

Stockholm University
Department of English

Relative Clause Formation in King Alfred's Translation
of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*

Shawn Duff

Degree Project

Linguistics

HT 2007

Supervisor: Nils-Lennart Johannesson

Abstract

Relative Clause Formation in King Alfred's Translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*.

Shawn Duff

Supervisor: Nils-Lennart Johannesson

In this paper, relative clauses in King Alfred's Old English translation of Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care* were examined using relative frequency as a tool to determine whether or not certain factors influenced the choice of relativization strategy. These factors include antecedent case, antecedent gender, antecedent number, distance, animacy, noun phrase type, case of relativized NP, and syntactic function.

The method involved gathering together all the occurrences of relative clauses using the Old English corpus and a Modern English translation. This process was not unproblematic as the correct translation from Old English to modern English sometimes was left to the discretion of the translator. Some clauses that were initially thought to be relative clauses were, in fact, not relative clauses. The components of each of the clauses were then examined and categorized after any problematic examples were discarded. Relative frequencies for each of the categories were calculated and chi-square tests were performed to check the reliability of the results.

The results of this paper were compared to another paper which did somewhat similar research to determine if the findings were consistent although that paper did not look at as many factors as this paper.

Key words: relativization strategy, relative clause, relative frequency, Old English.

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Material.....	2
2.1.	Primary Material	2
2.2	Secondary Material	2
3.	Previous Research.....	3
4.	Method	3
5.	Results	8
5.1	Relativizer Strategy	8
5.2	Antecedent Gender.....	10
5.3	Distance.....	11
5.4	Antecedent Number.....	12
5.5	Antecedent Case.....	13
5.6	Animacy	15
5.7	Noun Phrase Type	16
5.8	Syntactic Function of the Relativized NP	17
5.9	Case of Relativized NP	19
6.	Conclusion	20

1. Introduction

The information that is currently available concerning relative clause formation in Old English does not take into account relative frequencies or any contextual features that may favour a particular relative strategy. By examining the frequencies of particular relativization strategies, we may better understand whether certain relative clause constructions are constrained to a given strategy and what factors influence their use. We may also find that features found in a particular type of relative clause prevent it from being widely employed and that it is dependent upon a particular environment, i.e. other features must be present either at the sentence level or at the clause level.

The corpus used for this study, King Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care*, is a significant text because of its influence on the language at the time of its translation by King Alfred, so it might be best to provide a brief background into that period. Born in Wantage, Berkshire, in 849, King Alfred was the fifth and youngest son of Aethelwulf, then king of the West Saxons. He was born into a land ravaged by persistent Danish Viking raids which had begun in 793. By the time Alfred was crowned King of Wessex in 871, he had already become leader of the resistance forces against the Danes. Realizing that he could not push the Danes out of England, he decided to enter into a peace treaty with them. As a result of this treaty (along with another which saw the creation of the Danelaw), Alfred was then able to focus on other matters (Royal Household, 2007: 25).

King Alfred had learnt Latin in his thirties and was concerned about the deterioration in learning and religion as a result of the Vikings' destruction of monasteries. He felt that Latin's decline would weaken the use of the charter as an instrument to convey the instructions of the king and his legislation. Alfred attempted to improve literacy by arranging, and taking part in, translations of a number of books from Latin into Anglo-Saxon. Among these was a book by Gregory the Great entitled *Cura Pastoralis*, a handbook for bishops which was sent to all the bishops in the kingdom. It was Alfred's view that the Viking invasions were a punishment from God for the general decay of English learning, church life and morality in England at the time. Alfred thought that an educated populace was a fortified populace and therefore strived to educate his people and improve their religious lives. The establishment of a court school provided his children and those of noblemen and others of lesser birth the

chance to become literate (Guthrie, 2002).

