

Aspects of word order and information structure in Old Saxon

Sonja Linde

1. Introduction

Current research on the development of word order in the Germanic languages suffers from the lack of a consistent description of the situation in Old Saxon (henceforth OS) which offers one of the earliest writing traditions of the Germanic group at all and includes various types of word order patterns. Standard descriptions of OS contain very little or no information about word order. While e.g. the grammar book by Gallée (ed. Tiefenbach 1993) only refers to issues of phonology and inflectional morphology, Behaghel's (1897) comprehensive monograph mainly reflects the syntactic behaviour of different word classes with respect to their property to organize word groups and phrases but lacks any observations on the most intriguing question with respect to our investigation, the description of the linear order of constituents in the clause. In the preface to his monograph, Behaghel himself addresses the incompleteness of his book with respect to word order, cf. Behaghel (1897: vi).

A notable exception in this respect is the survey of OS provided by Rauch (1992) who pays attention to the sentence structure in OS records. Rauch (1992: 24–31) accounts for a high degree of variation in word order and establishes a distinction between marked and unmarked patterns on the basis of their relative frequency in the records. In the case of independent declarative sentences, she argues that the (X)VSO order with all arguments following the verb and an optional single non-argument preceding it displays the most common pattern which therefore is defined as unmarked, while other patterns like (X)SVO or (X)SOV are said to be less frequent and therefore marked (1992: 24). In accounting for the functional differences among marked and unmarked patterns, Rauch addresses the issue of their textual role and pragmatic value in the discourse. E.g., she explains the pattern in which the verb precedes all arguments as a device of “concatenation or continuation in a narrative sequence” (Rauch 1992: 30). As shall become clear later, this is a major consideration in the approach pur-

sued in the present study as well. However, the analysis provided by Rauch raises a couple of questions. First, she discusses early verb positioning in the pattern (X)VSO accounted by her as unmarked on the basis of the example *gaf it is iungarum forð* '[he] gave it [=the bread] further to his disciples' (Rauch 1992: 28–30). Admittedly, this is an elliptical coordinate conjunct which has no overt subject itself but shares the subject of the previous conjunct expressed in the phrase *manno drohtin* 'the Lord of men'. Hence, this example is no suitable representative of the (X)VSO pattern, which really abounds in OS. Second, Rauch explains the initial placement of the verb *gaf* '[he] gave' in relation to Behaghel's Rule 2 according to which old information precedes new one in a sentence. In Rauch's analysis of the example quoted, the verb denotes one of a series of expected actions and therefore carries of old information. At the same time, she seems to overlook that the old information is actually conveyed in the subject *manno drohtin* 'the Lord of men' dropped in this sentence and that the verb merely introduces the new information assigned to it. All in all, Rauch's discussion on the matter is very brief. It neither results in an attempt to provide a general model of the underlying syntactic structure of the OS sentence nor does it systematically explore all factors leading to variation in the linear order of sentence constituents.

Moreover, the classification of marked vs. unmarked order in OS given by Rauch (1992) contradicts the observations made approximately one hundred years earlier by Ries (1880: 5–11). In his view, the basic or regular word order pattern in OS involves the preverbal position of the subject in (S...V...) while the pattern in which the subject (including all arguments) follows the verb (...VS...) is regarded to be secondary, and derived from the basic order for special rhetorical and textual purposes. On closer look, it turns out that the pattern viewed as 'unmarked' in Rauch's terms corresponds to what Ries counts as a secondary, or occasional pattern, and vice versa. Ries builds his proposal on language-internal as well as genealogical considerations. First, he accounts for the fact that the reverse pattern is typical for interrogatives, requests, exclamations etc., i.e. for sentences that bear a special, occasional usage with respect to simple declaratives. Therefore, it is not likely that the syntactic patterns occurring in those functionally 'marked' cases should present the basic order in the language. He further points at the fact that the preverbal position of the subject is the basic one in the Indo-European proto-language and a common property of all ancestors except of Celtic which was the only one to generalize verb-first as its basic order. Above all, Ries (1880: 11) explicitly refers to the high frequency of sentences with the so-called reverse order

but argues that quantity of occurrences alone is not decisive for the identification of the basic word order in the system of a language.

Apart from these contradictory views, the elaborations in Ries (1880) and Rauch (1992) share one important property: they both promote the idea that word order in OS – although exposing a variety of competing word order patterns – is by no means random but obeys specific rules and principles influencing the positioning of sentence constituents, and especially the placement of the finite verb. They further relate these principles to the broad field of pragmatics and discourse organization, though a more precise characterization of the functions and categories taking primary influence on the syntactic realization of sentence constituents is still missing.

In more recent times, a small investigation on the issues of word order in OS appeared aiming to evince that the principles of word order in OS are explainable on purely syntactic grounds, cf. Erickson (1997). This account is nested within the ‘Government and Binding’ model of generative theory and shows that methods and concepts provided for the explanation of the syntactic regularities in other early Germanic languages like Lenerz (1984) for Old High German or van Kemenade (1987) for Old English are adaptable to the situation in OS. Following this approach, OS exhibits a base-generated SOV order retained in embedded clauses introduced by an overt complementizer whereas independent clauses display a variety of features related to a generalized V2-pattern like in modern German or Dutch.

