

Studies on Old High German Syntax

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA)

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA) provides a platform for original monograph studies into synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Studies in LA confront empirical and theoretical problems as these are currently discussed in syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, and systematic pragmatics with the aim to establish robust empirical generalizations within a universalistic perspective.

General Editors

Werner Abraham
University of Vienna / Rijksuniversiteit
Groningen

Elly van Gelderen
Arizona State University

Advisory Editorial Board

Cedric Boeckx
Harvard University

Guglielmo Cinque
University of Venice

Günther Grewendorf
J.W. Goethe-University, Frankfurt

Liliane Haegeman
University of Lille, France

Hubert Haider
University of Salzburg

Christer Platzack
University of Lund

Ian Roberts
Cambridge University

Lisa deMena Travis
McGill University

Sten Vikner
University of Aarhus

C. Jan-Wouter Zwart
University of Groningen

Volume 112

Studies on Old High German Syntax. Left sentence periphery, verb placement and verb-second

Katrin Axel

Studies on Old High German Syntax

Left sentence periphery, verb placement
and verb-second

Katrin Axel
Saarland University

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Axel, Katrin.

Studies on Old High German syntax : left sentence periphery, verb placement and verb-second / Katrin Axel.

p. cm. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, ISSN 0166-0829 ; v. 112)

English version of the author's thesis (doctoral)--University of Tübingen, 2005.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. German language--Old High German, 750-1050--Syntax. 2. German language--Old High German, 750-1050--Sentences. 3. German language--Old High German, 750-1050--Verb. 4. German language--Old High German, 750-1050--Word order. I. Title.

PF3925.A94 2007

437'.01--dc22

2007035307

ISBN 978 90 272 3376 9 (hb : alk. paper)

© 2007 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IX
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	XI
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aims	1
1.2 On Old High German	2
1.3 A short overview of Old High German sentence grammar	4
1.4 Special features of Old High German sentence grammar	10
1.5 Outline of the investigation	14
1.6 The corpus	16
1.7 Data acquisition and citation modes	22
CHAPTER 2: VERB MOVEMENT	27
2.1 Introduction	27
2.2 Indo-European origins of verb fronting	27
2.3 Verb movement in the earliest Germanic languages	29
2.3.1 Particles and verb movement in Gothic	35
2.4 Verb movement in Old High German: Independent clauses	40
2.4.1 Verb movement in sentences with sentence particles	40
2.4.2 Verb movement in interrogatives, imperatives and negated sentences	52
2.4.3 Verb movement in declarative clauses	62
2.4.4 Conclusion	66
2.5 Independent declaratives without verb movement?	68
2.5.1 ‘Layout-driven’ verb-end placement	71
2.5.2 Verb-end and the problem of word-order ambiguity	72
2.5.3 Verb-end order in non-initial conjuncts?	77
2.5.4 Summary	79

2.6	Verb movement in Old High German: Dependent clauses	79
2.6.1	The right sentence periphery in Old High German	80
2.6.2	Verb movement to a medial I-position?	95
2.6.3	Short verb movement?	108
2.7	Summary	109

CHAPTER 3: VERB-FIRST DECLARATIVES

113

3.1	Introduction	113
3.2	Ways of filling the prefield	116
3.3	Verb-first order in the precursors of the <i>es</i> -verb-second clauses	120
3.4	Verb-first order and unaccusativity	124
3.4.1	Predicate classes	124
3.4.2	Subject extraposition	131
3.4.3	Expletive <i>pro</i> ?	135
3.5	Verb-first order in subjectless constructions	142
3.5.1	Quasi-argument and correlative <i>pro</i> ?	143
3.6	Verb-first order in the context of verbs of saying and negation	150
3.7	Verb-first order due to topic drop?	153
3.7.1	The topic-drop hypothesis	153
3.7.2	Extensions at the left sentence periphery of OHG verb-first declaratives	157
3.8	Pragmatic aspects of verb-first declaratives	161
3.8.1	Old High German verb-first declaratives and theme-rheme structure	162
3.8.2	Verb-first declaratives and narrativity	164
3.8.3	Verb-first order in sentences with particles	167
3.8.4	On the diachronic development of verb-first declaratives	170
3.9	Conclusion	171

CHAPTER 4: LEFT SENTENCE PERIPHERY AND XP-MOVEMENT

173

4.1	Introduction	173
4.2	Indo-European origins of topicalization and <i>wh</i> -movement	173
4.3	The structure of the left periphery in Germanic	178
4.3.1	The structure of the left periphery in Proto-Germanic	178
4.3.2	Left-peripheral particles and the fine-structure of the C-domain in Gothic	183
4.4	XP-fronting in Old High German	189
4.4.1	Operator movement	192

- 4.4.2 Stylistic Fronting 196
- 4.4.3 Conclusion 200
- 4.5 Verb-third constructions in Old High German 200
 - 4.5.1 Verb-third order after dislocated topics 203
 - 4.5.2 Verb-third order after two prefinite phrases that ‘form a unit’ 211
 - 4.5.3 Verb-third order with sentence adverbs 217
 - 4.5.4 Verb-third order with pronouns and short adverbs 222
 - 4.5.5 Summary 227
 - 4.5.6 Verb-third order with adverbial clauses 227
- 4.6 Summary 233

CHAPTER 5: PRONOUN PLACEMENT AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE**237**

- 5.1 Introduction 237
- 5.2 Personal pronouns at the left sentence periphery 239
 - 5.2.1 Syntactic distribution 239
 - 5.2.2 Analysis 249
- 5.3 Are there clitic pronouns in Old High German? 254
 - 5.3.1 Full and reduced forms 255
 - 5.3.2 Strong personal pronouns 262
 - 5.3.3 Sentence-initial personal pronouns 264
 - 5.3.4 Pronouns at the left periphery of the middle field 268
 - 5.3.5 Pronouns in the order XP–pron–V_{fin} 272
- 5.4 XP–pron–V_{fin} due to verb-end placement? 277
- 5.5 Pronoun distribution due to asymmetric verb movement? 279
 - 5.5.1 Kiparsky (1995, 1996) 279
 - 5.5.2 Kroch & Taylor (1997), Haeberli (1999a, 2000, 2001, 2002a) and Eythórsson (1995) 285
- 5.6 Summary 290

CHAPTER 6: NULL SUBJECTS AND VERB PLACEMENT**293**

- 6.1 Introduction 293
- 6.2 Overview of Old High German null-subject constructions 294
- 6.3 Non-canonical properties of OHG null subjects 299
- 6.4 Alternatives to the *pro*-drop analysis? 304
 - 6.4.1 Topic drop? 304

6.4.2	Loan syntax?	305	
6.5	Syntactic distribution of Old High German null subjects	307	
6.6	Morphological distribution of OHG null subjects	314	
6.7	The loan-syntax hypothesis revisited	319	
6.8	The loss of null subjects in Old High German	321	
6.9	Summary	326	
	SUMMARY		327
	REFERENCES		335
	INDEX		359

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is based upon my doctoral dissertation, completed at the University of Tübingen in May 2005, which was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft as part of the Collaborative Research Centre *Linguistic Data Structures*.

First and foremost I would like to express my profound intellectual and personal gratitude to Marga Reis. Little bits of her occur throughout these pages: her knowledge, for instance of the intricacies of German grammar; her interests, for example for historical syntax; but also her approach to research, above all, the insight that linguistic theorizing should build on a sound descriptive basis. I deeply appreciate her generous support, her encouragement to develop my own ideas, her human warmth and kindness. I owe her much.

I would also like to express my warm thanks to Veronika Ehrlich, who has accompanied me throughout my linguistic training with her kind advice and active support. She contributed immensely to the academically stimulating environment in which the work in this book took place.

I am grateful too to the other two members of my dissertation committee, Ulrike Demske and Wolfgang Sternefeld, for their interest in my work and their valuable comments. Thanks also for Ulrike's support since I have been at Saarland University.

The exciting research atmosphere at the Collaborative Research Centre *Linguistic Data Structures* in Tübingen was a social and intellectual pleasure and a spur to activity. I would like to thank my colleagues Sam Featherston, Nele Hartung-Schaidhammer, Daniel Holl, Reimar Müller, Dirk Wiebel and, in particular, Serge Doitchinov, who were always ready to join in enthralling discussions on both linguistic and non-linguistic topics.

Tanja Kiziak and Helmut Weiß deserve special thanks for their many helpful remarks on this book and for our fruitful exchanges.

I am indebted to the editors of this series, Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen, and to the managing editor Kees Vaes for their help in preparing the manuscript for publication. Special thanks are extended to Kirsten Brock for her thorough proof-reading.

