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Old Icelandic relative clauses are frequently preceded by the pronoun sá, considered by most grammars to be a demonstrative. Using a large corpus of Old Icelandic prose, I show that when sá precedes relative clauses, it is often ambiguous between a cataphoric demonstrative (referring ahead to a relative clause) and relative pronoun (part of the relative clause). Syntactic and prosodic evidence indicates that, at least in some instances, sá is unambiguously a relative pronoun, used in tandem with the particle er; thus Old Icelandic relative clauses seem to have doubly filled COMP. A notable characteristic of relative sá is its pervasive attraction to the case of the matrix antecedent. I argue that case attraction represents an intermediate stage in the reanalysis of sá from a demonstrative to a true relative pronoun. Structurally, case-attracting relative pronouns and true relative pronouns occupy different functional positions within a split-CP system. Sá achieved the final stage of the development in the seventeenth century, but rapidly declined under competition with the complementizer sem, thus leaving the false impression that sá never developed beyond the case-attraction stage.
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1. INTRODUCTION. In the languages of western Europe, there are two types of relativizers: relative pronouns (e.g. English which, Spanish quien, Standard German der) and relative complementizers (e.g. English that, Spanish que, Norwegian som).¹ Relative pronouns may show pronoun-like agreement features and may be similar to either demonstrative pronouns or wh-pronouns, while relative complementizers are often homophonous with other complementizers (Harbert 2007:424–26). To account for the fact that English relative clauses employ one of these two types, but never both together, Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) proposed the DOUBLY FILLED COMP FILTER. However, subsequent work has demonstrated that the doubly filled COMP filter is not universal; relative clauses containing both a pronoun and a complementizer can be found in languages such as Bavarian German (1) and Middle English (2).

(1) Der Hund der wo gestern d’ Katz bissn hod (Bavarian German)
the dog der rp yesterday the cat bitten has
‘The dog that bit the cat yesterday’ (Bayer 1984:213)

---

¹ I thank the audiences of the 13th Diachronic Generative Syntax conference at the University of Pennsylvania, the 18th Germanic Linguistics Annual Conference at Indiana University, the 22nd Germanic Linguistics Annual Conference at the University of Iceland, and Dorian Roehrs for helpful feedback on earlier versions of this paper. I especially thank the editors and anonymous referees of Language for challenging me to look at additional data and strengthen my analysis.

² These represent just two of the relativization strategies in the languages of the world. For more on the pronoun/particle distinction and a comparison with other relativization types, see de Vries 2001 and references therein.

---

² In the examples throughout this article, antecedents, (potentially) relative pronouns, and relative particles are in boldface. The glosses employ the following abbreviations: ABL: ablativa, ACC: accusative, DAT: dative, GEN: genitive, NOM: nominative, PASS: passive, PL: plural, REFL: reflexive, RP: relative particle/complementizer, SG: singular, ST: strong adjective inflection, WK: weak adjective inflection. All examples are from Old Norse (mostly Old Icelandic) unless otherwise indicated.
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only the sight of hire whom that I serve

(2) only the sight of her whom I serve

(Middle English)

Bayer (1984) proposed that *wo* in (1) is in the position of complementizers, while the pronoun *der* is in the landing site of WH-movement. In X-bar-theoretic terms, relative complementizers are heads base-generated in the C position, while relative pronouns are phrases that move to Spec-CP, leaving a trace in the position of the relativized argument (Fanselow & Felix 1987:143).

In Icelandic, the most frequent relativizers, *sem* and *er*, are not relative pronouns but complementizers (Thráínsson 1980, 2007, Jónsson 2017), or traditionally ‘relative particles’ (RP). In Old Icelandic, this invariant relative particle may be preceded by a pronoun, usually *sá*, which is homophonous with the demonstrative pronoun. This pronoun is considered a demonstrative by some (Nygaard 1905:261–62, Gordon 1988:296, Faarlund 2004:264, Wágner 2017:126ff.), a correlative pronoun by Lindblad (1943), and a relative pronoun by Áfarli (1995).3 If *sá* is indeed a relative pronoun, Old Icelandic has relative clauses with both C and Spec-CP occupied by overt elements, as in Bavarian.4

The primary reason that traditional scholars have viewed *sá* as a demonstrative, even when immediately preceding a relative clause, is that it nearly always bears the case of its antecedent rather than that of the relativized argument (Nygaard 1905:261).5 In (3), *sá* appears in the masculine accusative singular form *þann*, agreeing with the accusative antecedent *jarl*, rather than appearing in the nominative case of the relativized subject. Likewise, in (4), *sá* appears in the genitive as *þess* in agreement with the antecedent *Herodís*.6

(3) Hann setti *jarl* í hverju fylki, *þann er* dœma skyldi log

He set earl.Acc in each district sá.Acc RP[e].NOM judge should law

‘He placed an earl in each district, who should judge the law.’