The aim of the present study is to account for both views on OS syntax in more detail and to trace back the influences of both syntactically as well as pragmatically based factors for the explanation of the word order patterns attested in OS records. The study is based on the observation of a large amount of empirical data that exceed the examples discussed in the previous literature. The results of the investigation give proof that both types of governing principles – discourse-configurational as well as purely syntactic ones – can be identified as motivating word order in OS. These observations allow for the assumption that OS is a language in which two competing systems govern the linear ordering of constituents.

2. The Source

OS is attested in two major texts, *Heliand* and *Genesis*, which are both alliterative rhyme poems dated back to the 9th century. Besides, there are some prose texts, e.g. some liturgical texts or tax lists (*Heberegister*). Un-

fortunately, the prose texts are of a rather small size, and research on OS is based on the two major texts of the *Heliand* and the *Genesis*. Of these, the *Heliand* is the more extensive one by far including about 6000 long verses. Therefore, it was taken as the basis of this investigation.

The OS *Heliand* was handed down in two major manuscripts, *C* (Ms. Cotton. Calig. A. VII, London, British Library) and *M* (Cgm 25, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek) as well as in four fragments. The text itself is subdivided into 72 chapters called ‘fits’ which in the original manuscripts are indicated by initial capital letters. In manuscript *C*, fits are additionally enumerated by Roman numbers.¹ Quite often, the beginnings of smaller episodes or periods show initial capitalization as well. It is clear that the *Heliand* manuscripts expose a sophisticated system of capitalization according to which initial capitals function as indicators of the text organization provided by the writer. Unfortunately, none of the current editions of *Heliand* reflect these potentially valuable text structuring devices but represent the graphical layout of the manuscripts normalized according to modern German usage. Since no complete facsimile edition and no diplomatic edition exist, evidence on the formal means of text organization provided in the manuscripts is not available to us in full extent.

The OS data are taken from the old but rather well-accepted *Heliand* edition by Sievers (1878). It reflects both major manuscripts in parallel columns and presents the original writing in glosses in case the edition differs from the manuscript. In terms of punctuation and capitalization, Sievers applies the rules of modern German usage. All examples cited are taken from manuscript *M* according to Sievers (1878) and from manuscript *C* only if there is no equivalent in *M*.

3. Properties of V2 in OS?

Well-known generative work (e.g. cf. Lenerz (1984) for Old High German, van Kemenade (1987) for Old English) assumes that the early Germanic languages expose a base-generated verb final order. In independent clauses, the inflected verb is raised regularly to a vacant C^0 -position, and additionally, the Spec C -position is usually filled thus yielding a generalized V2-pattern like in modern German and Dutch.

A similar view has been proposed by Erickson (1997) for OS as well. In fact, the data presented in his investigation strongly support this view. In this section, we shall investigate in more detail the assumed V2-properties of OS and discuss some further points concerning this question.

A great part of the observable data indeed prompts the view that OS displays some typical features of a SVO- language. In dependent clauses like complement clauses (1) or relative clauses (2) the finite verb appears at the end of the sentence following all its arguments:

- (1) [so *uuas thero liudio thau* = ‘so it was the custom with the people’]
that that erlo gihuulic obean scolde
 COMP that-ACC noblemen-GEN everyone celebrate should
 (Hel 2732)

‘(...) that everyone of the noblemen should celebrate that (i.e. the birthday of the monarch)’

- (2) [*buide imu be theru brudi* = ‘He was living with the woman’]
thiu er sines broder uuas
 the-FEM before his-GEN brother-GEN was
 (Hel 2706)

‘(...) who had been his brother’s bride before.’

As an exception, PPs and CP-complements are often extraposed, cf. the adjunct phrase *an Galilæo land* in (3):

- (3) *tho he im mid is gesidon giuuet eft an*
 COMP he he-DAT with hiscompanions went back to
Galilæo land [for im (...)] (Hel 2290)
 Galilee land went he-DAT

‘When he came back to Galilee with his company, he went ...’

In root clauses, on the other hand, the finite verb occurs in the second position like in modern V2-languages, where it is typical that the specifier position of the C-domain is occupied by any constituent regardless of its grammatical relation to the governing verb or to its information-structural value in the context. This property of V2-languages may be traced back in OS data as well. In (4), the constituent in front of the verb is the pronominal subject *siu* ‘she’. In case that an object or adjunct is preposed, the subject remains post-verbally. This is shown in (5) and (6) accordingly where the pronominal subject follows the verb:

- (4) *siu uuelde tho ira geba egan* (Hel 2769)
 she wanted then her gift have
 ‘She wanted to have her reward’
- (5) *that scoldun sea fiori thuo fingran scriban*
 that-ACC should they four then fingers-DAT write
 (Hel 32)
 ‘These four were to write it down with their fingers’
- (6) *so helde he thea haltun man* (Hel 2357)
 so healed he the lame men
 ‘so healed the lame people’

Furthermore, the preverbal position may host a syntactic operator as the wh-phrase in a direct question (7), the aboutness-topic of an utterance (8) as well as newly added information, i.e. focal material (9):