I wish to thank my parents and family for their loving care over the years and last, but not least, Carsten for his patience, encouragement and love.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

AC	adverbial clause	PP	Prepositional Phrase
ACC	accusative case	PREFIX	prefix
ADJ	adjective	pres.	present
ADHORT	adhortative	PRET	preterite
Adj	Adjective Phrase	PREVERB	preverb
ADV/adv	adverb	<i>pro</i>	small <i>pro</i> (= null subject)
AdvP	Adverb Phrase	PRON	pronoun
AgrP	Agreement Phrase	quasi-arg. (R)	quasi-argument (al) translation taken from Robinson (1997)
arb/ARB	arbitrary interpretation	REFL	reflexive
ASP	aspect	REL	relative (clause, pronoun, particle)
C	complementizer	SG/sg.	singular
Comp	complementizer	SOV	subject object verb
CONJ	conjunctive	Spec	specifier
DAT	dative case	SU	non-pronominal subject
DEM	demonstrative	subj	subject
DP	Determiner Phrase	t	trace
DUAL	dual	Top	topic
FEM/fem.	feminine	TP	Tense Phrase
Fin	Finite, part of the CP	V	verb
Foc	focus	V _{fin}	finite verb
Force	illocutionary force	V _{infin}	infinite verb
GEN	genitive	VO	verb object
IP	Inflection Phrase	vP	small vP
IMP	imperative	VP	Verb Phrase
ind.	indicative	/	line break
INSTR	instrumental	\	half-verse division
INTERJ	interjection	{ }	material enclosed has been reconstructed (cf. Chapter 1)
LOC	locative	*	ungrammatical
MASC/masc.	masculine	#	unattested example
NEG	negation	&	'et'
NOM	nominative		
NTR/ntr.	neuter		
obj	object		
OHG	Old High German		
OV	object verb		
P	Phrase		
PARTCL	particle		
PL/pl.	plural		

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aims

This book is a historical investigation into various aspects of the syntax of the left sentence periphery in German. Its major aim is to investigate the origins of the verb-second property. Accordingly, it centres on the following three phenomena: the generalization of verb movement, the development of obligatory XP-fronting, and the establishment of the ‘linear’ verb-second restriction in the strict sense.

The language period which will be investigated is the oldest attested stage of the German language, i.e. the Old High German (OHG) period. As Otto Behaghel (1932:11) already claimed in his historical syntax of German, some essential aspects of the verb-second phenomenon were present in the earliest Germanic times. As a matter of fact, I will argue extensively in the present study that some crucial steps toward a verb-second grammar, such as the generalization of verb movement in root clauses, had already been taken in OHG.

Nevertheless, at least the earlier OHG texts display a number of syntactic phenomena which are not compatible with the standard notion of a verb-second grammar. For example, verb-third effects appear to be less restricted than in the modern Germanic verb-second languages. The same is true for verb-first placement in independent declarative clauses. Moreover, features such as the null-subject property and the residues of a system of sentence-typing left-peripheral sentence particles are not easily accommodated within current assumptions on verb-second. In the present investigation, I will systematically describe and analyse these special features of OHG syntax, which are all directly related to the problem of verb placement and to the structure of the left sentence periphery. My main objective is to gain a comprehensive picture of the OHG pre-verb-second syntax which takes into account a great number and a variety of parameters – including those that have been neglected or entirely ignored in the previous literature.

A further important aim of the present work is a more comparative one: to find out to what extent the situation in OHG is compatible with current diachronic models of the origins of verb movement and of XP-fronting in Germanic which have been developed based on investigations of other Old Germanic languages such as Gothic and Old English.¹

¹ Since the seminal investigation by Lenerz (1984) and the studies by Tomaselli (1995), Donhauser (1996) and Abraham (1997), there has hardly been any research on the syntax of OHG by theoretically oriented linguists. Besides the present study, this topic has also been taken up

1.2 On Old High German

OHG is the oldest attested period of the German language. More precisely, the term ‘OHG’ is used to refer to a group of dialects of the West Germanic branch of the Germanic family. The continuous written documentation of OHG sets off in the second half of the eighth century. The end of the OHG period is generally dated to the second half of the eleventh century. The linguistic criteria for this periodization are phonological (and not syntactic) ones: The main phonological difference between OHG and the West Germanic dialects from which it developed is that OHG was subject to the High German consonant shift or Second Sound Shift. This phonological change had its beginning before the period of the oldest High German monuments. It is generally held to have taken place very approximately between the sixth and seventh centuries. By the mid eleventh century a further sound change was practically completed: In unstressed syllables the various different vowels had mostly been reduced to schwa, a process that also affected the morphological system of inflectional endings.²

At this earliest attested stage of the German language, a standard or supra-regional variety had not yet evolved: Each text was written in a particular dialect or in a mixture of dialects. The OHG dialects are sometimes referred to as monastery dialects because their written documentation consists mainly of manuscripts from a few major ecclesiastical centres (bishoprics and monasteries). The major dialectal division in the OHG period was between Upper German and Middle German. Upper German mainly consisted of the Alemannic dialects (main monasteries: St. Gallen, Reichenau and Murbach) and the Bavarian dialects (Mondsee, Freising, Regensburg, Wessobrunn and many more). In OHG times, Middle German only comprised the Franconian

only recently in the project by Karin Donhauser and Roland Hinterhölzl on “The role of information structure for the development of word order regularities in Germanic” (staff: Svetlana Petrova and Michael Solf), which is part of the Collaborative Research Centre on Information Structure (SFB 632 University of Potsdam/Humboldt University in Berlin). I should also like to mention the dissertation by Agnes Jäger on the “History of German Negation” (Jäger 2006) as well as the diploma thesis by Oliver Schallert on OV/VO-order in OHG and other Old Germanic languages (Schallert 2006). Jürg Fleischer has worked on OHG pronoun syntax (Fleischer 2005) and Helmut Weiß on the right sentence periphery in OHG (Weiß to appear). Most of the results of these research activities were published after the completion of my dissertation (Axel 2005a), on which this book is based. This is why I have not always been able to add a full discussion of these recent publications, some are only mentioned in footnotes. Due to this newly arising interest, we will probably soon have a more complete picture of OHG sentence grammar integrating results not only on the left, but also on the right sentence periphery and on the middle field.

² See Sonderegger (2003:31f.) for a more detailed account of the relevant phonological changes.

dialects.³

The written attestation of OHG comprises more than 150 texts. Apart from inscriptions and glosses, one can roughly distinguish between translational and autochthonous texts (cf. Sonderegger 2003:66-78). The vast majority of texts, however, belong to the first group, which is, of course, a big drawback for linguistic research. Even more problematic – especially for syntactic investigations – is that there are only very few prose texts available.

Among the prose texts, the word-by-word translations of the so-called ‘interlinear versions’ (e.g. the Benedictine Rule) are not appropriate for syntactic studies. According to Sonderegger, there are furthermore translations with partial interlinear traits. Besides the numerous smaller texts of religious practice (e.g. various creeds, *Pater Nosters* and confessions), the OHG Tatian (ca. 850, East Franconian), which is one of the major OHG documents, has been argued to belong to this group. A relatively free translation from early OHG is the Isidor. This text is a translation of the tract *De fide catholica ex veteri et novo testamento contra Iudeos*, written by the bishop Isidore of Sevilla (ca. 560-636). The South-Rhine-Franconian translation, which is extant in the so-called Paris Codex, was produced around 800 (Sonderegger 2003:129). The ‘Isidor-group’ in a wider sense also comprises the so-called Mon(d)see-Vienna Fragments (early ninth century). This collection of fragmentary manuscripts contains a Bavarian version of the Isidor tract in addition to Bavarian translations of the Gospel of St. Matthew, the anonymous tract *De vocatione gentium*, a sermon by St. Augustine on Matthew 14, and the last part of an anonymous sermon. In late OHG, the monk Notker Labeo, ca. 950-1022, who is generally regarded as one of the founders of German vernacular literature, produced a large OHG corpus (in Alemannic) containing very free translations, paraphrases and commentaries of numerous important works of classical Greek and Latin literature, e.g. Boethius’ *Consolations of Philosophy*, Capella’s *Marriage of Mercury and Philology*, Pope Gregory I’s *Morals*, and Aristotle’s *Categories*. Finally, roughly 60 years later, in the second half of the eleventh century, Williram, the abbot of the famous Benedictine Abbey of Ebersberg in Bavaria, composed a German translation and paraphrase of the Song of Songs.

Autochthonous prose texts, on the other hand, are very rare. Apart from some proverbs and the Straßbourg Oaths, hardly any such texts have been handed down to us. This is why some linguistic studies – even on syntactic topics – have investigated lyrical texts, in particular the monumental Gospel Harmony by Otfrid of Weißenburg (ca. 863 to 871, South Rhine Franconian) and the Hildebrandslied (ca. 820/830)⁴, the sole surviving record of Old High German heroic poetry, whose language is a mixture between Old High German

³ Franconian can be further divided into (i) East Franconian (e.g. Würzburg and Fulda), (ii) Rhine Franconian (e.g. Mainz, Frankfurt, Lorsch and Worms) and (iii) Middle Franconian (Trier, Echternach, Cologne etc.).