(Heimskringla 98)

---

3 Lindblad’s ‘correlative’ is a pronoun in the antecedent DP that cataphorically refers to a subsequent relative clause. However, such pronouns are syntactically indistinguishable from other demonstratives, and Wágner (2017:79) claims that the demonstrative and correlative functions of *sá* can both be subsumed under ‘unique reference’. Because correlatives are a type of demonstrative, in this article they are described as ‘cataphoric demonstratives’.

4 According to Thráínsson (2007:449–50), Modern Icelandic has some double complementizers like *sem að*, but does not allow a pronominal relativizer followed by a complementizer such as *hver sem*. However, these do occur in Old Icelandic, as in (5). See Larsson 2014 for more on this and other types of double complementizers in modern Scandinavian languages.

5 According to Nygaard (1905:261), pronouns very rarely bear the case of the relativized argument in the ‘popular style’. However, this is common in the ‘learned style’, which Nygaard (1905:263) argues is an imitation of Latin syntax. Heusler (1950:159) claims that *sá* can have the relativized case only in ‘lose angeknüpften Sätze’ (‘loosely connected clauses’); while it is possible that Heusler means by this nonrestrictive relative clauses, I find virtually no examples of nonattracting *sá* regardless of the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction. (See Evans 2017 on the effect of this distinction on case attraction in Old High German.) Nonattracting *sá* in my corpus is further discussed in §4.2 below.

6 Note that (1) is from Heimskringla (Áðalbjarnarson 1979, which is not in the Icelandic Parsed Historical Corpus (IcePaHC)), while all other Icelandic examples are from IcePaHC unless otherwise indicated. Punctuation in the examples is as reported in the sources and may correspond to edited versions of these texts rather than the manuscripts. As noted above, antecedents, potential relative pronouns, and relative particles are in bold. When relevant, the position and case of the relativized argument is given in the gloss as [e]. Glosses and translations of Icelandic examples are my own.
The case facts are the main reason to believe that *sá* is a demonstrative here and not a relative pronoun; Nygaard (1905:256) goes so far as to state that vernacular Old Norse has no relative pronouns, a claim repeated by Heusler (1950:158). Most recently, Wagener (2017) has argued that *sá* cannot be a relative pronoun, not only because of the case facts, but also due to its distribution: it often precedes the antecedent rather than the relative clause, it does not occur with demonstrative *sá* in the same DP, and (in Wagener’s corpus) it is never repeated in stacked relative clauses.\(^7\)

Nevertheless, it is possible to treat such uses of *sá* as relative pronouns, based on two assumptions. First, *sá* can be considered a relative pronoun that displays case attraction (as in Åfarli 1995). In other words, syntactically it can be part of the relative clause, although in terms of morphology its case matches that of the matrix antecedent. This analysis seems plausible for Old Icelandic, given that case attraction occurs with relative pronouns in other Germanic languages (for details, see §4.1). The second assumption is that *sá* has only recently been reanalyzed as a relative pronoun in Old Icelandic, so that the relative and demonstrative uses of *sá* continue side by side. This explains why *sá* sometimes shows distributional properties of a relative pronoun (e.g. preceding the relative clause) and other times behaves as a demonstrative pronoun (preceding the antecedent). I propose that these two assumptions are related: case attraction represents an intermediate stage in the reanalysis from demonstrative pronouns to relative pronouns, and it is this intermediate stage that is captured by literary Old Icelandic. Unlike the development in German, however, in which case attraction declined and the pronoun in question became an unambiguous, nonattracting relative pronoun, in Icelandic the relative use of *sá* achieved the final stage of the reanalysis just as it was being fully replaced by the uninflected relative complementizer *sem*. Because nonattracting *sá* disappeared shortly after it entered the final stage of its development, we are left with the false impression that the reanalysis of *sá* from a demonstrative to a relative pronoun got stuck in the transitional, case-attraction stage.

The data in this article are drawn from the Icelandic Parsed Historical Corpus (IcePaHC v. 0.9; Wallenberg et al. 2011), which spans the whole history of Icelandic from the twelfth to the twenty-first centuries. With a coding query written in the Corpus Search language (Randall 2009), I extracted 26,110 DPs from IcePaHC, over 10,400 of which contain a relative clause and over 15,600 of which contain a demonstrative but no relative clause. Each DP is tagged for: type of relative particle; type of demonstrative; presence or absence of a relative clause; position of the demonstrative vis-à-vis any antecedent noun, adjective, quantifier, possessor, other demonstrative, or relative clause; case of the antecedent noun, demonstrative, and trace in the relative clause; and century. The results were loaded into R (R Core Team 2013) for analysis.