- (7) *huui uueldes thu thinera modar manno liobosto gisidon*
 how wanted you your mother man dearest do
sulica sorga (Hel 821)
 such worries
 ‘How could you cause your mother such worries, dearest sun?’
- (8) *thea liudi stodun umbi that helaga hus* (Hel 101)
 the-PL people-PL stood-PL around the holy house
 ‘The people stood around the temple’
- (9) *Gabriel bium ic hetan* (Hel 120)
 Gabriel am I called
 ‘I am called Gabriel’

However, the straightforward analysis of OS as a V2-language faces a number of methodological and empirical problems which shall be discussed briefly below. One of them concerns the proper differentiation of root vs. embedded clauses in the data from OS. Bearing in mind that the system of complementizers is not fully grammaticalized at that period in the sense that subordinating conjunctions are not distinguishable from adverbials and pronouns in each case, a high number of sentences can be interpreted both as root and dependent clauses. This mainly concerns some adverbial clauses (10) as well as relative clauses (11):

- (10) *uuarun im an Nazarethburg thar the neriondio*
 were they-DAT in Nazareth there the saving
Krist uuohs undar them uuerode (Hel 782)
 Christ grew among the people
 ‘They were in Nazareth, where the saving Christ grew up among
 the people.’
 ‘They were in Nazareth. The saving Christ grew up there among
 the people.’
- (11) *Sie ni uueldun it thoh farlaten ac hetun thar*
 they NEG wanted-PL it yet leave-off but ordered-PL there
ledien ford en uuif for themu uuerode
 guide away a woman in front of the people
thiu habde uuam gefrumid (Hel 3840)
 the-FEM sin sin comitted
 ‘They did not want to give up but instead they ordered to bring a
 woman in front of the crowd, who had comitted sin.’
 ‘They did not want to give up but instead they ordered to bring a
 woman in front of the crowd. She had comitted sin.’

Synchronically, the position of the finite verb cannot be used to distinguish root from subordinated clauses. There are clauses which are unambiguously subordinated ones but exhibit post-verbal arguments like subjects (12) or objects (13):

- (12) [*thit sculun gi uuitan alle iungaron mine* = ‘You shall know it all,
 my disciples’]
huand iu fargeben habad uualdand thesaro uueroldes
 because you forgiven had ruler this-GEN world-GEN
 (Hel 2434)
 ‘(...) because the ruler of the world had forgiven you’
- (13) [*habda them heriscipie herta gisterkid* = ‘He strengthened the heart
 of their army’]
that sie habdon bithuungana thiedo gihuilica (Hel 55)
 COMP they had defeated folk every
 ‘(...) so that they had conquered every nation.’

Moreover, matrix clauses show much more variation with respect to verb placement than is expected in a pure V2-language. In OS, the verb is often found in initial position (14) as well as in later positions (15)²–(16):

- (14) *habda im the engil godes al giuuisid*
 had them the angel god-GEN everything shown
torhtun tecnun (Hel 427)
 bright-DAT.PL signs-DAT.PL
 ‘The angel of God had shown them everything with bright signs’
- (15) *thuo hie sia an is era antifeng thuru hluttran*
 then he her in his protection took through clear
hugi (Hel 5619)
 mind
 ‘Then he took her under his protection due to his clear mind.’
- (16) *nu ik theses thinges getruon* (Hel 285)
 now I this-GEN thing-GEN trust
 ‘Now I trust in this matter’

Patterns like (14)–(16) are frequent in the *Heliand*. Therefore, it seems unjustified to exclude them from the analysis of OS syntax as isolated exceptions picturing archaisms³. The attested data induce most notably two questions: First, how can we explain this confusing coexistence of different word order patterns syntactically, and second, how are the constituents in patterns organized which do not display V2 in the surface.

According to Kiparskys (1995) well-known analysis, Old Germanic syntax just started to establish the category of CP. As a consequence, the shift from adjunction to embedding by means of subordinating complementizers in C⁰ took place and so did V-to-C-movement in main clauses as well. Since this syntactic change is supposed to proceed in steps, early attested data may still show variations between CP and S main clauses as reflexes of this development. In fact, the differences in Old Saxon word order shown above can be best explained by assuming this variation, this means that the C-projection is not fully established yet; and therefore V-to-C-movement did not occur in all cases.

Bearing in mind an analysis like this, still the question arises how to explain the order of elements in non-V2 main clauses since it seems to be dissatisfying just to notice that the finite verb could not move to the C⁰ slot due to the fact that these clauses have no CP at all. Furthermore, still an

asymmetry between V1 and V-late main clauses occurs. Although in particular V1 clauses can be explained as cases of V-to-C-movement with an empty focus-operator in SpecC⁴, I want to investigate alternatively whether V1 and V-late in independent declaratives may be attributed to information-structural conditions instead of confining on syntactical factors only.

Taking as a starting point some influential ideas in early philological work on the function of different word patterns (Ries 1880, Delbrück 1911) and some more recent approaches on this matter (cf. Donhauser and Hinterhölzl 2003), I will pursue an approach to discerning pragmatic or information-structural factors which account for variation in OS verb placement.

4. A discourse-pragmatic analysis

4.1. Some basic assumptions

Recent work on the role of information structure and discourse organization for the explanation of different word order patterns in Old High German (Hinterhölzl and Petrova 2005) reveals some regular correlations between pragmatic factors and verb placement in early Germanic languages.

