.1)
TOTAL	1090	52	1142

Table 3: Distribution of relativizers according to word order in early Middle English (normalized frequencies per 10,000 words)

In the light of the results shown in Table 3, verb-non-final word order is in fact becoming the favourite word order, used almost twice as frequently as verb-final word order (98.5 vs 52.1, respectively). In this table we observe that all relativization strategies favour non-final word order, confirming the change from OV to VO word order already referred to. Surprisingly however, there is a group of examples which still favours verb-final word order, basically those relative clauses introduced by invariable relativizers, the group of relative clauses which in Table 2, corresponding to late Old English, also favoured verb-final word order.

We can conclude from the results in Tables 2 and 3 that the drift OV to VO was in fact taking place with the diachronic progression of language. However, we cannot reinforce the same conclusions as previous studies on relativization and word order (e.g. Bean, Dowsing or Dekeyser), since my results do not show a positive correlation between relativizer and word order, in particular regarding the invariable relativization strategy, the most frequent one in late Old English.

4.2. TYPE OF RELATIVE CLAUSE

Another potentially relevant factor of variation in the word order of relative clauses in early English is the type of relative clause, whether restrictive or non-restrictive, as illustrated by examples (17) and (18) respectively.⁹

- (17) To eallum uncystum [_{RC} þe on gomum beoð acenned], wudugate geallan mid
to all diseases rel in palate are produced, of wild goat
gall with feldbeona hunige gemenged
of humble bees honey mixed
‘Against the diseases which arise in the palate, [put] wild goat’s gall mixed with
humble bees’ honey’

[*Quadrupedibus* 396]

- (18) Lazarus, [_{RC} þe Crist awehte þy feorþan dæge þæs þe on byrgene wæs ful
Lazarus rel Crist raised the fourth day after that in tomb was corrupt
wunigende],
renaining
he getacnaþ þysne middangerard.

⁹ I am aware that in some cases it is not easy to determine whether a relative clause is restrictive or non-restrictive. See Suárez-Gómez (2004: 83-105, 194-196) for the criteria used to distinguish between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

he betokens this world
 ‘Lazarus, whom Crist raised on the fourth day after that he remained corrupt in the tomb, he betokens this world’

[*The Blicking Homilies* 6: 153]

In my opinion, the type of relative clause may have a relevant influence in word order, especially bearing in mind, the effect of type of relative clause on the degree of integration of relative clauses (see Lehmann 1988).¹⁰ Relying on this background, the hypothesis would be that restrictive relative clauses are considered to be more integrated; thus, they would tend to verb-final word order and non-restrictive relative clauses are considered to be less integrated, thus, they would tend to verb-non-final word order. The results from the correlation between relativization strategy, type of relative clause and word order in late Old English are included in Table 4.

		RRC	NRRC	TOTAL
Invariable	Non-final	169 (41.5)	75 (18.4)	244
	Final	217 (53.3)	31 (7.6)	248
	TOTAL	386	106	492
Pronominal	Non-final	23 (5.6)	59 (14.5)	82
	Final	13 (3.2)	21 (5.2)	34
	TOTAL	36	80	116
TOTAL		422	186	608

Table 4: Distribution of types of relative clause according to word order in late Old English (normalized frequencies per 10,000 words)

The overall results from the analysis reflect a clear difference in the general distribution of word orders in restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses, a difference which was hidden in the previous correlation. Restrictive relative clauses score higher in verb-final word order (53.3) than in verb-non-final (41.5), when they are introduced by an invariable relativizer. By contrast, if they are non-restrictive, they are more frequently verb-non final (18.4) than verb-final (7.6), even in Old English. With respect to the pronominal relativization strategy, we observe that relative clauses are mostly verb-non-final, irrespective of the type, but this tendency is more marked when they are non-restrictive (14.5 vs. 5.2) than when they are restrictive (5.6 vs. 3.2).

¹⁰ Huddleston (1984: 264) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1058), for instance, consider that restrictive relative clauses hold a relation of modification with respect to its antecedent, the typical relation held by an adjective, as opposed to non-restrictive relative clauses, which are more loosely affecting the antecedent and rather behave as appositions, or as peripheral dependents.

In early Middle English, the correlation shown above is expected not to be so clear because of the gradual tendency of English language towards VO. The results of the correlation between type of relative clause, relativizer and word order are shown in Table 5.