2. Material

2.1. Primary Material

The primary material used for this essay is the *Pastoral Care* as translated by King Alfred. It was obtained from the Toronto Corpus (2004) and is a fifty-seven page Microsoft Word document spanning the first 227 pages (approx. 30 000 words) of the *Pastoral Care*. The corpus was not tagged, and therefore it was necessary to manually examine the plain text file. A program (Highlight) was used to mark all the forms that could be potential beginnings of relative clauses as well as any instance of *se* in the demonstrative form. Highlight proved to be a very useful program but it was not without its faults. In one case, it could not read the antecedent located within brackets and omitted it from the corpus document altogether. Only after close examination of the text from the book was this error found and corrected. It also was not capable of finding only the relativizers needed for this study but could instead only mark all the forms being searched for whether they were relevant or not. This produced a lot of garbage that needed to be sifted through manually.

2.2 Secondary Material

In order to analyze the corpus and determine which of the markings indicated the beginning of a relative clause and which could be excluded from further study, I used a version of King Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care* in book form, with a modern English translation by Sweet (1958). There were two versions of Old English found in the book which are different working copies of King Alfred's original Old English version and the corpus was based on MS Hatton's version so it was this version that was used during the process of finding all the relative clauses and comparing the Modern English translation to the Old English text. Other materials used in the analysis include a program which was used to perform chi-square calculations and Johannesson's compendium (Johannesson, 2007), which proved to

be an invaluable source for discerning between the three relativization strategies used when analyzing relative clauses. Baker's introductory book on Old English (Baker, 2007) was also helpful during the process of learning the relevant number/case/gender for each example and the glossary proved to be very useful for this purpose. Other useful resources included Pollington's Old English dictionary (2004), while historical information on King Alfred was obtained from the website of the Royal Family (Royal Household, 2007).

3. Previous Research

Mitchell (1963) states that syntacticians have not been able to find any sort of system that would explain choosing one of the three relativization strategies over the others, then goes on to explain that, even though there are discernible patterns that can be seen within each strategy, they are not rules which can be used to explain the choices made for each strategy (p. 313). Sundquist (2002) looks at relative clause variation in *Beowulf* and tries to prove that *Beowulf* was written by a single author as opposed to multiple authors as others have postulated. While Sundquist's paper is focused on poetry, it still provides insights into relative clause variation and frequency since the paper is a quantitative analysis using both the chi-square and VARBRUL tests. Note that Sundquist only performs these tests using distance of the antecedent, relative strategy frequency and antecedent type as variables and so is quite limited in its scope.

4. Method

The method of investigation for this essay began with general research into an understanding of the qualities of relative clauses both in Modern English and in Old English. The *Stæfcræft* compendium proved most valuable at this stage. Since this study was confined to the text of King Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care* and its relevant translation, it was first necessary to find all instances of relative clauses in the translation and then find the same clauses within the Old English text. Examples of nominal relative clauses introduced by a demonstrative pronoun *ðæt* and having no

antecedent or introduced by *swā hwā swā* or *swā hwæt swā* were not included in the study. In the end, 190 examples were found; however, four examples were later dismissed as either being demonstrative forms or felicitously made into a relative clause by the translator.

After collecting all the examples, the study moved into the process of categorization. This is done “to determine the relative frequency of variant expressions, or simply variants – phonological, morphological, or syntactic – in a text corpus or in the speech of an individual informant or a group of informants” (Johannesson, 1988:56). In order to properly categorize the variants, it was necessary to determine the independent and dependent variables. There are three strategies used when identifying relative clauses and each strategy used a different form of relativizer. These three strategies are the dependent variables in the study, while the independent variables are those that change depending on what we are looking for.

Note that this study only looked at relative clauses in a text by one author; it cannot be said to be representative of all authors in Old English. However, it does allow us to check the author’s consistency when using relative clauses in one of the three strategies shown below. Also note that the names given to each of these strategies are taken from the *Stæfcræft* compendium (Johannesson, 2007: 66-71).

The first strategy is called the boundary marking strategy and the relativizer used in this strategy is the particle *ðe* which always marks the beginning of the relative clause and is not inflected. The relativizer *ðe* is used like Modern English *that* and within the relative clause there will be a gap where the relativized NP has been omitted. In (1) below, the antecedent is marked by double underlining and a triangle is used to mark the omitted direct object which is shown in subscript.

Note that the Modern English translations used in the examples were all taken from Sweet (1958) and the Old English is taken from the corpus. The reference numbers shown at the end of each example refer to the name of the text *Cura Pastoralis* followed by chapter, page, and line numbers.