In this paper I will show that OS word order also depends to a large extent on pragmatic rules which can be consistently described in terms of information structure. Information structure itself is a complex phenomenon which comprises at least two aspects concerning the organization of an utterance. On the one hand, the utterance can be divided into a topic and a comment about this topic (*topic-comment structure*), on the other hand, the most relevant information in the utterance makes up the focus as opposed to the background (*focus-background structure*) (Lambrecht 1994: 117ff and 206ff).⁵

The topic-comment structure affects the predicational separations of an utterance and is deeply connected with the concept of *aboutness* in the sense of Hockett (1958) and Reinhart (1981) or with the notion of *familiarity* in the sense of Gundel (1988). Usually, the topic expression refers to an entity which is given or presupposed in the particular context. By contrast the level of focus-background is defined in terms of the speaker's attitude towards the informational relevance of sentence parts. Novelty often correlates with the referent of the focus expression, but also presupposed elements can be emphasized under certain conditions.

The pragmatic categories of topic and focus should not be understood as complementary ones. However, there are conditions which prevent the

establishment of a topic-comment structure in an utterance as is the case in so-called *thetic* sentences (Drubig 1992, Sasse 1987). On the level of focus-background structure these sentences are analysed as all-focus structures, i.e. the focus domain comprises the entire utterance (cf. Lambrecht 1994: 137ff and 233ff).

For the identification of the pragmatic categories of topic and focus in a historical text, features that are grammatical correlates of these categories are most important. So e.g. topics are assumed to be expressed by anaphoric means while focus correlates with prosodic prominence which in the data analysed here may be detected by virtue of rhyme, rhythm and stress.

Furthermore, factors of discourse organization play an important role in word order regularities. I refer to the basic assumptions in two of the most accepted models of discourse analysis, the *Rhetorical Structure Theory* (RST) by Mann and Thompson (1988) and the *Segmented Discourse Representation Theory* (SDRT) by Asher and Lascarides (2003)⁶. As a basic principle both share the assumption that utterances in discourse hold certain logical relations among each other yielding a hierarchical structure in the discourse. Although the catalogue of discourse relations is subject to extended discussion, two main types of relation can be broadly distinguished:

- (i) An utterance can hold a dependency relation to a previous one in supplying more information on it;
- (ii) Two utterances can display no dependency relation among each other, i.e. they belong to the same level of discourse organization.

According to Asher and Lascarides the first type of relation is called *subordination* prototypically instantiated by 'elaboration', while the second one is called *coordination* with 'narration' as its prototypical representative. Each structural unit within a discourse is associated either to coordination or to subordination. The types of discourse relations are assumed to be linked to formal correlates such as prosody, tense usage, anaphoricity, linear word order etc. which are governed by parametrical variation.

Comparing the discourse function and the information structure of an utterance, one can realize that these correlate in some important points. Based on the definition of the subordinating type of linking, it should be evident that elaboration involves a topic-comment structure. By contrast to that, sentences of the coordinative type help to develop the main line of the narration. Following these considerations, one can assume that sentences of the coordinative type open a new sequence or signal a change in the

narrative setting but do not necessarily display a topic-comment structure. In other words, they share properties ofthetic judgements.

In a recent application of this model to data from OHG Hinterhölzl and Petrova (t.a.) and Petrova (2006) point at a correlation between the word order and the discourse function of a sentence. Their suggestion especially concerns the placement of the finite verb. To summarize, verb first patterns are said to appear in sentences opening a new text sequence or denoting a change in the narrative setting, thus correlating with coordinating discourse relations. On the other hand, the verb second pattern occurs in contexts elaborating on an already established discourse referent and is therefore prototypical for subordinating discourse relations.

In the following section, this model will be applied to OS in order to look whether properties of discourse organization correlate with verb placement in OS as well.

4.2. Subordinating Discourse Relations in the OS Heliand

Here, we investigate sentences which provide more information on a discourse-given or presupposed referent in supplying additional information on it. Due to their pragmatic nature, we expect these sentences to expose a topic comment division, i.e. to qualify as categorical judgements.

In sentences establishing such kind of relations, the V2 pattern dominates. The preverbal constituent in this case is a referential expression conveyed in different forms such as full NPs (17), pronouns (18) and elliptical material (19). These correlate with the topic referent:

- (17) [The three Magi enter the place of the birth of Christ]
_{TOP}[*thea uurekion*] *fellun te them kinde an kneobeda*
 the-PL strangers fell-PL to the child on knees
 (Hel 671)
 ‘The strangers fell on their knees in front of the child.’

- (18) [An old woman named Anna came into the temple]
_{TOP}[*siu*] *habde ira drohtine uuel githionod te thanca*
 she had her Lord well served to gratitude
 (Hel 505)
 ‘She had served her Lord well in gratitude.’

- (19) [‘There was an old man’]
 [that *uwas fruod gomo_i*] _{TOP}[*pro_i*] *habda ferehtan hugi*
 this was wise man had experienced mind
_{TOP}[*pro_i*] *uwas fan them liudeon Leuias cunnes* (Hel 73)
 was from the people Levi-GEN dynasty-GEN
 ‘He was a wise man and had much experience and was descended
 from the dynasty of Levy.’