⁴ See Lühr (1982), Greule (1987) and Suchsland (2000) on the syntax of the Hildebrandslied.

and Old Saxon.

The texts which were part of the corpus used in the present study will be described in more detail in section 1.6. Some methodological and terminological issues will be addressed in section 1.7.

1.3 A short overview of Old High German sentence grammar

All modern Germanic languages – with the exception of English – are subject to the so-called ‘verb-second constraint’.⁵ In purely descriptive terms this means that the finite verb is always exactly the second constituent in (minimal) declarative root clauses. As has been observed in the descriptive literature as well as in the few generative studies available so far (e.g. Lenerz 1984, 1985b; Weerman 1988; Tomaselli 1995), the verb-second constraint seems to have also been operative in OHG already.

Indeed it seems to be the case that already the grammars of the eighth and ninth century prose texts (i.e. the Monsee Fragments (MF), Isidor (I), Tatian (T)) display the essential features of a verb-second language:

First, the clause-initial position in front of the finite verb is not always occupied by the subject (lexical or pronominal) as in (1)-a and (1)-b, but also by non-subject XPs of any syntactic category or with any syntactic function. For example, one can find the following XPs in this position: topicalized object DPs, as in (1)-c and (1)-d; different types of adverbials in the form of PPs or AdvPs, as in (1)-e to (1)-g; predicative adjectives as in (1)-h; and infinite parts of the verb, as in (1)-i to (1)-k.⁶

- (1) a. [*Druhtin*] *suuor* *dauite* *in uuaarnissu* (I 610)
 Lord swore David-DAT in truth
 “the Lord swore to David in truth” (R)
Iurauit dominus dauid in ueritate
- b. [*ih*] *gáb* *íu bilidi/* (T 553,9)
 I gave you image
 “I gave you an example”
/exemplum enim dedi uobis/

⁵ Outside the Germanic language family, verb-second characteristics can be found for example in Kashmiri (cf. Bhatt 1999), in Breton (cf. Borsley & Kathol 2000; Bury 2003:142ff.), and in Rhaeto-Romance (cf. Poletto 2000:88-107). See Chapters 1 and 4 on the verb-second properties of further early Germanic languages. As for the medieval stages of non-Germanic languages, verb-second phenomena have been observed, for instance, for Old and Middle French (e.g. Adams 1987; Roberts 1993, Vance 1997) as well as for some medieval Northern Italian Dialects (e.g. Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà 1985) and for Middle Welsh (cf. Willis 1998).

⁶ Cf. section 1.7 on citation modes as well as on grammalogues and abbreviations.

- c. *Enti* [*miin ur teili*] *chundit* *deotom*
and my judgement-ACC declare-3.SG nations-DAT
“and he shall declare my judgement to the nations” (MF V,8; Mt 12:18)
et iudicium gentibus nuntiabit
- d. [*Dhinerā uuomba uuaxsmin*] *setzu ih ubar miin hohsetli* (I 611)
your womb’s fruit put I upon my throne
“I will place the fruit of your womb upon my throne” (R)
De fructu uentris tui ponam super sedem meam
- e. [*In dhemu nemin cyres*] *ist christ chiuuisso chiforabodot*
in the name Cyres is Christ certainly presaged
“by the use of the name ‘Cyres’ Christ is certainly presaged” (I 162)
In persona enim cyri christus est prophetatus
- f. [*Chiuuisso*] *chioffanodom* *uuir nu hear dhazs ...* (I 484)
certainly revealed we now here that
“certainly we have now revealed here that ...” (R)
Probauimus dominum nostrum ...
- g. *Endi* [*after dhēs chifehtēs ende*] *uuir dhit dhar chisetzit idalnissa*
and after the fighting’s end becomes there instituted desolation
“and after the end of the fighting desolation will be instituted there” (R)
et post finem belli statuta desolatio (I 473)
- h. [*toot*] *ist her.* (T 313,14)
dead is he
“he is dead”
/quia mortuus est/
- i. [*chimanacfaldit*] *uuir dhit siin chibot* (I 389)
multiplied becomes his rule
“his authority will be multiplied” (R)
multiplicabitur imperium eius
- j. *Enti* [*{uuntr}entiu*] *uur tun elliu dhiu folc ...* (MF V,16; Mt 12:23)
and astonished became all the people-PL
“and all the people were astonished ...”
Et stupebant omnes turbæ ...
- k. [*Zi uuizsanne*] *ist nu uns chiuuisso, dhazs fater einemu ist*
to know is now us certainly that father alone is
dhurahchunt ... (I 120)
well-known
“we should certainly know now that only the father really knows ...”
Scire autem manifestum est solum patrem ...

When the prefield is occupied by a non-subject XP, the subject – if overtly expressed – generally occurs after the finite verb as in (1)-d to (1)-f and (1)-h to (1)-j. This type of ‘inversion’ is not only a typical property of the modern Germanic verb-second languages, but can also be found in further Old Germanic and Old Romance languages; cf. (2) and (3):

- (2) a. [*On twam þingum*] *hæfde* **God** *þæs mannes sawle gegodod*
 in two things had God the man's soul endowed
 "with two things God had endowed man's soul"
 (ÆHT_h.I,20,1; from van Kemenade 1997:333) Old English
- b. [*Hlióðs*] *bið* **ek** *allar /helgar kindir*
 silence-GEN ask I all holy beings-ACC.PL
 "I ask all holy beings for silence"
 (Edda, Vsp 1; from Eythórsson 2002:192) Old Norse
- (3) a. [*Uino & agua*] *deue* **el** *clerigo mezclar en el caliz*
 wine & water must the priest mix in the chalice
 "the priest must mix wine and water in the chalice"
 (Leyes.13v; from Fontana 1993:95) Old Spanish
- b. [*Par ces trois*] *sera* **la** *Queste achevee*
 by these three will-be the Quest accomplished
 "the Quest will be accomplished by these three"
 (Queste del Saint Graal 73,14; from Vance 1997:8) Old French

In OHG, the finite verb is usually fronted to the left sentence periphery in independent clauses. It is either found in second position (directly after the initial XP) as in (1), or in first position as in (7) below. One of the major aims of the present investigation is to find out whether verb movement is already obligatory in the grammar that is witnessed by the older prose documents.

As in present-day German, verb placement in OHG seems to be 'asymmetric': In independent clauses (without complementizers) the finite verb occurs at the left periphery, whereas in subordinate clauses introduced by a complementizer it remains in its base position at the end of the clause. This asymmetry can be clearly seen in the sentence pair in (4)-a and (4)-b. Note that OHG *thō* "then, at that time; when" was both an adverb and an adverbial subordinator. In the independent clause in (4)-a, the finite verb follows the initial adverb *thō* and thus occurs in second position, the object pronoun *in* and the subject being relegated to postfinite positions. By contrast, in the subordinate clause in (4)-b, the finite verb is in final position and is preceded by the subject pronoun and the object.

- (4) a. */tho antuurtita in der heilant/* (T 287,16)
 then answered them the Saviour
 "the Saviour answered to them then"
/Ihesus autem respondit eis;/
- b. */tho her thisiu quad/* (T 343,28)
 when he these said
 "when he had said these things"
/Et cum haec dicer&/

It has often been claimed that (syntactic) subordination did not really exist or was still very incomplete in OHG (e.g. Fleischmann 1973; Ebert 1978:20; Abraham 1993:117). But this claim runs into problems when one takes into consideration that (i) even the early documents contain a large inventory of subordinators – cf. (5) for an (incomplete) overview – and that (ii) sentences which are introduced by these subordinators generally show verb-final order as has been illustrated above.

- (5) a. complementizers: *thaz/dhaz(s)* “that”, *ibu (oba, ob(e) etc.)* “if”, *(h)wedār* “whether”
 b. relatives:
 particles: *thǣ/ðe/d(e)/do//thie* etc.; (*thaz*)
d-pronoun (+ particle): *ther* + (*the*) (*therde*) ...
w-pronouns + *sō*: *sōwer(sō)* “who, whoever”, *sōuuelīh(sō)* “which, whichever”
 c. adverbial subordinators:
 morphologically simple: *sō* (temporal/conditional: “when”/“if”), *t(h)ō* (temporal: “when”), *thār* (local: “where”), *ēr* (temporal precedence: “before”), *sār* (temporal: “as soon as”), *sīd* (temporal/causal: “since”/“because”), *than(n)e* (temporal/conditional: “when”/“if”), *unz* (temporal: “until”), *tho(h)* (concessive: “even though, although”) etc.
 morphologically complex: *sō* + adverb/*w*-word (*sō*) *sō ofto sō* “as often as, whensoever”, *sō sliumo (sō)* “as soon as” etc.