In this article, I use the terms ‘demonstrative’ and ‘relative’ pronoun as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
(5) & \quad \text{TERM} & \quad \text{STRUCTURE} \\
& a. \quad \text{demonstrative} & \{sá\} \text{NP}_1 \{sá\} [\text{CP} \text{pro}_1 [c \text{er/sem} \ldots e_i] \\
& b. \quad \text{case-attracting relative} & \text{NP}_1 [\text{CP} sá_i [c \text{er/sem} \ldots e_i] \\
& c. \quad \text{nonattracting/true relative} & \text{NP}_1 [\text{CP} sá_i [c \text{er/sem} \ldots t_i] \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^7\) I take up Wagener’s arguments against the relative analysis of *sá* in §3.5 below.
The demonstrative in 5a is part of the matrix DP and can either precede or follow the matrix N.8 Demonstratives can have a number of functions, including extralinguistic deixis (referring to a referent in the real world) and intralinguistic reference, either anaphorically to a referent earlier in the linguistic context or cataphorically to a following relative clause (the semantics of each Old Icelandic demonstrative is discussed in §2.1 below). Relative pronouns, by contrast, are in the relative clause. I argue in §4 below that case-attracting relative pronouns are generated in the highest projection of the CP layer of the relative clause (5b), while true relative pronouns are generated in the position of the relativized argument and wh-move to Spec-CP (5c).9 I argue that the original function of sá was as a demonstrative (5a), a function that continues into Modern Icelandic. Alongside that demonstrative use of sá, it was reanalyzed in some contexts as a case-attracting relative in Old Icelandic (5b). In early-modern Icelandic, there is evidence that sá was further reanalyzed to a nonattracting relative pronoun (5c), a function that disappeared from the language by the modern period.

Distinguishing demonstratives from relative pronouns in Old Icelandic is not, however, always clear cut. Setting aside case, relative pronouns can be distinguished from demonstratives in three ways: (i) relative pronouns are in the embedded clause, while demonstratives are outside it; (ii) relative pronouns are an argument of the embedded clause, while demonstratives have deictic or referential properties (Wagener 2017); and (iii) relative pronouns are unstressed, while demonstratives may be stressed (Diessel 1999:121). But on these criteria, many instances of sá are ambiguous between a demonstrative and relative pronoun, because Icelandic demonstratives can appear in various positions within the DP, demonstrative sá can cataphorically refer to a relative clause, and information about stress is not recoverable in prose texts. Therefore, I consider sá an unambiguous demonstrative if it has the deictic or contrastive semantics of a demonstrative determiner, regardless of word order. It is also categorized as an unambiguous demonstrative if it is nonadjacent to the relative clause. When sá occurs between the matrix N and the relative clause, I consider it ambiguous between a cataphoric demonstrative and a case-attracting relative pronoun. Sá is considered an unambiguous relative pronoun if it is at the beginning of the relative clause but nonadjacent to the antecedent DP, if there is evidence from punctuation or metrics that it belongs prosodically with the relative clause, or if it fails to show case attraction.

I next present the basic distribution of the various relative particles and demonstrative/relative pronouns in the history of Icelandic (§2). This part of the study largely confirms the developments mentioned in previous studies such as Nygaard 1905 and Thráinsson 1980. In §3, I use a number of diagnostics to demonstrate that in Old Icelandic, while it is often ambiguous, sá can sometimes be in the relative clause: that is, it can be a case-attracting relative pronoun, contra Wagener 2017. Section 4 then compares Old Icelandic case attraction to that in the other Germanic languages and accounts for case attraction as the result of the reanalysis of sá from a demonstrative to a relative pronoun. Finally, I discuss the development of sá in terms of grammaticalization, cyclic change, and the doubly filled COMP filter (§5) and then briefly conclude (§6).

8 I assume the DP hypothesis of Abney 1987. Throughout, I use ‘NP’ to indicate a projection that contains N but not D, as in 5a, except when reporting on studies that do not assume the DP hypothesis.
9 While 5b and 5c appear to be structurally identical, I argue in §4 that Old Icelandic has a split-CP system and that case-attracting and nonattracting sá are in different Specs of the CP layer.
2. Basic diachronic trends.

2.1. Distribution of demonstrative pronouns in relative contexts. As mentioned in §1, the relative particles sem and er are often preceded by a pronoun in Old Icelandic. This is most frequently the demonstrative sá, but one can also find the interrogative pronoun hverr or the other demonstratives sjá/þessi (hereafter simply referred to as þessi) or hinn. The paradigms for the three demonstrative pronouns are given in Tables 1–3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. G.</td>
<td>sá</td>
<td>sú</td>
<td>þat</td>
<td>þeir</td>
<td>þær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>þann</td>
<td>þá</td>
<td>þá</td>
<td>þá</td>
<td>þá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>þeim</td>
<td>þeirri</td>
<td>þvi</td>
<td>þeim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>þess</td>
<td>þeirrar</td>
<td>þess</td>
<td>þeirra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Paradigm for sá (Gordon 1988:295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. G.</td>
<td>sjá/þessi</td>
<td>sjá/þessi</td>
<td>þetta</td>
<td>þessir</td>
<td>þessar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>þenna</td>
<td>þessa</td>
<td>þetta</td>
<td>þessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>þessum</td>
<td>þessi</td>
<td>þessui</td>
<td>þessum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>þessa</td>
<td>þessar</td>
<td>þessa</td>
<td>þessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Paradigm for sjá/þessi (Gordon 1988:295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. G.</td>
<td>hinn</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>hitt</td>
<td>hinir</td>
<td>hinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>hinn</td>
<td>hina</td>
<td>hina</td>
<td>hina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>hinum</td>
<td>hinni</td>
<td>hinu</td>
<td>hinum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>hins</td>
<td>hinnar</td>
<td>hins</td>
<td>hinnar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Paradigm for hinn (Gordon 1988:294–95).