- (1) ða idelnesse [ðe he of aceorfan sceolde Δ_{DO} .]RelCl. ‘...the frivolity which he ought to prune away.’ CP 15.93.18

There were four problematic examples within the boundary marking strategy which should be looked at a little closer:

- (2) Bi ðæm anwalde, [ðe we sculon ure unðeawas [mid Δ_{NP}]_{PP} ofercuman, ...]_{RelCl}.
 ‘As to the power with which we can correct our vices, ...’ **CP** 14.85.19
- (3) Done ealdordom & ðæt riceter [ðe se reccere for monigra monna ðearfe underfehð Δ_{DO} ...]_{RelCl}. ‘The authority and the power which the ruler receives for the benefit of many...’ **CP** 17.119.6
- (4) ...geseoh ða hearsælða & ða sconde [ðe ðas her doð Δ_{DO}]_{RelCl}. ‘...see the wickedness and abominations which they do here.’ **CP** 21.155.7
- (5) ...geseoh ða scande & ða wierrestan ðing [ðe ðas menn her doð Δ_{DO}]_{RelCl}.
 ‘...see the shame and most wicked things which the men here do.’ **CP** 21.153.18

In example (2), the antecedent has a neuter *ðæm* as well as a neuter *anwalde*. Since the genders for both are the same, the antecedent was marked neuter. The next three examples have double objects separated by an ampersand. In (4), the gender of both objects is feminine so the entire NP was marked feminine. However, in (3) the objects have both masculine and neuter genders respectively and in (5) the objects have both feminine and neuter genders respectively. In these two cases, the decision was made to use the gender of the object closest to the relativizer since it should logically be the word most likely to influence the choice of relativization strategy.

The second strategy is the case marking strategy and a form of the distal demonstrative pronoun *se* is used as a relative pronoun. The use of *se* is, in many ways, similar to that of *wh*-pronouns in Modern English.

- (6) ...se lareow, [[se]_i [t_i]_S bið saule læce, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...the teacher, who is the soul's physician, ...’ **CF** 17.123.20

In this strategy, the relative pronoun's case is determined by the syntactic function of the relativized NP resulting in nominative case for subjects, accusative case for direct objects (or some other oblique case depending upon the verb that is used) and dative case for indirect objects. In (6) above, *se* is the subject of the relative clause and therefore the relativized pronoun is in the nominative case.

The final strategy is the combination strategy and it also uses a form of the distal demonstrative pronoun *se* but the pronoun is combined with the particle *ðe*. An example of this strategy is shown in (7) below.

- (7) Se ðonne [[se ðe]_i [t_i]_S fundige wislice to sprecanne, ...]_{RelCl}. 'He therefore who hastens to speak wisely, ...' CP 15.93.23

The case of *se ðe* in the example is determined by the function of the relativized element and also agrees with the case of the antecedent. This is not always the case since there are examples where there is no case agreement with the antecedent. In (8), the case of the antecedent is accusative while the case of the relativized NP is nominative.

- (8) ...settað ða to domerum, ðæt hie strienen & stihtien ymb ða eorðlican ðing, [[ða ðe]_i [t_i]_S ne beoð sua suiðe geweorðode mid ðæm gæstlicum giefum.]_{RelCl}. '...appoint them judges, that they may rule and arrange about earthly things who are not so greatly honoured with divine gifts.' CP 18.131.5

There are also examples where the form of *se* is combined with a form of the predeterminer *ealle*. *De* alone is the relativizer. These examples are included in the boundary marking strategy and an example of this type can be seen in (9) below.

- (9) ... ealle ða [ðe Δ_S for oðrum beon sculon,]_{RelCl} ...all those who are to be above others...' CP 18.139.22

When doing a modern variation analysis, it is important to recognize that

“...linguistic variation is never completely free, or random, but rather probabilistic. A number of factors, intralinguistic as well as extralinguistic, will affect the probability that a particular variant will be used in a given situation. One branch of variation analysis aims at determining the precise degree of influence of different influencing factors and, on the basis of these data, predicting the probability, for a given combination of influencing factors, that a particular variant will be chosen” (Johannesson, 1990:69).