Interestingly, the correspondence between verb position and clause type already seems to be fairly similar to the present-day German situation in the major OHG prose texts: In the core clause types, the predominant productive word orders are: verb-second in declaratives, cf. (1) above, as well as in interrogatives with a fronted *wh*-phrase, cf. (6), and verb-first in *yes/no*-interrogatives, cf. (7)-a, and in imperatives, cf. (7)-b.⁷

- (6) /*uuvo gisahi thu abrahaman?/* (T 451,7)
 how saw you Abraham
 “how can you have seen Abraham?”
 /& *abraham uidisti/*
- (7) a. /*quidis zi uns thesa parabola/ oda zi allen/* (T 529,2)
 tell-2.SG to us this parable or to all
 “are you telling this parable only to us, or to everybody?”
 /*ad nos dicis hanc parabolam/ an & ad omnes/*

⁷ In examples (6) and (7) and in most of the examples in (1) the position of the finite verb in the OHG text does not correspond to the verb position in the Latin source. This suggests that the relevant word orders are native orders. See section 1.6 on the relationship between the OHG and the Latin word orders in the individual texts.

- b. */tuot riuaa .../ (T 103,1)*
 do-2.PL.IMP repentance
 “repent!”
/pænitentiam agite .../

Summing up, it can be noted that two features of a verb-second grammar are already present in OHG: XP-fronting and verb movement to the left sentence periphery. Moreover, there are similar correlations between verb position and clause type as in the modern language.

As to the word order at the VP-level, it should be noted that OHG largely exhibits the characteristics of an (S)OV-language. Nominal complements usually show up left of the verb in base position; cf. (8)-a. The same holds for the infinite parts of the verb, cf. (8)-b to (8)-d, and for the particles of particle verbs; cf. (8)-e to (8)-g.

- (8) a. *dhaz ih dhinan uuillun duoe (I 295)*
 that I your will do
 “that I do your will”
ut faciam uoluntatem tuam
- b. *HUUEO CHRISTUS FONA DAUID FRAMCHUMFTI CHIBORAN UUARDH*
 how Christ from David lineage born became
 “how Christ was born from the lineage of David” (R)
QUIA CHRISTUS DE STIRPE DAUID NATUS EST (I 604)
- c. *fona huueliihhemu ædhile christ chiboran uuerdhan*
 from which noble-lineage Christ born become
scoldi (I 606)
 should
 “from which noble lineage Christ was to be born” (R)
ex qua tribu nasciturus esset christus
- d. */... thaz sie ... / ... managa diuuala/ úz uuvrphin ... / (T 177,9)*
 that they many devils out cast
 “that they ... cast out many devils”
/ut / ... / ... demonia multa eiciebant. /
- e. */... thiu mán iuuuh furisezze./ (T 167,30)*
 that-REL.PRON one you before-set
 “what is set before you”
/... que apponuntur uobis/
- f. */unzir úz far&., .../ (T 167,29)*
 until-you-PL forth go
 “until you depart”
/donec exeatis., .../

As can be seen in the examples in (8), in subordinate clauses the finite verb most of the time shows up in absolute clause-final position due to the underly-

ing OV-order. There are, however, exceptions to the prevailing verb-final pattern: First, as is suggested by examples as in (9) and (10), the finite verb may occur in a surface position further to the left. Such phenomena are also quite common in modern Germanic dialects, where they are generally attributed to so-called verb raising or verb projection raising (see Chapter 2 for details). Both these constructions are still very common in modern Germanic languages in particular on the dialectal level. Second, XPs can be quite freely extraposed behind the verbal complex in OHG; cf. (10).

- (9) a. *dher dhar scoldii chiboran uuerdan* (I 422)
 who PARTCL should born become
 “who was supposed to be born”
 (no corresponding Latin sentence)
- b. *dher fona uuerodheoda druhtine uuard chisendit* (I 216)
 who from Hosts’ Lord became sent
 “who was sent by the Lord of Hosts” (R)
qui a domino exercituum mittitur
- (10) a. *dhazs ir selbo gotes sunu uuard in liihhe chiboran* (I 381)
 that he same God’s Son became in body born
 “that that same Son of God was born in the body” (R)
eundem filium dei natum in carne
- b. */... Inti thiethár uolle mit thir uuehslon/* (T 145,12)
 and who+REL.PARTCL want with you exchange
 “and those who would want to exchange with you”
/... & uolenti mutuaire a té. /
- (11) a. */... Inti thie thár hab&un diuual/* (T 133,1)
 and who PARTCL had-PL devil
 “and those who were possessed with the devil”
/... & qui demonia habebant. /
- b. */thaz in mir habet sibba/* (T 591,8)
 that in me have peace
 “that in me you might have peace”
/ut In me pacem habeatis/

The fact that in subordinate clauses, the finite verb sometimes appears non-finally in OHG and other Old Germanic languages, in particular in Old English, has also been regarded as evidence that it may move into a sentence-medial functional head. One of the questions that will be discussed in the following chapter is how well motivated this assumption is for the OHG data.

As this short overview of OHG clausal syntax has shown, there are some striking similarities to the modern verb-second grammar: In root clauses two syntactic operations are already attested in the earlier documents, i.e. verb

movement and XP-fronting. In subordinate clauses, by contrast, the finite verb is generally found at the end. On the other hand, it should be noted that there are also a number of phenomena attested which are unexpected from the perspective of the modern verb-second languages. A detailed investigation and analysis of these phenomena, which will be briefly introduced in the next section, is one of the primary goals of the present study.

1.4 Special features of Old High German sentence grammar

As sketched in the last section, two essential properties of a verb-second grammar are already attested in the early prose documents: verb movement and XP-fronting.

However, the traditional definition of verb-second, as it has been developed on the basis of the situation in the modern Germanic languages, additionally includes the following generalizations (cf. also Vance 1997:10; Poletto 2002):

- (12) a. The cooccurrence of two XPs in front of the fronted finite verb is heavily restricted. (= linear restriction)
 b. In declarative clauses, verb-first placement is rare and subject to some special, clearly identifiable semantic/pragmatic restrictions (concerning information structure, illocutionary force and/or discourse environments).

The evidence in the prose literature from the eighth and ninth centuries (e.g. the Monsee Fragments, the Isidor and Tatian) suggests that these generalizations did not hold in earlier OHG. In other words, earlier OHG did not behave like a prototypical verb-second language. There are quite a few constructions attested which are not compatible with the generalizations in (12).

In the older OHG prose texts there are independent declarative clauses attested in which the finite verb does not occur in second, but in a later position. For instance, we can find examples where a preposed XP is followed by a local or temporal adjunct in front of the verb; cf. (13). There are also examples in which a prefinite XP is followed by a prefinite sentence adverb; cf. (14). Most frequently, however, the finite verb is relegated to later than second position by a pronominal argument occurring to the right of the fronted XP; cf. (15).

- (13) [*Dher selbo forasago*] [*auh in andreru stedi*] *chundida*, *dhazs* ...
 the same prophet also in other place proclaimed that
 “the same prophet also elsewhere proclaimed that ...” (I 348)
testatur idem propheta ...

- (14) [*Dhiu*] [*chiuuisso*] *ist* *bighin* *gotes sunes* (I 116)
 that certainly is origin of-God’s son
 “that certainly is the origin of the Son of God” (R)
origo scilicet filii dei

- (15) a. [Erino portun] [ih] firchnussu (I 157)
 iron portals I destroy
 “I destroy iron portals”
Portas aereas conteram
- b. [Auar] · [iu] sagem *** (MF XI,18; Mt 18:19)
 again you-DAT.PL say-1.SG
 “again I say to you: ...”
{Iterum dico uobis ...} .

Furthermore, we can find left dislocated phrases at the left sentence periphery which are linked to clause-internal resumptive pronouns in various OHG texts. At first sight, this construction looks similar to the so-called ‘hanging topic construction’ which we know from the modern verb-second languages. Its OHG ‘counterpart’ has not yet been studied.

- (16) a. /... Inti ir_i uuarliho [nu habet ir_i gitruobnessi] ./ (T 587,26)
 and you verily now have you sorrow
 “and you also, you have sorrow now”
/... & uos igitur nunc quidem tristitiam habebitis./
- b. Got_i [so ir_i erist mannan chifrumida] ... (I 488)
 God when he first Man made
 “God, when he first made Man ...” (R)
Deus cum hominem fecisset ...