		RRC	NRRC	TOTAL
Invariable	Non-final	544 (71.8)	166 (21.9)	710 (93.7)
	Final	352 (46.4)	28 (3.7)	380 (50.1)
	TOTAL	896	194	1090
Pronominal	Non-final	14 (1.8)	23 (3.0)	37 (4.9)
	Final	10 (1.3)	5 (.6)	15 (2.0)
	TOTAL	24	28	52
TOTAL		920	222	1142

Table 5: Distribution of types of relative clause according to word order in early Middle English (normalized frequencies per 10,000 words)

The results from Table 5 show that verb-non-final word order is mostly used (confirming the drift towards VO towards which English was developing). In spite of this dominant tendency to VO, the correlation observed in late Old English between word order and type of relative clause is still kept in early Middle English, especially regarding the invariable relativization strategy, the only frequent one in both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses. Invariable relativizers favour verb-non-final relative clauses; however, this tendency is more marked in non-restrictive relative clauses, with most examples showing verb-non-final, than in restrictive relative ones, where more than half of the tokens show verb-final word order. A similar distribution is observed in the isolated tokens of pronominal relativizers of early Middle English. They favour verb-non-final relative clauses, but more clearly when these are of the non-restrictive type.

5. CONCLUSION

We can conclude therefore that relativization strategies are indeed sensitive to word order patterns; however, they are more sensitive if word order patterns are classified according to type of relative clause, whether restrictive or non-restrictive. From the results above, a correlation can be posed involving the relativization strategy, the word order of the relative clause and the type of relative clause. This leads us to the following two conclusions:

- Restrictive relative clauses tend to show verb-final word order, and this increases if the relative clauses are introduced by an invariant relativizer.
- Non-restrictive relative clauses favour verb-non-final word order, and this is more marked if the relative clauses are introduced by a pronominal relativizer.

With these conclusions we can update the traditional correlation established between word order and status of the clause, whereby main clauses show a tendency to verb-second word order and subordinate clauses a tendency to verb-final word order. With respect to relative clauses, inherent factors to relativization turn out of utmost importance, factors such as the relativizer and, even more importantly, the type of relative clause. We have shown how the distinction restrictive and non-restrictive relative clause determines the word order, a correlation further enhanced by the relativization strategy used to introduce the relative clause.

REFERENCES

- Bean, Marian C. (1983). *The Developments of Word order Patterns in Old English*. London and Canberra: Croom Helm.
- Bernárdez, Enrique and Paloma Tejada (1995). Pragmatic constraints to word-order, and word order change in English. In Jucker, Andreas H., ed., *Historical Pragmatics. Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 217-241.
- Biber, Douglas (1988). *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Dekeyser, Xabier (1986). Relative markers in the *Peterborough Chronicle*: 1070-1154 or linguistic change exemplified. *Folia Linguistica Historica* VII: 93-105.
- Denison, David (1993). *English Historical Syntax*. London: Longman.
- Dowsing, Anita (1979). Some syntactic structures relating to the use of relative and demonstrative *þæt* and *se* in late Old English prose. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* XCIII: 163-183.
- Downing, Angela and Phillip Locke (2006). *A University Course in English Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Fischer, Olga (1992). Syntax. In Blake, Norman F., ed., *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. 2: 1066-1476. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman and Wim van der Wurff (2000). *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Huddleston, Rodney (1984). *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1987). *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kivimaa, Kirsti (1966). *þe* and *þat* as clause connectives in early Middle English with special consideration of the emergence of the pleonastic *þæt*. *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 39/1: 1-271.
- Kytö, Merja (1996). *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. Accessed December 10, 2007 from <http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/HC/INDEX.HTM>.
- Lehmann, Christian (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). *Clause Combining and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 181-225.

- McIntosh, Angus (1947-1948). The relative pronouns *þe* and *þat* in early Middle English. *English and Germanic Studies* 1: 73-87.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1985). *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1988). Syntax and word-order in the *Peterborough Chronicle* 1122-1154. In Mitchell, Bruce (ed.). *On Old English. Selected Papers*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 221-242.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1995). Variation and change in Old English class structure. *Language Variation and Change* 7: 229-260.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey K. Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Romaine, Suzanne (1982). *Socio-historical Linguistics. Its Status and Methodology*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Romaine, Suzanne (1988). *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.
- Suárez-Gómez, Cristina (2002). Towards a definition of relative constructions in Old English. In Falces Sierra, Marta, Díaz Dueñas, Mercedes and Pérez Fernández, José María, eds., *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference of the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies (AEDEAN), Granada, 13-15 December 2001*. Granada: Universidad de Granada. [CD-ROM]
- Suárez-Gómez, Cristina (2004). *Relativization in Early English (With Special Reference to the Distribution of Relativizers and the Position of Relative Clauses)*. Servizo de Publicacións e Intercambio Lingüístico. University of Santiago de Compostela. [CD-ROM]
- Tejada Caller, Paloma (1991). Diachronic considerations on English relative clauses: semantic and structural evolution. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 22-23: 145-164.
- Trask, Robert L. (1996). *Historical Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1992). Syntax. In Hogg, Richard (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. 1. Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: C.U.P.: 168-289.