The analysis becomes more difficult as we take into consideration more and more influencing factors. However, even a small number of factors that can influence may give insights into a particular variable's use. This idea of linguistic variation being probabilistic was kept in mind when doing the analysis of the data, and it was because of this that a few examples of what were initially thought to be relative clauses were omitted from the results. Three examples which were initially thought to be relative clauses were falsely identified as a result of the translator's interpretation. The translation clearly indicated a relative clause but the corpus revealed that there was no relativizer present to indicate that it truly was a relative clause. In the only other example that was falsely identified the example was, in fact, a nominal relative clause which we are not concerned with in this essay. We did not look at the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses either since a number of examples would have been indeterminable.

Each example found in the corpus was then analyzed by locating the exact antecedent, the relativizer and the precise relative clause. All of the full relative clauses with antecedents (as well as any pertinent information found before, between or after the clause or antecedent) were put into an Excel spreadsheet and a personal reference number as well as the reference number from the corpus was placed beside each example. The antecedents were then subjected to further categorization where the case, gender and number of the antecedent were identified. The case of the antecedent was determined to be nominative, accusative, dative or genitive. The gender of the antecedent could be masculine, feminine, or neuter but the antecedent could also be a plural pronoun not having a specific gender. The number of the antecedent was marked either singular or plural. Finally, the antecedent was

determined as being either animate or inanimate.

The relative clause was also subjected to further categorization where type of noun phrase, case of the relativized noun phrase, syntactic function, and relativization strategy were determined. The type of noun phrase was indicated as being a noun, pronoun, adjective or zeroed. The case of the relativized noun phrase could be indicated as being nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, or instrumental. Syntactic function divided the examples depending on whether they were subject, object, determiner in a noun phrase, or complement in a prepositional phrase.

A category called distance was established and used to show whether the antecedent was placed directly before the relative clause or if there were other constituents placed between the antecedent and the relative clause. A final table was made which showed the relativization strategy based on the three different strategies (boundary marking, case marking and combination) mentioned earlier. In the results, this is the first table that will be presented as it gives an overall picture of the variation between the relativization strategies.

The next stage in categorizing the results from the corpus involved finding the relative frequency of each of the relative strategies in conjunction with the various factors that influence these strategies. Relative frequency is determined by relating the number of occurrences of the variant to the number of occurrences of the variable being examined.

The final stage in compiling the results involved finding the chi-square value for each of the tables. The numbers used for the chi-square contingency table test are taken from totals for number of occurrences and not the relative frequency percentages found in each table.

5. Results

5.1 Relativizer Strategy

Before we begin to look at the results of the tables having both dependent and independent variables, a quick examination of the table showing number of

occurrences and relative frequency of examples based on the three relativization strategies should be mentioned.

Note that because of the low number of occurrences within the case marking strategy, the rest of the presented tables will be revised to include the two occurrences of case marking strategy within the totals for the combination strategy. This is done because both *se* and *se ðe* can be marked for case. It also allows for more reliable chi-square value test results since the values entered into the test will be high enough for us to accept the test results. The two occurrences of case marking strategy that we have incorporated into the totals for the combination strategy are shown below as examples (10) and (11).

(10) ...se lareow, [se bið saule læce, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...the teacher, who is the soul’s physician, ...’ CP 17.123.20

(11) Se ðonne [se bið healede]_{RelCl}. he ne mæg mid weorce begean ða scondlicnesse, ... ‘He who is afflicted with hydrocele cannot carry out his shameful desires, ...’ CP 11.73.3

Relativization Strategy							
	ðe		se		se ðe		Σ
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Corpus	146	79	2	1	38	20	186
Σ	146		2		38		186

Table 1:1 Relative frequencies of the relativization strategies.