Apart from these verb-third cases the older prose texts also contain a substantial number of verb-first constructions. Thus it seems as if in older OHG the verb-second property in (12)-b had not yet fully evolved. In contrast to present-day German, verb-first placement in declaratives seems to not have only been characterized by pragmatic properties such as rhematicity or narrativity. Instead, syntactic and lexical factors also appear to play an important role: For example, the extraposition of the subject as in (17)-a, or the fact that the pre-field expletive *iȝ* “it” or the quasi-argument *iȝ* had not yet evolved or were not very common at the time; cf. (17)-b and (17)-c.

- (17) a. /uuard tho giheilil ther kneht in thero ziti./ (T 183,7)
 became PARTCL healed the servant in this hour
 “his servant was healed at that very hour”
/& sanatus est puer in illa hora;/
- b. /uuas thar ouh sum uuitua In thero burgi .../ (T 415,2)
 was there also some widow in that city
 “there was a widow in that city”
/vidua autem quaedam erat In ciuitate illa .../

- c. /... uwas tho zit / nah sehsta. .../ (T 275,29)
 was PARTCL hour after sixth
 “it was about the sixth hour”
 /... hora erat/ quasi sexta; .../

Moreover, it is still an open issue whether sentences with the negation particle *ni* or with the coordinating conjunction *int(i)* (*inte*, *enti*, *unti* etc.) in front of the finite verb should also be analysed as verb-first sentences. In the literature it has been proposed that in examples such as (18)-a, *ni* is an adverb occupying the prefield. Similarly, it has been argued that *enti* can be used as an adverb (and not only as a conjunction); cf. (18)-b. As will be argued in Chapter 3, however, these proposals are not really very convincing.

- (18) a. /*ni* quad ih fon iu allen/ (T 553,21)
 NEG spoke I of you all
 “I haven’t spoken of all of you”
 /*Non de omnibus uobis dico*/
- b. *enti* uuarth ar fullit des brut hlaufte(s) ka stuoli
 and became filled the wedding’s hall
 “and the wedding banquet was filled with guests” (MF XV,23; Mt 22:10)
 {*et impletae sunt nuptiae discumbentium*}

To sum up: Even though there was already XP-fronting and verb movement in OHG, there are also quite a few constructions attested that are not normally found in verb-second languages: There is a substantial amount of verb-third in the older texts so that one can conclude that the ‘linear restriction’ was not as strict as expected. Furthermore, declarative clauses with verb-first order were quite frequent and had different properties than in the modern language.

A further difference to the modern verb-second languages is that the OHG grammar licensed referential null subjects. It has been claimed in the literature that due to principles of universal grammar the null-subject property is incompatible with the specifics of a verb-second grammar (e.g. Jaeggli & Safir 1989; Rohrbacher 1999). Intuitively, these two phenomena indeed appear to be irreconcilable. This can be illustrated by means of the data in (19). In examples such as (19)-a, the verb-second restriction would only be observed if the null subject occurred postfinitely. If it occupied a prefinite position, the null subject would induce a verb-third effect. By contrast, in examples such as (19)-b, with surface verb-first, only the prefinite occurrence of the null subject would lead to a regular verb-second construction.

- (19) a. *In dhemu druhtines nemin* (pro) archennemes (pro) ... *fater* (I 279)
 in the Lord’s name recognize father
 “in the name of the Lord we recognize the Father” (R)
In persona enim domini patrem accipimus

- b. /*(pro) steig tho (pro) in skifilin .../ (T 193,1)*
 went-up PARTCL into boat
 “he got into a boat”
 /*Et ascendens in nauicula .../*

A further phenomenon that is rather unusual for verb-second languages is the occurrence of sentence-particles. Such particles are typically found in verb-first languages.⁸ In the older OHG texts, the interrogative particle *inu (eno)* often occurs in *yes/no*-interrogatives and in *wh*-interrogatives, (20)-a, sometimes even in combination with the affirmative particle *jā*, cf. the sequence *eno ia/inu ga* in (20)-b.

- (20) a. /*eno nibirut ir furiron thanne sie sin?/ (T 155,17)*
 ENO NEG-be you more than they are
 “are you not much better than they?”
 /*Nonne uos magis plures estis illis./*
- b. *Inu ga ih andre gaborane k{atuae, selbo ni gabe}re (I 71)*
 INU JA I others bear make self NEG bear
 “should not I, who makes others give birth, also give birth myself?”
 {*Numquid qui alios parere facio,} ipse non {pariam?}*
- c. *Inu huu{e}nan meinit · ir · daz ih sii ·*
 INU who-ACC think you-PL that I am
 “who do you think that I am?”
 {*Uos autem quem} me esse dicitis (MF XXXVIII,1; St Augustini sermo)*

Some further peculiarities of OHG syntax which will be discussed in this investigation do not pertain to main clauses, but to subordinate clauses. Several phenomena have led some scholars to believe that the syntax of subordination was still underdeveloped. For example, preposed adverbial clauses were placed at the leftmost edge of their matrix clause in OHG: They occupied the position to the left of the fronted XP in independent declarative matrix clauses, thereby inducing a verb-third effect in the matrix clause; cf. (21)-a. Similarly, when the matrix clause itself was a dependent clause, adverbial clauses were regularly found to the left of the matrix complementizer; cf. (21)-b.

- (21) a. [*Dhuo ir himilo garauui frumida*], *dhar uuas ih (I 91)*
 when he heavens' equipment made there was I
 “when he fashioned the heavens, I was there” (R)
 /*Quando praeparabat celos, aderam*

⁸ See, e.g., Hendrick (2000), Roberts (2005), Bury (2003) on some (modern) Celtic languages and Willis (1998) on historical Welsh.

- b. ... *neíst tés nīomannen vuúnder . [sō der uuínt uuáhet] .*
 NEG-is this-GEN nobody-ACC wonder when the wind blows
táz tiu uuélla an den stád sláhet (N BCon IV 211,2)
 that the wave at the shore crashes
 “nobody is surprised that the wave crashes at the shore when the wind is blowing”
Nemo miratur flamina chori. tūdere litus frementi fluctv (l. 1)

Constructions such as (21)-a have been taken as evidence that clause combining was still very paratactic in OHG (e.g. Erdmann 1886; Fleischmann 1973). Some scholars have claimed (e.g. Fleischmann 1973; Abraham 1993:117) that the category of the subordinating conjunction or of the complementizer as well as the main/subordinate asymmetry in verb placement had not yet emerged or were still very incomplete. In particular, it has been denied that lexemes such as *dhuo* in (21)-a and *sō* in (21)-b (see also (4)-b above) were true adverbial subordinators. Instead, they have been regarded as simple adverbs which could be placed at the left edge of a syntactically independent clause with verb-final order which was only paratactically combined with the following clause. In several diachronic studies on Germanic (e.g. Kiparsky 1995; Roberts & Roussou 2003) scenarios have been proposed according to which the innovation of the category of the complementizers or true subordinators led to the introduction of the CP-structure, a development which in turn triggered the emergence of V-to-C movement in independent clauses. This is why the question as to whether OHG lexemes such as *thō* were subordinating conjunctions or not has implications for the development of German sentence grammar, in particular for the verb-second phenomenon.

To sum up: Already in the OHG prose texts from the eighth and ninth centuries, there is evidence for verb movement and XP-fronting to the left sentence periphery. On the other hand, these texts show a number of phenomena that are not consistent with the notion of verb-second as it prevails in studies on the modern Germanic languages. For example, verb-third constructions appear to be far less restricted in OHG than in modern German or in other modern Germanic verb-second languages. The same holds for verb-first constructions in declarative clauses. Moreover, features such as the null-subject property and the occurrence of sentence-typing particles are rather untypical for a verb-second language. Finally, there are some open issues concerning the syntax of subordination.

1.5 Outline of the investigation

In the last section I sketched a number of peculiarities of OHG sentence grammar. The primary aim of this investigation is to study and analyse these phenomena. This way I hope to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the left sentence periphery in OHG which takes into account as many factors as possible. This objective is reflected in the conception of this investigation, which

consists of a sequence of studies, each of which focuses on one of these factors. Each study is presented in a separate chapter and each chapter is more or less readable on its own.

Accordingly, the investigation is structured as follows:

The following chapter (Chapter 2) focuses on verb movement. Starting from relatively recent research on verb fronting in Indo-European and in further Old Germanic languages, I will discuss how strongly generalized verb fronting was in various sentence ‘types’ in the older OHG prose texts. I will first consider those sentence ‘types’ which have been identified as the Old German core contexts for verb movement, namely interrogatives, imperatives and negated sentences. In a second step, I will deal with verb movement in declaratives. Furthermore, I will discuss the question of whether deviations from OV-order in subordinate clauses should be regarded as evidence for verb movement into a sentence-medial functional projection.