Before we look at the occurrence of the pronouns in relative contexts, some discussion of the semantic differences between the three demonstratives is necessary. We begin with þessi, which is the proximal demonstrative (‘this’). Wagener (2017:64–65) notes that þessi can point to a referent in the linguistic context (as an anaphor) or in the situational (extralinguistic) context. The demonstrative sá is argued by Wagener (2017:67) to have ‘unique reference’, which largely corresponds to Bickerton’s (1981) features [+hearer knowledge, ±specific]. Despite the fact that sá has been traditionally described as a distal demonstrative ‘that’ (e.g. Gordon 1988:295), Wagener (2017:67) finds that it has deixis only within the linguistic context, as a so-called ‘anaphoric demonstrative’. Even in relative contexts, Wagener (2017:79) claims that sá usually has unique reference, signaling that the reference of the antecedent is to be found in the subsequent relative clause; however, there are also some instances where sá lacks unique reference (Wagener 2017:124). Finally, while hinn is etymologically a demonstrative pronoun, by the time of Old Icelandic it had evolved into a preadjectival definite article hinn. According to Wagener (2017:69), hinn has unique reference like sá, but unlike sá it cannot be anaphoric.10

10 Throughout this article, hinn refers to a nonclitic demonstrative/article. The clitic article, which is coded differently from the nonclitic demonstrative in IcePaHC, is referred to as -inn here. According to Wagener (2017:67), -inn differs from both sá and hinn in that it is always [+specific].
Table 4 below shows the frequency of the various pronouns occurring in the same DP as a relative clause. The counts for *sá* include instances in which *sá* is unambiguously a demonstrative, those that are ambiguous between a demonstrative and a relative interpretation (like example 4 above), and those that are argued to be unambiguous relative pronouns (details in §3). As for *þessi* (6) and *hinn* (7), I argue below that these are unlikely to be relative pronouns even when immediately preceding a relative clause, but they have been included anytime they occur in a relative context. WH-pronouns can of course be used in interrogatives, but the numbers below reflect their use as relative pronouns only, as in 8.

(6) Hafi *stafróf þetta er* hér er áður ritað
have alphabet this RP here is before written
‘Let him have this alphabet that is written above (until he gets a better one)’

(7) *in* helga *María, er* bar Drottin
the holy Mary RP bore Lord
‘the holy Mary, who bore the Lord’

(8) *kom* einn kóngur virðuligur og voldugur *hver er* hét
came a king honorable and mighty who RP was.called T.
‘came an honorable and mighty king who was called Translatius’

### Table 4. Types of pronouns occurring with relative clauses by century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th><em>sá</em></th>
<th><em>þessi</em></th>
<th><em>hinn</em></th>
<th>WH-pronoun</th>
<th>No pronoun</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th century</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th century</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th century</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st century</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>10,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportions for Table 4 are illustrated in Figure 1. Most relative clauses in Old Icelandic have one of the pronouns preceding the relative clause. By far the most frequent pronoun is *sá*, occurring with around 63–81% of relative clauses in the twelfth through fifteenth centuries. (Similarly, Wagener (2017:63) finds very high frequencies of *sá* before relative clauses.) The other two demonstratives and the wh-pronoun are much less frequent in relative contexts in Old Icelandic, although the wh-pronoun does experience a period of popularity from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Beginning in the sixteenth century, relative clauses with no pronoun become the most frequent type.

### 2.2. Distribution of the relative particles.

Next, let us examine the distribution of the relative particles (i.e. complementizers) *er* and *sem*. Table 5 gives the frequencies in each century of relative clauses introduced by *er, sem*, other particles (the infrequent *að, eð, sem að*, and *það*), and no particle. The proportions are illustrated graphically in Figure 2.

Throughout the history of Icelandic, *er* and *sem* exist side by side. Until 1500, *er* is the most frequent particle, although *sem* steadily increases over each century. From
1500 to 1900, *sem* occurs in about half of relative clauses, competing with *er* and the infrequent particles (see Thráinsson 1980:68 on relative *að* and *eð* and 1980:85–86 on *sem að*).

An additional possibility until the twentieth century was the option to have no relative particle at all, which occurs mostly in the religious texts of IcePaHC. Some of these involve *sá* (9). Especially in religious texts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we find relative clauses with no particle and the wh-pronoun *hverr* ‘who’, which does not display case attraction (10); arguably, these are an imitation of Latin relative clauses (see Thráinsson 1980:70–72).