In most of these cases, the topic is the grammatical subject, however, an object which functions as the aboutness topic is also found in the preverbal position (20):

- (20) [‘His name was Simon’]
_{TOP}[*Im*] *habda giuuisid uualdandas craft langa*
 him-DAT had led rulers power long-ACC
huila (...) (Hel 469)
 time-ACC
 ‘The power of the ruler had led him for a long time (...)’

The pattern in (17)–(20) is a prototypical topic comment structure with the topic in the left periphery and the comment following it. The structure Top+V2 is therefore firmly associated with the type of subordinating linking. Syntactically expressed these OS data show instances of V-to-C-movement and SpecC filled by a topic expression for discourse internal reasons.

However, besides V2-clauses with a topic expression in the preverbal position, we find a number of main clauses establishing a subordinating discourse relation to the previous context which exhibit a word order which is different from the one described above. More precisely, these sentences involve more than one constituent to the left of the finite verb, see (21)⁷ and (22).⁸

- (21) *endi siu an iro breostun forstod* (Hel 292)
 and she in her heart understood
 ‘In her heart she realized’
- (22) *thar ina thiū modar fand sittean under them*
 there him-ACC the mother found sit-INF among the
gisidea (Hel 818)
 crowd
 ‘The mother found him there sitting in their company.’

In (21) and (22) both arguments and adjuncts are placed in front of the finite verb. Looking at the informational status of the preverbal elements, we notice that they are clearly arranged according to their pragmatic status⁹. In both sentences, one of the preverbal constituents is the aboutness topic of the utterance, cf. *siu* in (21) and *ina* in (22). The remaining constituents left to the verb are also contextually given elements (e.g. *thar*, *thiu modar* in (22)) or elements related to already established entities (*an iro breoston* in (21)). In other words, all preverbal elements share the property of being presupposed. Therefore they constitute the background of the utterance. This is in clear contrast to the information represented by the verb, which is new. This leads to the assumption that in all verb-later cases above, the finite verb separates background and focus material in the utterance.¹⁰ Further evidence for a postverbal position of focus is provided by the syntactic placement of new referents (23) or given entities which are highlighted for reasons of contrast or emphasis (24):

- (23) *Thar imu tegegnas quam* ^{new}*[en idis fan adrom*
 there him-DAT towards came a woman from other
thiodun] (Hel 2984)
 people
 ‘There a woman from another region came towards him.’

- (24) *endi thar an them uuiha afstod* ^{emphasis}*[mahtig barn*
 and there at the temple stayed powerful child
godes] (Hel 797)
 god- GEN
 ‘And the mighty son of God stayed in the temple.’

It is important to note that in most of the verb-late main clauses discussed above an adverbial is placed in the initial position. These adverbials bear referential properties as indications for time, place and manner. Therefore they function as frame elements belonging to the background of the utterance.

To sum up, syntactic structures occurring in sentences of the subordinating type and showing a verb-late pattern can be represented in the following scheme given in (25).

- (25) Background – V_{fin} – Focus

The background domain is structured in the way that the frame elements precede the aboutness topic and this is followed by the remaining presupposed elements if any are given.

From the perspective of pragmatic principles motivating the syntactic placement of sentence constituents in OS, we can also provide an explanation for structures being ambiguous between root and embedded clauses, cf. (10)–(11) above. Both sentences serve to provide more information on a previously established referent, i.e. they are prototypical cases of subordination in discourse. Quite consequently, they expose the pattern in (25). In this sense, it is not appropriate to speak about parataxis and hypotaxis in our modern understanding of these terms; instead, utterances in OS often obey the rule of organizing the material according to pragmatic principles.

Since patterns with the finite verb in a later position than the second one are too frequent to be exceptions and some rules concerning their contextual appearance as well as their linear word order can be identified, one can assume that they reflect an older stage in which CP was not developed yet so that V-to-C-movement cannot take place; the finite verb is expected to remain in its base position. Above we showed that the elements in these verb-late patterns are ordered with regard to their information structural status rather than exclusive of their syntactical status, although word order is surely based on it. Focus elements are assumed to be extraposed.

Even though we stated that these structures are frequent, one cannot ignore the fact that the V2-pattern is the more common one in sentences of the subordinated type of discourse relations. Here the preverbal constituent represents the aboutness topic regularly. This is consistent to the fact that subordinate discourse relations add more information about an already established discourse referent, which functions then as the aboutness topic of the utterance. Therefore these patterns depict prototypical topic-comment structures.

All in all, these observations lead to following schemes representing patterns occurring in sentences of the subordinating type:

- (26) a. ${}_{\text{TOP=BG}}[\text{NP}] {}_{\text{COM=FOC}}[\text{V}_{\text{fin}} \dots]$
 b. ${}_{\text{BG}}[(\text{Frame})[\text{Top}](\text{XP} \dots)] {}_{\text{FOC}}[\text{V}_{\text{fin}}(\text{XP})]$

However, if two utterly different patterns, namely a prototypically V2-structure involving V-to-C-movement (26a) and a rather pragmatic organized structure analysed as some kind of relict without CP (26b), constitute subordinating discourse relations, the question arises how their discourse internal counterpart – the coordinated discourse relations – is structured.