The table in figure 1:1 simply shows that, of the three different relativization strategies, 146 examples used the boundary marking strategy with *ðe* as the relativizer and this represented 79% of the total examples found. Only 2 examples of the case marking strategy were found, representing 1% of the total while the combination strategy was used 38 times and represented 20% of the total. It would, therefore, be perfectly reasonable to say that the boundary marking strategy is, by far, the most

frequently used strategy when constructing a relative clause. These numbers also agree with the results given by Sundquist (2002) where he found that Type 1 (boundary marking strategy) clauses had a high relative frequency in all the other texts which he compared to *Beowulf* but not *Beowulf* itself.

5.2 Antecedent Gender

Antecedent gender is the next table examined and it will hopefully give a clearer picture into distribution of gender within the three marking strategies. The examples from the case marking strategy have been incorporated into the combination strategy totals as mentioned earlier. There are 42 examples like (15) in which the antecedent was the plural demonstrative pronoun *ða*, which cannot be marked for gender. These examples were excluded from the analysis on the influence of antecedent gender. The following are examples for each antecedent gender as well as one example of a plural pronoun. Example (12) shows a feminine antecedent while example (13) shows a masculine antecedent and example (14) shows a neuter antecedent.

- (12) ...Godes heorde [ðe Δ_S under eow is.]_{RelCl}. ‘...God's flock which is under your care.’ CP 18.137.15 (feminine)
- (13) ...se sweta mete [ðe hie heton Δ_{DO} monna,]_{RelCl}... ‘...the sweet food which they called manna, ...’ CP 17.125.17 (masculine)
- (14) ...ða godcundan wisan [ðe he læran Δ_{DO} scolde.]_{RelCl}. ‘...the divine things which he ought to teach.’ CP 18.129.2 (Neuter)
- (15) ...ða [ðe Δ_S him wiðstandan wiellen.]_{RelCl}. ‘...those who oppose him.’ CP 15.91.14 (Plural Pronoun)

	Antecedent Gender				Σ
	Ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Masculine	70	67	34	33	104
Feminine	21	100	0	0	21
Neuter	13	100	0	0	13
Plural Pro.	42	87.5	6	12.5	48
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:2. The distribution of the relativisation strategies over gender of antecedent.

In Table 1:2, Masculine gender favours the combination strategy (33%) more than feminine and neuter gender. The relative frequency of the boundary marking strategy after a masculine antecedent is clearly lower than after the other genders or plural pronouns. Therefore, feminine and neuter genders can be said to favour the boundary marking strategy. Since feminines and neuters both yield the same results, they can be conflated in order to perform the chi-square contingency table test. Plural pronouns are also excluded from the test so the results give a chi-square value of 14.749 which is above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. This result means that gender of the antecedent influences the choice of relativization strategy.

5.3 Distance

The next table to be examined shows whether or not there is distance between the antecedent and the relativizer respective of the strategy used. An example of distance is shown in (16) while an example showing no distance is shown in (17).

- (16) Se [ðe ænigne ðissa ierminga besuicð ...]_{RelCl}. ‘He who deceives one of the little ones ...’ CP 2.31.14

- (17) Se bið eallenga healt [se ðe wat hwider he gaan sceal ...]_{RelCl}. ‘He is altogether lame who knows whither he ought to go ...’ CP 11.65.12

	Distance				Σ
	Ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
No distance	114	84	21	16	135
Distance	32	63	19	37	51
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:3. The distribution of the relativization strategies over distance.

Occurrences where the antecedent and the relativizer occur together favour the boundary marking strategy where the relative frequency accounts for 84% of all the examples where there is no distance. When there is distance between the antecedent and the relativizer, it appears to favour the case/combination strategy with a relative frequency of 37%.

The chi-square contingency table test allows us to reject the null hypothesis since the value (10.325) is above the critical value (7.88) for one degree of freedom and the significance value of .005. This means that we can, in fact, state that the difference in frequency is significant and that distance influences the choice of strategy. If there is no distance, then the boundary marking strategy is preferred while the combination/case marking strategy is favoured when there is distance between the antecedent and the relativizer.

5.4 Antecedent Number

An example of a singular antecedent in the combination strategy is shown in (18) while an example of a plural antecedent in the boundary marking strategy can be seen in example (19).