Chapter 3 deals with the question to what extent XP-movement to the left periphery was generalized in OHG. The discussion focuses on different classes of examples where XP-movement has failed to occur, i.e. on different types of verb-first declaratives. My main concern here is to find out which grammatical factors are responsible for the absence of XP-movement in these cases. This will also shed some new light on the question of whether there is a historical continuity between the verb-first declaratives in OHG and those in present-day German. I will furthermore discuss two classes of examples where it is unclear if we are dealing with verb-second or with verb-first declaratives. These are cases with sentence-initial elements whose status as XP-elements is questionable, namely declarative clauses with the left-peripheral negation particle *ni* (= *ni-V_{fin}-...*) and declarative clauses in which the conjunction *inti/enti/unde* ‘and’ is followed directly by the fronted finite verb (= *inti-V_{fin}-...*).

Chapter 4 is devoted to various aspects of XP-movement to the left periphery. First, some recent research on the diachronic origins of different types of XP-preposing (topicalization, left-dislocation constructions, *wh*-movement) in the old Indo-European and the early Germanic languages will be discussed. On the basis of these results, I will then try to find out how the situation in OHG fits into the different ‘scenarios’ that have been proposed. Furthermore, I will study examples with more than one XP in front of the preposed verb. Note that in OHG, such ‘verb-third’ constructions can be divided into two broad classes. First, there are verb-third constructions where it is undoubtedly the case that both prefinite elements are true XP-elements (= *XP-XP-V_{fin}*). Here, we have to find out which cases must be considered as true reflexes of the native OHG grammar and which ones are probably due to a too narrow translation process. Second, there is a class of examples where pronominal elements occur between the initial XP and the fronted finite verb. This phenomenon will be dealt with in the following chapter (Chapter 5).

Chapter 5 examines the distribution of personal pronouns in earlier OHG

texts. I will argue that their prefinite occurrence in declarative clauses behind a proposed XP (XP-pron-V_{fin}) cannot be traced back to their potential status as X⁰-clitics as has been proposed for their Old English counterparts. My primary interest is to find out which implications pronoun distribution has for the analysis of the early OHG sentence structure. Note that the distribution of pronouns and their putative status as clitics in early Germanic has played a central role in various scenarios for the diachrony of verb-second. In particular, the left-peripheral occurrence of pronouns has been regarded as evidence for (different forms of) a CP-IP-sentence structure with asymmetric verb movement. In this chapter, I will therefore discuss in great detail whether the situation in OHG is compatible with different proposals.

Chapter 6 deals with the null-subject property of earlier OHG, a phenomenon that has been entirely ignored in previous word-order studies. This is all the more surprising since the syntactic distribution of null subjects has implications for the determination of verb position and thus for the syntax of the left sentence periphery. I will therefore mainly try to find out in which syntactic configurations (referential) null subjects occur. In a second step, I will furthermore consider some morphological factors that play a role in null-subject licensing. These results will then allow me to critically evaluate the widespread claim that the null-subject occurrences in OHG are the result of Latin loan syntax.

My main findings are summarized in Chapter 7. This chapter is followed by a bibliography containing the lists of primary sources and of secondary sources.

1.6 The corpus

As was already discussed in section 1.2, not many prose texts from the OHG period have been handed down to us. This is a major problem for word-order studies and it is aggravated by the fact that the few sources available are translational texts of differing qualities.

The corpus used in the present study contains both the major prose texts from the earlier OHG period (i.e. from the eighth and ninth centuries), i.e. the Isidor, the Monsee Fragments and Tatian, and from the late OHG period (i.e. eleventh century), i.e. Notker's *Consolatio* and Williram's paraphrase of the Song of Songs.

As was already mentioned above (1.2), the so-called OHG Isidor is a translation of the Latin tract *De fide catholica ex veteri et novo testamento contra Iudeos* by the bishop Isidore of Sevilla (ca. 560-636).⁹ The tract is concerned with several topics, such as the defence of the claim that Jesus Christ fulfilled the messianic prophecies from the Old Testament and the dogma of the Trinity.

⁹ See Krotz (2002) for a recent philological investigation of the manuscripts of the Isidor group.

It has been argued that the OHG translation should be viewed in the context of the polemic against the Adoptionist heresy (e.g. Ostberg 1979:7). The secondary literature has unanimously praised the high quality of the translation. Lippert (1974:188) emphasizes its striving for independence from the Latin. As evidence for this, he discusses ample material which shows that verb-second placement in declarative clauses is the norm and that syntactic phenomena that are typical for the Latin language (such as participle constructions and the ablative absolute) are systematically abandoned and rendered by native German constructions. Wehrli (1984:189) even glorifies the Isidor translation as a marvellous piece of early German prose. Betten (1987a:15) stresses that the linguistic standard of this oldest contiguously written prose text was not paralleled in a long time. Note, however, that Matzel (1970:357) has found out that there is a difference between the commentary passages and Bible quotations: In the former, the translation technique is often very free, whereas in the latter it remains very close to the Latin. For my investigation, I used the edition by Eggers (1964), which is based on the Paris Codex as the *Leithandschrift* (Cod. Par. 2326). A fragmentary Bavarian adaptation of the Isidor is also extant in the Monsee Fragments. The Monsee Fragments (Cod. Vind. 3093*) furthermore contain remnants of the Latin text. In Eggers's Isidor edition the Latin of the opening chapters is from the Vienna Codex since this part is not extant in the Paris Codex. However, it is doubtful whether the Latin text of the Paris Codex was the basis of the OHG translation. As Matzel (1970) argues, the OHG parts in the Paris (and in the Vienna Codex) ultimately go back to a third non-extant Latin original. According to Ostberg (1979:5), the Latin version of the Paris Codex may be considered as very close to the original. For the syntactic phenomena which are investigated in the present study we can neglect the differences in the different extant Latin versions. Furthermore, Eggers's edition contains those small pieces of the OHG Isidor from the Vienna Codex which do not cover the same ground as the Paris Codex.¹⁰ These pieces have also been included in the corpus of the present study.¹¹

Apart from the Isidor pieces, the Monsee Fragments also contain OHG translations of the gospel of St. Matthew, of two sermons (*De vocatione gentium* and a shorter one) and of a sermon by St. Augustine on Matthew 14. The quality of these translations has also been judged as very good (e.g. Matzel 1970:365; Kartoschke 2000:90f.). The corpus of the present study contains all the texts of the Monsee Fragments. They are cited from the edition by Hench (1890). The Isidor pieces have not been included (those initial sections of the

¹⁰ The relevant OHG variants which are part of the sections jointly covered by the Paris and Vienna fragments are given in footnotes in Eggers' edition.

¹¹ It is not necessary for our purposes to take into account the Vienna variants. As Lippert (1974:48) points out there are only very few syntactically relevant divergences between the OHG versions of the Paris and the Vienna Codexes and those divergences do not pertain to phenomena such as verb placement and the like.

Isidor that have only survived in the Vienna Codex are cited from the edition by Eggers 1964).

The OHG Tatian goes back to the *Diatessaron*, a synthesis of the four Gospels into a continuous narrative of the life of Jesus, which the Syrian writer Tatian produced around 175 A.D. The original Syriac or Greek composition has been lost. One Latin adaptation survived in the monastic library at Fulda, where it served as the source text for the OHG version, which was written in East Franconian dialect. The names of the translators are unknown. The complete German text has only survived in one manuscript (Codex Sangallensis 56), which after its completion was removed from Fulda to the famous library of St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century.

For a long time, the OHG Tatian has been neglected as a source for syntactic studies on OHG. One reason for this is that it has been assumed that the OHG word order was heavily influenced by the Latin.¹² Sonderegger (1974, 2003:128), however, advocates a more differentiated view on this topic. He does concede that there are passages where the OHG is very close to the Latin, but nevertheless he argues that the OHG translation cannot be regarded as a mere mechanical rendering of the Latin since there are many places where native German constructions have been chosen. Even in the prologue, which very closely follows the Latin, one can find many additions and reorderings of words and constituents. There are also quite a few passages where the schematic technique of the so-called interlinear versions has largely been abandoned. On the whole, Sonderegger classifies the OHG Tatian translation as intermediate between an interlinear and a free translation.

More recently, the extensive investigation by Dittmer & Dittmer (1998) has contributed to the rehabilitation of the OHG Tatian as a source for syntactic studies. As the authors show, the Latin word order was not slavishly preserved, but we can find many systematic deviations from the Latin – most notably in the form of reorderings and additions. More precisely, they prove that virtually any systematic modification of the OHG as compared to the Latin resulted in word-order patterns which are consistent with the topological regularities that are operative in modern German.