4.3. Coordinating Discourse Relations in the OS Heliand

Also in instances belonging to the coordinating type of linking two particular patterns occur. Here, structures in which an adverbial particle precedes the verb in second position (27) and V1-structures (28) prevail. Note that all sentences have an overt subject in postverbal position:

- (27) *Tho uuard that heuencuninges bodon*
 then became-the-ACC heaven.king-GEN messenger-ACC
harm an is mode (Hel 159)
 sorrow-NOM in his heart
 ‘Then the messenger of the king of heaven felt sorrow in his heart.’

- (28) *Bidun allan dag that uuerod for them*
 wait-PRT.PL all day the crowd in front of the
uuiha (Hel 174)
 temple
 ‘The people waited all day long in front of the temple.’

Both sentences establish a new situation which is settled on the main line of narration. For all that I can tell they seem to be functional equivalents. The sentence in (27) opens a new fit. In an analogous way, (28) opens a new sequence involving a change of place and participant: whereas the preceding context informed us on the events concerning Zacharias inside the temple, the narration switches to a characterization of the people waiting outside. As to the quantitative distribution of these patterns, cases of *tho*+V2 occur more than twice as often as V1 in this respect. Next to the adverbial particle *tho*, we find V2 clauses associated to coordinating discourse relations with other adverbial elements in the initial position such as *so* (29):

- (29) *So uurogdun ina mid uuordun uuerod Iudeono*
 so accused him-ACC with words crowd Jews-GENc
thurh hotean hugi (Hel 5245–46)
 through full of hatred mind
 ‘So the crowd of Jews accused him with words full of hatred thoughts.’

Furthermore, there is a group of verbs which inherently have an event-reporting status and focus the entire proposition. As instances of such

predicates we interpret *verba dicendi*¹¹, motion verbs and verbs of sensual perception, the latter especially in inchoative meaning. Hinterhölzl and Petrova (t.a.) observe that in Old High German these verbs regularly occur in V1 or *tho*+V2-patterns respectively. It is argued that these lexemes signal a change in the overall deictic orientation of the situation with respect to place, time and participant. Therefore, instances with these verbs are analysed as typical cases of all-focus sentences inducing a change in the narrative situation. In OS, the situation is quite similar in sentences with *verba dicendi* (30), motion verbs (31) or perception verbs (32):

(30) *tho het he sie an thana sid faran* (Hel 637)
 then told he them to that way go
 'He then instructed them to go on their journey.'

(31) *quamun managa Iudeon an thene gastseli* (Hel 2736)
 came-PL many Jews into the hall
 'Many Jews came to the great hall.'

(32) *uuissun that thoh managa liudi aftar them landa*
 knew-PL that yet many people in the land
 (Hel 855)
 'But many people all over this country knew that.'

The placement of the verb in the initial position to highlight the entire content of the sentence is assumed to be common to all Germanic languages (Fourquet 1974: 316; cf. also Ries 1880). In other words that the verb opens a maximal focus domain constitutes a very old pattern.

Surface-V1-declaratives allow for two types of explanations. On the one hand, one may assume that they derive from general V-to-C-movement with a SpecC slot remaining empty or hosting a silent focus operator, and synchronically nothing contradicts this point of view. On the other hand, some functional contexts were analysed where verb movement to the left periphery seems to have taken place much earlier than overall V-to-C-movement. In general, imperatives, negated sentences and *wh*-interrogatives are closely associated to verb fronting in Old Germanic (see e.g. Eypórrsson (1996: 111) and Axel (2007: 52f)). In this paper we do not want to discuss if CP itself or the movement of the finite verb to C⁰ is optional in Old Germanic. However, it is crucial for our aim to perceive verb fronting under certain circumstances as mentioned above since all of them are related to the purpose of focusing the proposition of the utterance.

V1-patterns in OS Heliand always focus the entire utterance. For all we know structures with a fronted verb associated to focus operations are much older than general V-to-C-movement with additional XP-fronting. In accordance with V-late structures discussed above V1 declaratives seem to represent some kind of reflex of a prehistorical stage of language.

On the other hand, *tho*+V2 corresponds to the need for a lexically filled SpecC slot in declarative main clauses like in modern V2- languages. According to this, all-focus structures in OS are most often found with the adverbial *tho*, which gradually loses its temporal semantics and develops to a text-structuring discourse-particle. It signals the continuation of the narration and guarantees progress in discourse. The structure *tho*+V2 is the most wide-spread verb second pattern in the Heliand by far. Besides *tho* as a focus particle we also find *tho* functioning as a referential temporal adverbial element in the middlefield which can be topicalised optionally. Therefore, the patterns (i) $[[tho_{\text{Particle}}]_{\text{FOC}}[V_{\text{fin}} \dots]]$ and (ii) ${}_{\text{BG}}[tho_{\text{Frame}}]_{\text{FOC}}[V_{\text{fin}} \dots]$ cannot always be distinguished with certainty.