(9) Og sá það *margir vitrir menn þeir* hjá honum voru
and saw that many wise *men.nom sá.nom* with him were
‘and many wise men who were with him saw that … ’

(1210.THÓRLAKUR.REL-SAG,.73)
hrærðist sá stað-ur, í hver-jum þeir voru til samans safnaðir
‘that place in which they had gathered together shook’

(1540.NTACTS.REL-BIB,239.184)

In the twentieth- and twenty-first-century texts in the corpus, sem dominates, with the only other option being the increasingly rare er, which Thráinsson (1980:96) states is formal in Modern Icelandic.

To sum up this section, there are two main developments in the history of Icelandic relative clauses. First, and most important for this article, is the high frequency of the supposed demonstrative pronoun sá in the context of relative clauses in Old Icelandic, followed by its decline. The next section argues that sá in relative contexts has been reanalyzed as a relative pronoun, albeit a case-attracting one. The second development is the decline of the relative complementizer er (along with some minor patterns) in favor of the relative complementizer sem. I claim that these two developments are related in the following way. As argued in §4, sá achieves the final stage of the reanalysis of sá to a more typical, nonattracting relative pronoun only in the seventeenth century, just as sem is beginning to take over as the sole marker of relative clauses.

3. OLD ICELANDIC SÁ AS A RELATIVE PRONOUN. Having seen the basic diachronic developments in relative clauses over the history of Icelandic, we now look more closely at the high rate of sá before relative clauses in Old Icelandic (twelfth to fifteenth centuries). I argue that sá frequently precedes relative clauses because it is specialized as...
introducing relative clauses, either as a cataphoric demonstrative in the antecedent DP, or in some cases as a case-attracting relative pronoun.

There are several reasons to believe that sá, when it occurs immediately before a relative clause, has developed a specialized function of introducing relative clauses. First, I show that sá behaves differently from other demonstratives, in that only sá frequently occurs with relative clauses (§3.1), and then that, unlike the other demonstratives, it frequently lacks definiteness and demonstrative force when preceding a relative clause (§3.2). Section 3.3 argues that when a relative clause follows, sá is found in a number of word orders vis-à-vis elements in the matrix DP that are otherwise not seen. Some prosodic evidence from the philological record, which is the clearest indication that sá can be a relative pronoun, is examined in §3.4. Finally, I address some recent arguments that sá is not a relative pronoun (§3.5).

3.1. Sá and Other Demonstratives. First, recall from §2.2 that sá is by far the most common demonstrative in DPs also containing a relative clause. In fact, of the 4,371 instances of sá in the twelfth- to fifteenth-century texts of IcePaHC, 65% occur with a relative clause. Compare this to the other two demonstratives in Table 6, which occur with relative clauses only 3–4% of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Context?</th>
<th>sá</th>
<th>þessi</th>
<th>hinn</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>5,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,377</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Old Icelandic demonstratives in relative and nonrelative contexts.

When þessi and (nonclitic) hinn occur in the same DP as a relative clause, they appear to preserve their basic functions discussed in §2.1 above. The demonstrative þessi preserves its proximal deixis as in 6 above, and hinn precedes an adjective as in 7. However, when sá occurs before a relative clause, it very often has no demonstrative meaning.

(11) hver tunga hefir hljóð þau er eigi finna-st í annarri.
    each tongue has sounds sá RP not find-pass in another
    ‘every language has (*those) sounds that are not found in others’
    (1150.FIRSTGRAMMAR.SCI-LIN,.5)

In examples like 11, it seems that sá merely anticipates the following relative clause. However, it is entirely possible that sá here is still syntactically a demonstrative, given the fact that in Old Icelandic, demonstratives can precede or follow the head N. Even less clear are the instances where there is no antecedent N, as in 12a. One could interpret sá as a demonstrative, in which case it serves as the antecedent of the relative clause (12b). Alternatively, one could interpret such cases as free (headless) relatives: if correct, there is no antecedent, and sá is part of the relative clause (12c).

(12) a. hún gjörði-st verð að bera þann [e] oss leysti
    she made-refl worthy to bear sá ACC RP [e] us saved
    ‘she made herself worthy to bear him, who saved us … ’
    (1150.HOMILIUBOK.REL-SER,.51)

b. demonstrative pronoun: að bera þann [CP [e] er oss leysti]
c. relative pronoun: að bera [CP þann er oss leysti]

Setting aside free relatives, the frequent occurrence of sá with relative clauses, together with the fact that this use of sá can lack demonstrative semantics, indicates that sá has a specialized function in relative contexts, besides its original use as a demonstrative. Lindblad (1943) and Wagener (2017) argue that this use of sá merely refers to
the following relative clause but is not a relative pronoun inside the relative clause. Whether sá is a cataphorically referring demonstrative pronoun or a relative pronoun is thus a purely syntactic question and is difficult to decide on semantic grounds. After a brief discussion of the semantics of sá in the presence of a relative clause (§3.2), I therefore present word-order evidence that sá is sometimes a cataphoric demonstrative but other times a case-attracting relative pronoun (§3.3). While much of these data are ambiguous, §3.4 presents prosodic evidence for sá as a case-attracting relative pronoun.