(18) ...se [[se ðe: [t_i]_S ðone sacerdhad onfehð, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...he who undertakes the priesthood,’ CP 15.91.20 (Singular)

(19) ...ða [ðe Δ_S him underðiedde bioð, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...those who are under him, ...’ CP 4.39.6 (Plural)

	Antecedent Number				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Singular	75	69	34	31	109
Plural	71	92	6	8	77
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:4. The distribution of the relativization strategies over number of antecedent.

In Table 1:4 above, singular antecedents favour the combination strategy where the relative frequency is four times greater, at 31%, than that of plural antecedents with only 8%. Plural antecedents favour the boundary marking strategy where the relative frequency is 92%.

A chi-square contingency table test resulted in a chi-square value of 14.637. This value is above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. We can reject the null hypothesis for antecedent number and state that the difference in frequency is significant. Antecedent number, therefore, influences the choice of relativization strategy.

5.5 Antecedent Case

In the examples below, (20) has a nominative antecedent within the combination strategy. Example (21) has an antecedent marked in the accusative case within the boundary marking strategy while (22) and (23) have genitive or dative antecedents respectively and are both within the boundary marking strategy.

- (20) ...se ðafetere, [se ðe wile forgiefan ðæt he wrecan sceolde, ...]_{RelCl.} ‘...the assentator, who is ready to pass over what he ought to punish, ...’ **CP** 20.149.21 (Nominative)
- (21) ...& unwise geiecð ða idelnesse [ðe he of aceorfan sceolde.]_{RelCl.} ‘... and foolishly increasing the frivolity which he ought to prune away.’ **CP** 15.93.18 (Accusative)
- (22) Ac gif he geðencð ðone ege ðæs deman [ðe ofer eall sitt, ...]_{RelCl.} ‘And if he consider the terror of the Judge who sits over all, ...’ **CP** 13.79.14 (Genitive)
- (23) Ðonne [he] oferstæle[d] bið, & him gereah bið ðæt he oðrum mæg nytt bion on ðam [ðe him mon ðonne bebeodeð, ...]_{RelCl.} ‘When he is exalted and appointed that he may be useful to others in the post which is offered him, ...’ **CP** 6.47.16 (Dative)

	Antecedent Case				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Nominative	67	64	37	36	104
Accusative	37	97	1	3	38
Genitive	16	100	0	0	16
Dative	26	93	2	7	28
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:5. The distribution of the relative strategies over case of antecedent.

The table showing case of the antecedent shows that the nominative case favours the case marking/composition strategy with a relative frequency of 36%. On the other hand, occurrences marked in the accusative, genitive and dative cases favoured the boundary marking strategy with relative frequencies at 97%, 100% and

93% respectively. In order to perform the chi-square contingency table test, it was necessary to conflate the oblique cases (non-nominatives) and compare them with nominatives. This is done because the oblique cases behave in much the same way. The results of the test then give us a chi-square value of 27.671. This is well above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. Therefore, antecedent case influences the choice of relativization strategy.

5.6 Animacy

In most cases, the decision concerning what is and what is not animate is straightforward; however, there was one example where the decision proved difficult. That example is shown in (24). In this example, the brother is dead so he is not really animate. However, since he is a person that is normally animate, it was decided that the antecedent was, in fact, animate. Example (25) shows an animate antecedent within the case/composition strategies while (26) shows an inanimate antecedent within the boundary marking strategy.

(24) ...ðam gefarenan breðer [ðe Δ_S hie ær ahte.]_{RelCl}. ‘...the dead brother who formerly had her.’ **CP** 5.43.13

(25) ...se Dema [se ðe ðæt inngedone eall wát,]_{RelCl}. ‘...the Judge, who knows all the thoughts of the mind,’ **CP** 4.39.10

(26) ...ðone dom [ðe ðæræfter fylgð;]_{RelCl}. ‘the judgement which follows;’ **CP** 19.145.7

	Animacy				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Animate	105	72	40	28	145
Inanimate	41	100	0	0	41
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:6. The distribution of the relativization strategies over animacy.

Animacy is used to show if the antecedent is animate or not animate. The table shows that those antecedents that are animate favour the case marking/combination strategy with a relative frequency of 28% while those antecedents that are inanimate clearly favour the boundary marking strategy with a relative frequency of 100%. Inanimate antecedents favour the boundary marking strategy which appears to be a knockout.