Less frequently, other adverbs as *so*, *nu* etc. also function as discourse particles in initial position of an all-focus V2-sentence, cf. (29) above. However, it is interesting to note, that besides adverbs, also the subject can occupy the initial position of V2 sentences associated with coordinating discourse relations. In this case, the subject represents the focus exponent of the sentence, as is illustrated in (33). There are several criteria supporting this analysis: 1) the expression is stressed by virtue of its position in the metrical structure of the verse line; 2) the expression bears the alliteration rhyme (alliterative syllables are given in bold type for clarity); 3) the expression conveys new (or relevant) information. All these criteria apply for the initial element *Iohannes* in (33); the sentence is analysed as representing a coordinating relation because it introduces a new episode within on the main line of narration:

- (33) [A chain of five coordinate conjuncts with V1, which promote the progress of narration as an intermediate sequence]

<i>geng</i>	<i>thes</i>	<i>geres</i>	<i>gital</i>	<i>Iohannes</i>	<i>quam</i>
went	that-GEN	year-GEN	quickly	John	came
<i>an liudeo</i>	<i>lioht</i>	<i>lik</i>	<i>uuas</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>sconi</i>
to mankind-GEN	light	body	was	him	beautiful

(Hel 198)

‘The year passed by quickly. John came to the light of mankind. He was beautiful.’

However, while V2-patterns with an initial discourse particle, especially *tho*, are extremely frequent, patterns like the one in (33) occur very rarely.

Summarizing our findings concerning sentences attributed to the coordinating type of linking we can conclude that the following patterns appear in the OS *Heliand* in this function:

- (34) a. $\text{FOC}[\text{V}_{\text{fin}} \dots]$
 b. $[\text{Particle}]_{\text{FOC}}[\text{V}_{\text{fin}} \dots]$
 b.' $\text{FOC}[\text{F}_{\text{exp}}[\text{NP}] [\text{V}_{\text{fin}} \dots]]$

As SpecC is surely sensitive to focus elements, it does not surprise that these can be found in this position.

The quantitative distribution of these patterns indicates that the verb second pattern with an initial focus particle (34b) exceeds by far. Bearing in mind the overall development of word order in continental West-Germanic, one can assume that the pattern in (34b) replaces the one in (34a).

5. Conclusion

It is assumed that the confusing variation of linear word order patterns in Old Saxon *Heliand* is due to the mixture of two different grammars; however, our text reflexes “the elimination of the variation of CP and S main clauses” (Kiparsky 1995: 162) whereas a good part of main clauses construed as simple S are synchronically reanalysed as CP with a vacant SpecC slot, i.e. V1-declaratives. This point of view is supported by the well established assumption that language change in general takes place gradually and therefore reflexes of an older stage are still found later in changed environments with the possibility of reanalysing “old” properties with regard to the new conditions.

The scenario supposed carries out as follows: In a prehistoric language period, say to simplify matters in ProtoGermanic, only simple S clauses occur. Here the finite verb appears mostly in its base position following all arguments. Moreover, subordinate clauses are adjoined, and linear word order is not only related to the syntactic properties of constituents but also to information structural factors. Background elements are organized pre-verbally due to their salience and focus expressions are extraposed (see as

a reflex of this protogermanic property the postverbal focus position in OS, e.g. (12), most likely (13), (23) and (24)). Furthermore, in order to focus the whole utterance V1 appears connected to an overt or covert focus-operator triggering verb raising and bearing one of the following features [+wh], [+imperative], eventually [+negation] and, for opening new contents in a discourse, [+coordinative]. This leads to the assumption of a left-peripheral operator-position. However, once CP is established in Germanic, this operator position is reanalysed as SpecC which then opens successively for other elements than focus-operators only; first and foremost SpecC allures the aboutness topic which is predestinated for this position due to the fact that it occurred always preverbally representing the prototypical background element. And in fact, the presumption that SpecC becomes sensitive for any XP gradually is confirmed by the observation that other elements occupying the SpecC slot except for the so-called discourse particle *tho* and the aboutness topic are extremely rarely found in Old Saxon.

All in all, the OS Heliand mirrors a period of syntactic change; this is the establishment of CP in general associated to operations like overall V-to-C-movement, embedding of subordinate clauses in alliance with the development of the category of complementizers and – chronologically later – the generalisation of SpecC hosting any constituent.

6. Acknowledgements

The present paper relates to the information-structural analysis provided for my 2006 master thesis ‘Verbstellung und Informationsstruktur im Altsächsischen’, Humboldt Universität Berlin. The thesis was supervised by the research project SFB 632/B4 ‘Die Rolle der Informationsstruktur bei der Herausbildung von Wortstellungsregularitäten im Germanischen’. I am thankful to the principle investigators of this project Karin Donhauser and Roland Hinterhölzl for giving me the chance to complete my research on OS. I also thank Michael Solf for helpful comments concerning this paper. I am grateful to Svetlana Petrova for help and fruitful discussions during writing this paper.