3.2. The semantics of sá in relative contexts. In many cases, it is difficult to directly determine the semantics of sá in historical texts. If the antecedent is definite, it is difficult to rule out the possibility that sá retains its demonstrative semantics, modifying the antecedent N. Recall example 4, repeated here as 13, where the antecedent Herod contrasts with one of his sons, also named Herod. It is thus possible to read þess as an anaphoric demonstrative (‘that Herod’). But because Herod is a proper name, it does not need a determiner to mark it as definite, so þess could be a correlative/cataphorically referring demonstrative, merely anticipating the relative clause, or it could even be a genuine relative pronoun (representing the relativized argument of the embedded clause).

(13) synir Herodis þess, er börnum lét fara. [= 4] sons H. sá RP children let kill demonstrative: ‘… sons of that Herod, who had the children killed.’ (cor)relative: ‘… sons of Herod, who had the children killed.’

Consequently, post-N sá is often semantically and structurally ambiguous between a demonstrative and a relative pronoun.

Wagener (2017:124) claims that while sá usually has ‘unique reference’ (see §2.1 above), some instances of sá preceding relative clauses fail to refer uniquely. Such cases show that sá has added a function of introducing a relative clause, either as a cataphoric demonstrative or as a relative pronoun. However, because referentiality is not coded in IcePaHC, I have not been able to directly replicate Wagener’s result in my corpus. Nor does Icelandic have obligatory indefinite articles, so most indefinite Ns are not marked, making them impossible to find through an automated search. Nevertheless, in reading over examples, I have identified a few in which an unmarked, indefinite DP contains both sá and a relative clause.

(14) a. Hann setti jarl í hverju fylki, þann er dœma skyldi lǫg [= 3] he set earl in each district sá RP judge should law ‘He placed an earl in each district, who should judge the law.’ *‘He placed an earl in each district, the one who should judge the law.’ b. hver tunga hefir hjóðu þau er eigi finna-st í annari. [= 11] each tongue has sounds sá RP not find-pass in another ‘every language has sounds that are not found in others’ *‘every language has those sounds that are not found in others’ c. áttu þau son þann er Gunnbjörn hét had they son sá RP G. was.called ‘they had a son who was called Gunnbjörn’ *‘they had that son who was called Gunnbjörn’

In 14a, jarl is clearly indefinite, as the particular earl that has been assigned to any given district is unknown to the reader. In 14b, the particular sounds that each language has are not specified, and are thus unknown to the reader and indefinite. In 14c, son must be indefinite, because Gunnbjörn has not yet been introduced to the discourse, nor
does the couple have another son named Gunnbjörn who is an alternative to this Gunnbjörn. In these (admittedly few) clear cases, *sá* is [−hearer knowledge] and therefore does not have Wagener’s ‘unique reference’. Lacking the original function of demonstrative *sá*, here *sá* simply refers to the relative clause (if a cataphoric demonstrative) or is part of the relative clause (if a relative pronoun).

One way to automatically identify instances in which *sá* seems to occur in an indefinite DP is to search for those cases in which *sá* occurs with *einn* (ambiguous between the numeral ‘one’ and an indefinite, specific determiner ‘a certain’; see Faarlund 2004: 74). Beginning with *einn*, we first need to rule out examples where it is the numeral ‘one’, as these are not necessarily indefinite. Indeed, many instances of *einn* occurring with a demonstrative involve the numeral *einn* as in 15, which is to be expected because a demonstrative determiner and indefinite marker should not cooccur. In all such cases, *sá* precedes the N (mostly the order D > *einn* > N but also a few instances of *einn* > D > N), indicating that *sá* is a true demonstrative here.

(15) Nú er *sá* *einn* hlutur er óskilað er.
   now is *sá* *einn* part RP undecided is
   ‘Now there is that one thing that is not decided.’

(1350.BANDAMENNM.NAR-SAG,.172)

In other examples, *einn* is not the numeral ‘one’ but a determiner with indefinite, specific reference, in other words [−hearer knowledge, +specific]. In such cases, *sá* is incompatible with the [+hearer knowledge] interpretation that is for Wagener (2017) the main function of demonstrative *sá*. In many of these cases the noun in question is clearly discourse-new, because the relative clause specifies the name, as in 16.12 In all fifteen examples of this, *sá* immediately precedes the relative clause, suggesting a close connection between this pronoun and the relative clause.

(16) og kom þeir of kveld-ið til búanda eins, þess er *Atli* hét,
   and come they at evening-the to farmer *einn* *sá* RP *Atli* was.called
   ‘and they went in the evening to a certain farmer who was called *Atli*’
   *(and they went in the evening to one farmer, the one who was called *Atli*’

(1260.JOMSVIKINGAR.NAR-SAG,.1053)

Another way to identify indefinite DPs with *sá* is by searching for the occurrence of *sá* with indefinite quantifiers such as *enginn* ‘none’, *nokkur* ‘some’, and *margr* ‘many’.13 These occur in the same DP as *sá* thirty-four times in my corpus, but all instances of this also contain a relative clause. Again, this shows that *sá* does not have its original demonstrative function here, but merely introduces a relative clause. When *sá* is not adjacent to the relative clause, it must be a cataphoric demonstrative (17a), and when it immediately precedes the relative particle, it is structurally ambiguous between a cataphoric demonstrative and a genuine relative pronoun (17b).