We may thus conclude that the OHG Tatian can serve as an important source of evidence for the syntactic patterns of OHG, especially if one only considers syntactic properties which systematically diverge from the Latin. As Lippert (1974:49f.) points, we can be confident to have detected a native grammatical property provided that the relevant examples conform to regularities which are determined by the OHG target language and not by the Latin and provided that they occur with high frequency. A similar point has already been made by Gering (1876:1ff.), who even regards Tatian as more appropriate for

¹² See Dittmer & Dittmer (1998:16-20, 260-262) for an overview of research positions concerning the quality of the German translation.

linguistic studies than the Isidor translation since the latter text is such a free translation that it is often impossible to decide whether a particular deviation from the source should be attributed to the grammar of the OHG target or to merely stylistic factors.

In the 1960s some scholars (e.g. Baumstark 1964; Wissmann 1960) put forward the claim that the Latin source for the OHG Tatian translation was not the Latin version included in the Codex Sangallensis (nor that of the Fulda Cod. Bonifatianus 1), but an unknown Latin adaptation which was closer to the OHG text. However, Lippert (1974:50) argues that the Latin of the Codex Sangallensis can still be safely used for syntactic investigations since the evidence which was presented by proponents of an unknown Latin source (Wissmann 1960, Baumstark 1964; Ganz 1969) hardly pertains to issues of word order, and in particular not to the problem of verb placement. More recently, Masser (1994:30) has come to the conclusion that the traditional assumption is more convincing, namely that the Latin text of the Codex Sangallensis was obtained directly from the Codex Fuldensis.

Greule (2000) raises the question of whether the editions are reliable sources for the study of OHG syntax or whether we have to go back to the manuscripts. In the case of Tatian, the appearance of Masser's edition in 1994 marked an important step towards the improvement of the textual basis of word-order studies based on editions. A very important advantage of this edition over the standard edition by E. Sievers ([1892] 1961) is that it reproduces the essential features of the 'design' and 'layout' of the Codex Sangallensis. Crucially, the bilingual text is presented in two separate columns – Latin on the left and OHG on the right – as is the case in the original manuscript (Masser 1994:13). The line breaks in the edition correspond to those in the manuscript. It should also be noted that the translation itself was produced by more than one person. How many translators were involved is not known. Masser (1997:126) argues that they probably belonged to the same 'school' (even in the literal sense), which was probably the monastic school of Fulda. The text was written down by six different scribes, one of whom (scribe ζ) carried out a final revision of the whole text. There are clear indications that the scribes first filled in one line of Latin in the left-hand column and then directly added the German translation on the corresponding line in the right-hand column. As Masser (1997) argues, this practice sometimes led scribes to erase OHG constituents so that the text portions fitted in their respective lines. The relation between translators and scribes is unclear. It should be noted, however, that there was probably a draft which the translators wrote down themselves. Thus they attempted to achieve a translation such that the OHG text could be arranged as loyally to the line breaks in the Latin as possible. As the syntactic investigations by Masser (1997) and Dittmer & Dittmer (1998:23) show, this strategy has clearly had an impact on the German word order. However, this translational technique was not adhered to slavishly, but seems to have also obeyed further principles.

Dittmer & Dittmer show that the OHG translation is characterized by some interesting tendencies. To give just one example: There are more frequent deviations from the Latin in the context of ‘function’ words (e.g. auxiliary verbs and pronouns) than in the context of content words (ibid.:25).

The language of Notker’s late OHG translations has often been characterized as ‘mixed’ since the German text is interspersed with Latin words or sequences of words. The reason lies in the text type: Notker was a teacher at the monastic school at St. Gallen and he produced his texts for didactic purposes. The German renderings were issued for a better understanding of the Latin sources. This was a rather revolutionary endeavour as the vernacular was of course not yet established as an academic or ecclesiastic language at that time. Notker has been praised as the best OHG translator by far (Manthey 1903:5). Kartoschke (2000:197) considers Notker’s work as exceptional in the earlier history of German literature.

As far as syntax is concerned, Wehrli (1980:112) states that Notker’s work in general is relatively exempt from foreign syntax. As Näf’s (1979) detailed investigation of Notker’s translation of the famous *De consolazione Philosophiae* by Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (ca. 480-524) shows, matters of verb placement and the like are hardly affected by the Latin. Note that the manuscript (Codex Sangallensis 825) contains both the German translation and the Latin text. Differently than in Tatian (Codex Sangallensis 56), the Latin and the corresponding OHG translation are not presented in two separate columns, but are arranged successively. The Latin passage – which may be of varying length (a few words or phrases up to several sentences) – comes first and is followed by the OHG translation (cf. Näf 1979:58ff.). Often, the OHG translation is in turn followed by a commentary or sometimes even a longer excursus.

The Latin text of Codex Sangallensis 825 is not simply a copy of one of the versions of *De consolazione Philosophiae* (henceforth: *Consolatio*) of which the library of the Abbey at St. Gallen kept manuscripts, but an adaptation which Notker himself had produced for his specific purposes. Notker modified the Latin source by reordering words, phrases and parts of sentences (cf. Näf 1979: 58-61). Verb placement was also affected by this. In the secondary literature, different opinions have been forwarded as to why Notker might have undertaken this endeavour. Sonderegger (1974:66, 2003:136) claims that the reorderings were influenced by the word order of the succeeding OHG translation. He considers the Latin of Codex Sangallensis 825 to be a simplification and a rearrangement in the direction of the target grammar. Näf (1979:69), however, argues that there are many examples where this hypothesis fails. In the area of verb placement in particular, there are numerous cases where the Latin of Codex Sangallensis 825 deviates from the OHG target sentence even though the original Latin source was in line with the OHG in this respect. For example, Näf mentions that there are many relative clauses where the finite verb occurs in final position both in the original Latin source and in the OHG

translation, but occurs further to the left in Notker's modified adaptation. Näf (1979:66ff.) therefore proposes that the modifications in the Latin had the following purposes: First, difficult constructions of the Latin originals were untangled by putting those parts that belong together into a linear sequence (Näf 1979:66). Furthermore, Näf argues that the modifications served to achieve what he refers to as 'konstruktionelle Normalstellung' (construction with normalized word order), which was intended to facilitate the reader's grammatical analysis. Näf's concept of 'normalized' word order refers to a 'centrifugal' arrangement of words or parts of speech in the sense of a Tesnière-style dependency grammar where the governing elements precede the dependent elements. In the area of verb placement, this means that the finite verb should precede its complements. This is the reason why there are many cases where Notker has moved a sentence-final finite verb leftwards into a position before its complements in his Latin adaptation. In subordinate clauses, this reordering frequently results in a word order that is not in line with the OHG target. Yet in main clauses, this leftward movement often leads to a greater correspondence between the (adapted) Latin and the OHG text, as in OHG main clauses there was already systematic verb fronting. In Näf's eyes, this greater correspondence between the Latin and German was only a by-product of Notker's intention to achieve a centrifugal order. Further modifications of the Latin which Notker carried out can be regarded as attempts to make complex sentences more transparent or as clarifications through additions of words (cf. Näf 1979:76f.). It should be noted, however, that we do not know which version of the *Consolatio* Notker consulted for his work. At the Abbey of St. Gallen, there were probably three copies of this text available at the time (Näf 1979:56f.). Fortunately, the three versions hardly show any differences in the area of word order. This is why Näf (p. 58) concludes that for word-order studies, it is not really important to resolve the problem as to which codex/codices Notker consulted and thus he regards it as legitimate to use the 'normalized' text of the edition by Bieler (1957).

The language of *Expositio in Cantica Cantorum*, which Williram wrote at the famous Benedictine Abbey of Ebersberg in the second half of the eleventh century, has also been characterized as a mixture between German and Latin. The syntax is, however, hardly affected by the copying of Latin features as this phenomenon is largely restricted to the lexical level. The text is generally attributed to the late OHG or to the Early Middle High period. There are some similarities to Notker's writing. For example, Williram follows Notker's rules of accentuation. The OHG paraphrase and translation of the Song of Songs is part of the tradition of the so-called 'opus geminatum', where the same material is presented more than once with varying aesthetic means. In both the oldest main manuscripts from the second half of the eleventh century, which were edited under Williram's supervision, i.e. manuscript C from Ebersberg (Cgm. 10) and the Breslau manuscript B, the text is presented in three columns: The

first one contains a Latin paraphrase in Leonine hexameters, the second one the Vulgate text of the Song of Songs and the third gives a translation and commentary in German prose. The Latin paraphrase has been argued to have drawn on the commentary by Haimo of Auxerre and others. The present study is based on the edition by Schützeichel & Meineke (2001), whose *Leithandschrift* is the Ebersberg manuscript (Cgm. 10).