Notes

1. Cf. Bästlein (1991: 213ff). As Bästlein points out, the distribution of initial capitals differs in the single manuscripts. Bästlein challenges the traditional editorial usage to subdivide the *Heliand* into fits according C only, because only this youngest manuscript structures the text in this way.
2. (15) cannot be analysed as a temporal subclause as it is clearly divided from the previous sentence and is continued as follows: (...) *so im is herro gibod* ‘as his master told him’.
3. Eypórsson (1996: 116) describes OHG Vlate declaratives as “isolated (...) examples reflect[ing] a more archaic stage of Germanic” and therefore excludes them from his analysis. OS he states to be regularly V2.
4. E.g. Eypórsson (1996: 123) considers this solution.
5. For a more detailed discussion see also Petrova and Solf (in this vol.).
6. I follow the model presented in Hinterhölzl and Petrova (t.a.)
7. (21) is definitely not conjoined to a subordinate clause.
8. See also (15) and (16) above.
9. One can be inclined to explain the order of the preverbal elements e.g. in (22) as a realisation of Behaghel’s law of placing longer constituents after shorter ones (Behaghel 1932: 6). However, we think that principles of linear order stated by Behaghel are a correlate of pragmatic distinctions: in the cited OS data the preverbal elements are clearly ordered with respect to their salience.
10. Again, so-called long constituents like PP-complements may be extraposed independently of their information structural status.
11. See also Önnersfors (1997: 120ff).

Primary Text

[Hel] *Heliand*. Titelaufgabe vermehrt um das Prager Fragment des *Heliand* und die Vaticanischen Fragmente von *Heliand* und *Genesis*. Ed. by E. Sievers, Paderborn 1878.

References

- Asher, Nicholas and Alex Lascarides
 2003 *Logics of conservation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Axel, Katrin
 2007 *Studies on Old High German Syntax: Left Sentence Periphery, Verb Placement and Verb-Second*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bästlein, Ulf Christian

- 1991 *Gliederungsinitialen in frühmittelalterlichen Epenhandschriften: Studie zur Problematik ihres Auftretens, ihrer Entwicklung und Funktion in lateinischen und volkssprachlichen Texten der Karolinger- und Ottonenzeit.* Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Behaghel, Otto

- 1897 *Die Syntax des Heliand.* Wien: Tempsky.
1932 *Deutsche Syntax.* Band IV. Heidelberg: Winter.

Delbrück, Berthold

- 1911 *Germanische Syntax II: Zur Stellung des Verbuns.* Leipzig: Karl Teubner.

Donhauser, Karin and Roland Hinterhölzl

- 2003 Die Rolle der Informationsstruktur bei der Herausstellung von Wortstellungsregularitäten im Germanischen. In *Informationsstruktur: Die sprachlichen Mittel der Gliederung von Äußerung, Satz und Text.* Finanzierungsantrag 2003–2007, ed. Caroline Féry, 173–193. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.

Drubig, Bernhard

- 1992 Zur Frage der grammatischen Repräsentationen thetischer und kategorischer Sätze. In *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 4*, ed. Joachim Jacobs, 142–195. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Erickson, Jon

- 1997 Some observations on word order in Old Saxon. In *Sprache im Fokus*, eds. Christa Dürscheid, Karl Heinz Ramers and Monika Schwarz, 95–105. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Eyþórsson, Þórhallur

- 1996 Functional Categories, Cliticization, and Verb Movement in the Early Germanic Languages. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax.* Vol. II, eds. Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel D. Epstein and Steve Peter, 109–139. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fourquet, Jean

- 1974 Genetische Betrachtungen über den deutschen Satzbau. In *Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters*, eds. Werner Besch, Günther Jungbluth, Gerhard Maissburger and Eberhard Nellmann, 314–323. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Gallée, Johan Hendrik

- 1993 *Altsächsische Grammatik.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Gundel, Jeanette

- 1988 Universals of topic-comment structure. In *Studies in Syntactic Typology*, eds. Michael Hammond, Edith A. Moravcsik and Jessica R. Wirth, 209–239. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Hinterhölzl, Roland and Svetlana Petrova
 to app. Rhetorical Relations and Verb Placement in Old High German Tatian. In *Saliency: Multi-disciplinary perspectives on its function in discourse*, eds. Christian Chiarcos, Berry Claus and Michael Grabski. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hockett, Charles F.
 1958 *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Mac Millan.
- Karttunen, Lauri
 1976 Discourse Referents. In *Syntax and Semantics 7: Notes from the Linguistic Underground*, ed. James McCawley, 363–385. New York: Academic Press.
- Kemenade, Ans van
 1987 *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kiparsky, Paul
 1995 Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax. In *Clause Structure and Language Change*, eds. Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts, 140–169. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George
 1976 Pronouns and Reference. In *Syntax and Semantics 7: Notes from the Linguistic Underground*, ed. James McCawley, 275–335. New York: Academic Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud
 1994 *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lenerz, Jürgen
 1984 *Syntaktischer Wandel und Grammatiktheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Mann, William and Sandra Thompson
 1988 Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text* 8 (3): 243–281.
- Önnerfors, Olaf
 1997 *Verb-erst-Deklarativsätze: Grammatik und Pragmatik*. Stockholm: Alqvist & Wiksell.
- Petrova, Svetlana and Michael Solf
 this vol. On the Methods of Information-Structural Analysis in Historical Texts: A Case Study on the OHG Tatian.
- Rauch, Irmengard
 1992 *The Old Saxon Language*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Reinhart, Tanya
 1981 Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.

Ries, John

1880 *Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Heliand*. Strassburg/London: Karl J. Trübner.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen

1987 Thethetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics* 25: 511–580.