12 Heusler (1950:160–61) makes a similar claim, pointing out that the woman in example (i) is unknown at this point in the story.

(i) þá fundo menn hans *kono*, þá er þeir höfþo enga sét íafnvǽna
   then found men his woman *sá* RP they.had none seen equally.beautiful
   ‘then his men found a woman, such that they had never seen an equally beautiful one’

13 I thank a referee for this suggestion. Similar examples are given by Faarlund (2004:85) and Dyvik (1979: 56).
(17) a. ... var engi sá riddari að nokkura íþróttþyrfti við þá að
that was none sá knight RP any sport needed against him to
try
‘that there was no knight who needed to compete against him in any
sport’ (1480.JARLMANN.NAR-SAG,.23)

b. að hann leyndi bréfi nokkuru, þvi er honum hafði sent einn af
that he hid letter some sá RP him had sent one of
riddurum
knights
‘that he hid some letter, which one of the knights had sent him’
(1300.ALEXANDER.NAR-SAG,.496)

These examples of sá occurring in an indefinite DP are in line with Wagener’s finding
that sá can lack unique reference in the presence of a relative clause. I interpret this to
mean that in such examples, sá merely anticipates the relative clause as a cataphoric
demonstrative or is part of the relative clause as a relative pronoun.

3.3. RELATIVE SÁ AND DEMONSTRATIVE SÁ HAVE DIFFERENT WORD ORDERS IN THE
DP. In previous sections, we have seen that sá is much more likely than other demon-
stratives to occur with a relative clause and that it can lack its usual referential prop-
erties in such instances. In this section, I present word-order evidence that the sá that
precedes relative clauses behaves differently from sá in nonrelative contexts.

N > sá. First of all, note that demonstratives typically appear before their nouns in
Icelandic: Table 7 shows that of the 2,561 instances of sá and an N in the Old Icelandic
subset of the corpus, 1,885 have sá (directly or indirectly) preceding N. These cases of
sá preceding the noun are about evenly split into relative contexts (42%) and DPs with
no relative (58%). These are clearly demonstratives, because even those that occur with
a relative clause are separated from the relative clause by the head N, as in 18.14

(18) Sá stafur er hér [er] ritinn c
the letter RP here is written c
‘The letter that here is written c’ (1150.FIRSTGRAMMAR.SCI-LIN,.111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative context?</th>
<th>sá &gt; N</th>
<th>N imm. &gt; sá</th>
<th>N &gt; sá</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>800 (42%)</td>
<td>529 (88%)</td>
<td>76 (97%)</td>
<td>1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>1,085 (58%)</td>
<td>69 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Order of Old Icelandic sá and N in relative and nonrelative contexts.

By contrast, sá following the N is very likely to occur with a relative clause.15 Of the
instances of sá immediately following the N, 88% occur in relative contexts; most of
these (508 of the 529) are directly before the relative clause. These are syntactically and
semantically ambiguous between a cataphorically referring demonstrative and a rela-
tive pronoun, as in examples 14b–c. The remaining twenty-one examples, not directly
before a relative clause, are not compatible with an analysis as relative pronouns; such
examples must involve cataphoric demonstrative sá.

14 The second instance of er in this example, which is the third singular present of vera ’to be’, is missing in IcePaHC but is present in other editions, for example, https://etext.old.no/gramm/.
15 Heusler (1950:159–60) also finds that sá can occur in the middle of the matrix clause or directly before the relative clause.
(19) Vér eigum dag þann fyr hendi, er dómadagur heitir.
we have day at hand RP doomsday calls
‘We have that/the day at hand that is called doomsday.’

(1150.HOMILIUBOK.REL-SER,.940)

Finally, of the seventy-eight instances of sá following the N with some words between the two (‘N > sá’ in Table 7), seventy-six occur with (and all but one of those immediately precede) a relative clause; being adjacent to the relative clause and not the N, sá clearly is not in the matrix DP. We have already seen one such example (14a); recall that jarl is semantically indefinite, and notice that sá is separated from jarl by a prepositional phrase. In the following additional example, sá is not needed for reference because the antecedent búnað is already universally quantified; moreover, it is positioned adjacent to the relative clause rather than the antecedent.

(20) Tekur hún af allan búnað af barn-inu þann sem á var
takes she off all clothing from child-the that which was on was
*‘She removes from the child all clothing, that which was on it.’
‘She removes from the child all clothing that was on it.’

(1350.FINNBOGI.NAR-SAG,626.103)

Áfarli (1995:539) claims that sentences like 14a and 20 are the clearest syntactic evidence for sá as a relative pronoun, because sá and the relative clause have been extraposed together. In other words, in these examples sá is part of the same constituent as the relative clause.