One of the aims of the present investigation is also to discover diachronic developments in syntax. This will be done by comparing the late OHG texts (Notker and Williram) with the documents from the eighth and ninth centuries. This procedure is, of course, highly problematic since the texts were written in different dialects and differ in many further features such as text type, quality of the translation, register etc. Instead of the common tripartite distinction between *Frühalthochdeutsch* ‘early OHG’, *Normalalthochdeutsch* ‘normal OHG’ and *Späalthochdeutsch* ‘late OHG’, I will simply use the terms ‘older’ or ‘earlier’ OHG when referring to the language of texts from the late eighth and ninth centuries, and the term ‘late’ OHG when referring to the language of the texts from the eleventh century. Strictly speaking, it is, of course, very sloppy to speak of *the* OHG language or *the* late OHG language because there is no homogeneous language state to which we can refer. Nevertheless, I will show that there is great consistency in particular in the area of syntax among the earlier texts on the one hand and the later ones on the other. This can often be confirmed when further texts such as the smaller extant sources are checked additionally. I will do this at certain points in the argumentation. I also give examples from Otfrid’s Gospel Harmony, which is the most important piece of OHG metrical poetry that has been handed down to us. This text is also of major importance since it is the first literary work in German where end rhyme is used.

1.7 Data acquisition and citation modes

The results presented in the present study primarily go back to an investigation of the texts that have been described in the last section. Furthermore, I will sometimes quote examples from additional sources. The editions used are cited in the bibliography at the end, which also contains an index of text abbreviations. With the exception of the Isidor translations, which have largely been adapted from Robinson (1997), the English translations of the examples are my own, unless indicated otherwise. The present work is the first comprehensive study of OHG which is based on a first-hand investigation of the primary texts. This is an important innovation as compared to Lernerz (1984), which has so far been the only longer generative study on the diachrony of verb placement and on other issues of sentence grammar.

The quantitative findings have been obtained by my own counts. At various points, however, I also refer to the quantitative results given in the secondary literature, i.e. both in the word-order studies that have been published in the last decades and in the older word-order studies from the end of the nineteenth

century. This could not be handled otherwise since I studied a large range of different syntactic phenomena. To date, a syntactically annotated corpus of OHG texts has not been developed so that all the examples had to be collected ‘manually’. There is, of course, the problem that in the older word-order studies the data have sometimes been counted according to criteria which are not consistent with modern grammatical concepts even though these studies are primarily descriptive in nature. This means that older word-order studies are only useful provided that the authors have clearly defined the criteria on which their analyses and classifications have been based. To give an example: At the end of the nineteenth century, a number of word-order studies were published which were based on the theory of ‘covered verb-first order’ (= *gedeckte Anfangsstellung*), which had been proposed by Braune (1894) (see also Chapter 5). According to this theory, main declarative clauses with initial pronouns or weak adverbs are not verb-second, but verb-first clauses. Consequently, in the respective word-order studies, this class of examples was listed under the header ‘verb-first order’. In the present study, by contrast, I have classified such examples as verb-second clauses. Furthermore, manual searches are prone to error, of course. As has already been pointed out by Maurer (1924:147), however, it would be too time-consuming to carry out new searches in each case since it is to be expected that the newly gained results would not be significantly different.

It should be noted, however, that in contrast to the seminal study by Lenerz (1984), the only previous book-length study of historical German grammar in a theoretical framework, I have resorted to the secondary literature to supplement my findings with quantitative data at various points. All the syntactic phenomena addressed have been studied by a first-hand consultation of the primary texts. The material has been cited directly from the editions and not from grammar books or from other secondary sources, which also made it possible to take into account the relationship between the OHG and the Latin word order in the translations. Since the authors of the traditional word-order studies have mostly included exhaustive lists of example references, it was often possible to check the examples and to verify that they have been classified correctly even if modern descriptive and theoretical standards are applied.

The examples from our corpus of texts, which were described in the last section, are cited as follows:

The OHG Isidor (I) is cited according to the line numbers in the edition by Eggers (1964). I will only indicate in which line the OHG example begins. The corresponding Latin example, which is printed on the opposite left-hand and often has the identical line number, will be given in a separate line without indicating the line number. In many cases, I have adapted the modern English examples from Robinson (1997). I have indicated this by adding the letter ‘R’ in brackets after the translation. Note that it is possible to look up the line numbers of Eggers’s 1964 edition in the index in Robinson (1997:156-157): The

index gives the number of the page where Robinson has translated and discussed the relevant example.

Examples from the Monsee Fragments (MF) are cited according to the edition by Hench (1890) by giving the folio number and the number of the line where the example begins. The corresponding Latin text will be given in a separate line without folio or line numbers. Letters and words that have been reconstructed by Hench and are given in italics in his edition will be enclosed in curly braces (‘{}’) in the present study.

The examples from Tatian (T) are cited by page and line number according to the edition by Masser (1994) (the page numbers refer to the pagination of the edition and not of the manuscript.) Again the page and line numbers of the Latin sentence are not given. The line number is identical to the OHG one and the page number is always one lower than that of the OHG translation. The line breaks are indicated by slashes (‘/’). Masser’s edition also reproduces graphical features such as bold face, smaller and bigger font size etc. I have not copied these features in the quotations. As was already mentioned above, Codex Sangallensis 56 was written down by different scribes. I have not added this information. It is open to future research whether there are systematic syntactic differences in the different scribal sections.

Notker’s *Consolatio* (N BCon) is cited according to the new edition edited by Petrus W. Tax by giving the book number (I to V), the page number and the line number. If present, the corresponding Latin passage or, more precisely, Notker’s modified version of Boethius, which usually occurs immediately before his OHG translation and commentary and is given in italics in the edition, is also cited in a separate line after the modern English translation by indicating the line number.

Williram’s OHG paraphrase of the Song of Songs (W) is cited according to the edition by Schützeichel & Meineke (2001) by indicating the page number in that edition and the line number. In the edition by Schützeichel & Meineke, the Vulgate verses are given in a separate column between the Latin paraphrase and the German paraphrase as is the case in Ebersberg Codex. Where the OHG sentence renders a sentence from the Bible, this sentence is also cited in a separate line. The corresponding part in the Latin paraphrase is not cited. In the quotations from Williram, graphical features such as line breaks, majuscules etc. are not reproduced.

The punctuation marks have been given as they can be found in the editions. With the exception of the examples from Tatian, all punctuation marks that occur at the end of the citations have been omitted. Only question and exclamation marks have been handled differently: They have not been omitted. Likewise, in the Isidor examples, the quotation marks which surround the passages that are Bible quotations have not been given. In the facsimile of the Monsee Fragments (Hench 1890) and in the edition of Tatian (Masser 1994), there occur many punctuation marks which are no longer used today. In Tatian, the

abbreviation ‘&’ is used for the sequence of letters ‘et’ both in the Latin and in the OHG translation. In the Vienna manuscript, and accordingly also in Hench’s facsimile edition, there are often spaces within words between the syllables. In compound words, the component words are sometimes separated by a raised stop (·). Words or parts of words which were unreadable in the manuscript and could not be reconstructed by Hench are indicated by asterisks (‘***’).

Examples from Otfrid’s Gospel Harmony (O) are cited from the edition by Erdmann/Wolff (1973). Note that Kleiber’s (2004) edition, which would have been more appropriate for linguistic research, was published only after the empirical work for this study was finished.

The smaller OHG documents (e.g. *Christus und die Samariterin*, *Hildebrandslied*, *Muspilli*) are cited from *Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler* (“The Lesser Old High German Documents” edited by Steinmeyer (1919) (SD) by giving the document and line number.

Examples from other Old Germanic or Old Indo-European languages as well as from Middle High German and from Early Modern High German are cited from the secondary literature; the references are given to the right of or below the example. If they were not present in the secondary literature, I have added word-by-word glosses and/or translations without indication. This was mainly the case in those examples that were cited in German grammar books, journal articles or research monographs. In the English secondary literature, glosses and translations are fairly standard. In those cases where glosses were present in the literature, I have adapted them so that they contain the abbreviations and labels which are used in the present study.

The examples from the Gothic Bible have been handled differently: I have checked the Gothic examples discussed in the secondary literature in the edition by Streitberg (1919) and cited the examples from there including the corresponding Greek sentence. Note that it is unknown which Greek source text Wulfila used for his translation. Streitberg’s reconstruction of the Greek source has been subject to a lot of criticism. This is why in some studies on Gothic syntax (e.g. Ferraresi 2005), Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* is also cited in those cases where the two versions deviate. Since I have not done any original research on Gothic syntax myself and have only summarized the results of the secondary literature, I have confined myself to giving the Greek of Streitberg’s edition.

In the examples I have sometimes added square brackets (‘[]’) or traces (‘t’) or indices to sketch the intended syntactic analysis. Moreover, I have usually underlined the finite verb and/or sometimes highlighted constituents under discussion by boldface. In the word-by-word glosses, morphological features such as verbal mood, case, person/number etc. are only given where this is relevant for the argumentation and/or useful in determining the structure of the sentence.