The chi-square value contingency table test results show that the chi-square value of 14.409 is above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. We can, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and state that the difference in frequency is significant.

5.7 Noun Phrase Type

An example of the combination strategy used after a pronoun is shown in (27) while (28) shows an example of the boundary marking strategy after a noun.

(27) ...se [se ðe swele ne sie, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...he who is not fit, ...’ CP 9.59.7

(28) ...ðam menn [ðe bið abisgod on færelde mid oðrum cierrum, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...the man who is occupied on a journey with other affairs, ...’ CP 4.37.21

	NP Type				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Noun	76	88	10	12	86
Pronoun	70	70	30	30	100
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:7. The distribution of the relativization strategies over noun phrase type.

Before looking at the results in the table for noun phrase type, it should be noted that six zeroed noun phrase occurrences were incorporated into the noun category in order to accurately perform the chi-square test. The table shows that, when the noun phrase type is a noun, they favour the boundary marking strategy with a relative frequency of 88%. Pronouns, on the other hand, favour the case marking/combination strategy with a relative frequency of 30%.

The chi-square contingency table test results in a chi-square value of 9.245 which is above the critical value of 7.88 with one degree of freedom and a significance value of .005. We can thus state that the difference in frequency is significant and that noun phrase type influences the choice of relativization strategy.

5.8 Syntactic Function of the Relativized NP

Four examples are shown below which illustrate each of the four syntactic functions within the strategies they favour:

- (29) Se ðonne [[se ðe]_i [t_i] fundige wislice to sprecanne, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘He therefore who hastens to speak wisely, ...’ **CP** 15.93.23 (Subject)
- (30) ...ða scylde [ðe he stieran scolde Δ_{DO}, ...]_{RelCl}. ‘...the sin which he had to punish, ...’ **CP** 17.117.5 (Object)

(31) ...ðæs [ðe he bið gesewen [Δ_{det} ðeow]_{NP} on his ðenunge.]_{RelCl.} ‘...him whose servant he is seen to be in his ministraton.’ **CP** 19.147.15 (Determiner in NP)

(32) ...ðone pytt [ðe he [on Δ_{NP}]_{PP} aworpen wearð, ...]_{RelCl.} ‘...the abyss into which he was cast, ...’ **CP** 17.111.22 (Complement in PP)

	Syntactic Function of the Relativized NP				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Subject	103	72	40	28	143
Object	36	100	0	0	36
Comp. In PP	6	100	0	0	6
Det. In NP	1	100	0	0	1
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:8. The distribution of the relativization strategies over syntactic function of the relativized noun phrase.

In the table for syntactic function, the case marking/combination strategy is favoured by those clauses where the syntactic function is that of a subject. The relative frequency for subjects favouring the case marking/combination strategy is 28%. Objects, complements in a prepositional phrase and determiners in a noun phrase all favour the boundary marking strategy with relative frequencies for each type at 100%.

The chi-square contingency table test is done by conflating the objects, complements in a prepositional phrase and determiners in a noun phrase and comparing them to the subjects. This gives a chi-square value of 15.323 which is above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. Syntactic function of the relativized noun phrase is, therefore, an influence on the choice of relativization strategy.

5.9 Case of Relativized NP

An example from each of the noun phrase case types within the strategy each favours is give below:

- (33) Se ðonne [[se ðe]_i [t_i]_S sua higað ealneweg to andweardnesse his scippendes, ...]_{RelCl.} ‘He therefore who is continually striving to attain to the presence of his Creator, ...’ **CP 14.87.10** (Nominative)
- (34) ...ða twegen witgan [ðe God wolde sendan Δ_{DO} to læra(n)ne.]_{RelCl.} ‘...the two prophets whom God wished to send to teach.’ **CP 7.49.1** (Accusative)
- (35) ...ðæs onlicnesse [ðe awriten is ...]_{RelCl.} ‘...to him of whom it is written...’ **CP 17.111.20** (Dative)
- (36) ...ðæs [ðe he bið gesewen [Δ_{det} ðeow]_{NP} on his ðenunge.]_{RelCl.} ‘...him whose servant he is seen to be in his ministraton.’ **CP 19.147.15** (Genitive)
- (37) ...ðam witum [ðe he hit suiðe hrædlice wræc.]_{RelCl.} ‘...the punishments with which he very quickly punished it.’ **CP 4.39.18**

	Case of Relativized NP				Σ
	ðe		se ðe		
	N	%	N	%	
Nominative	103	72	40	28	143
Accusative	35	100	0	0	35
Dative	6	100	0	0	6
Genitive	1	100	0	0	1
Instrumental	1	100	0	0	1
Σ	146		40		186

Table 1:9. The distribution of the relativization strategies over case of the relativized NP.

When the case of the noun phrase is nominative, it favours the case marking/combination strategy with a relative frequency of 28%. All the other cases (accusative, dative, genitive and instrumental) favour the boundary marking strategy with relative frequencies of 100% given as a result for each type.

The chi-square contingency table test is performed by conflating the obliques (accusatives, datives, genitives, and instrumentals) and comparing them to nominatives. The results give a chi-square value of 15.323 which is above the critical value of 10.8 for one degree of freedom and a significance value of .001. It can therefore be stated that the case of the relativized noun phrase influences the choice of relativization strategy.

6. Conclusion

The goals of this essay were to evaluate the relative frequencies and characteristics of relative clauses found in King Alfred's translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* and to investigate which factors in the context influence the choice between the relativization strategies. The results show that, in most cases, the case marking/combination strategies are favoured by pronoun antecedents, are masculine in gender, and are animate as well as distant from the relativizer. They are also singular in number. The relativized NPs, in these occurrences, are generally nominative in case and are subjects. The boundary marking strategy is favoured, for the most part, by relative clauses having noun antecedents with genders other than masculine (feminine or neuter) or by plural pronouns, have no distance from the relativizer, are plural, and are not animate. Their relativized NPs also function syntactically as an object, determiner in a noun phrase or complement in a prepositional phrase while the case of their noun phrases are, for the most part, accusative, dative, genitive or instrumental.

When these results are compared to those of Sundquist (2002), it can be shown that there is agreement between the findings in this paper and of Sundquist's paper. Sundquist's findings indicate that *Beowulf* had a higher frequency of Type 3 (combination strategy) clauses than that found in the other Old English texts where, in each, the Type 1 (boundary marking strategy) clauses had the highest frequency. This

paper also found that the boundary marking strategy had the highest frequency. Furthermore, Sundquist found that the combination strategy occurrences most frequently showed distance between the relativizer and the antecedent which this paper substantiates. Because Sundquist categorizes noun phrase types differently in his paper, there was no comparison done between the results found here and his results.

More research needs to be done to determine whether or not the same results apply to other Old English texts. Sundquist's paper does substantiate some of the findings in this paper but only takes into account distance between the relativizer and the antecedent and noun phrase type.

References

Primary Sources

Toronto Corpus (2004). Retrieved September 27, 2007, from <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/index.html>

Sweet, H. *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, 2 vols., EETS 45, 50 London: reprinted. 1958.

Secondary Sources

Baker, Peter S. (2007). *Introduction to Old English* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Guthrie, Erich W. (2002). *King Alfred's literacy program 878-892*. Retrieved December 9, 2007 from <http://www.chass.toronto.edu/~cpercy/courses/1001Encyclopedia.htm>

Johannesson, Nils.-L. (1988). *English language essays: Investigation method and writing strategies*. (3rd ed.). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

—————. (2007). *Stæfcræft: An Introduction to Old English Syntax*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Mitchell, Bruce. (1963). *Adjective clauses in Old English poetry*. *Anglia*, 81. 298-322.

Pollington, Stephen. (2004). *Wordcraft: New English to Old English dictionary and thesaurus*. Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books.

Royal Household. *History of the Monarchs*. Retrieved December 15, 2007 from <http://www.royal.gov.uk/output/Page25.asp>

Sundquist, John D. (2002). *Relative clause variation and the unity of Beowulf*. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14 (3), 243–269.