(20’) Tekur hún af [DP allan búnað [t₁]] af barninu [CP þann sem á var]₁
However, there is another possible analysis of such clauses: it is theoretically possible that sá here is the head of its own DP which is in apposition to búnað, in which case sá alone is the antecedent of the relative clause.¹⁶

(20’’) Tekur hún af [DP allan búnað] af barninu [DP þann [CP sem á var]]
Because the relative clauses in 14a and 20 are restrictive, I find the apposition analysis (as in 20’’) unlikely in both of these cases. Therefore, while some instances of sá plus relative clause might be explained away as involving a DP in apposition, there are at least these two clear examples showing that sá can be extraposed with the relative clause of which it is a part.

To sum up, extraposition indicates that sá is sometimes a cataphoric demonstrative and other times a relative pronoun. On the one hand, there are examples like 19 which clearly indicate that sá remains with the antecedent when the relative clause is extraposed (see also Wagener 2017:57). On the other hand, there is also some clear evidence that sá can extrapose as part of a relative clause, in other words as a relative pronoun (14a, 20).

Adj > N > sá AND N > Adj > sá. Although there are several possible orders of an N, an Adj, and sá in Icelandic, some orders appear to be favored in relative contexts (Table 8). Beginning with orders that occur in all kinds of contexts, the order sá > Adj > N (21a), by far the most frequent order, actually occurs somewhat less frequently with relative clauses (42%) than in nonrelative contexts (58%). Similarly, the order N > sá > Adj (21b) occurs both in relative (58%) and nonrelative contexts (42%). Even in the presence of a relative clause, it is not possible that sá represents a relative pronoun in these orders, as it does not immediately precede the relative clause.

¹⁶ I thank a referee for pointing out this possibility.
(21) a. Og nú hittir konungur þann inn lend-a mann er hennar hafði
and now meets king the landed-wk man RP her had
beðið waited
‘And now the king meets that landed man, who had waited for her’
(1275.MORKIN.NAR-HIS,.103)

b. Í stað þeim, góð-um og dýrleg-um, er í Reykjaholti heitir
in place good-st and glorious-st RP in R. calls
‘In that place, good and glorious, which is called í Reykjaholti … ’
(1210.JARTEIN.REL-SAG,.332)

As further evidence that preadjectival sát is a demonstrative, note that the adjective following sát usually inflects as weak (21a), although there are a few examples of strong adjectives in this position (21b). Typically, determiners in Icelandic occur with a weakly inflected adjective, so the presence of weak adjectives after sát indicates that it is a cataphoric demonstrative here rather than a relative pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE CONTEXT?</th>
<th>sát &gt; Adj &gt; N</th>
<th>N &gt; sát &gt; Adj</th>
<th>Adj &gt; N &gt; sát</th>
<th>N &gt; Adj &gt; sát</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>55 (42%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>38 (97%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>76 (58%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Order of Old Icelandic sát, Adj, and N in relative and nonrelative contexts.

However, two other orders, Adj > N > sát (22a) and N > Adj > sát (22b), are much more likely to precede a relative clause than not: out of forty-two occurrences of these two orders, all but one are followed by a relative clause. Crucially, these are the orders where sát immediately precedes the relative clause.

(22) a. græddi þar sjúk-a menn þá sem til hennar voru færðir,
healed there sick-st men RP to her were led
‘there she healed (the) sick men that were led to her’
(1350.MARTA.REL-SAG,.580)

b. gjalda honum einn penning heil-an, þann er denarius heitir.
give him one penny whole-st RP denarius is called
‘give him one whole coin that is called denarius’
(1150.HOMILIUBOK.REL-SER,.1003)

Interestingly, in all of the examples in which sát follows an adjective but precedes the relative clause, sát fails to trigger weak inflection on the adjective; this seems to indicate that these instances of sát are not in the matrix DP. The generalization emerges that demonstrative sát (in both relative and nonrelative contexts) precedes an adjective, while postadjectival sát has no effect on the adjective’s inflection and occurs almost exclusively in relative contexts, providing another piece of evidence that sát can be a relative pronoun.

Universal Q > sát. It appears that the universal quantifiers allr ‘all’ and hverr ‘each’ can occur with sát in all six logically possible word orders. Two particular orders are very strongly favored when a relative clause follows: all instances of the orders Q > N > sát (23a) and N > Q > sát (23b) occur with a relative clause (see Table 9). Again, these are the two orders with the pronoun last, supporting the idea that in these cases the pronoun in question is closely connected to the relative clause.

17 I thank a referee for prompting me to investigate the inflection of these adjectives.
(23) a. og öllum ríkismónnum þeim sem þar voru gaf hann …
and all nobles sá rp there were gave he
‘and to all nobles that were there, he gave … ’
(1350.FINNBOGI.NAR-SAG,646.1183)
b. að brenna borgir allar þær, er í nánd voru
to burn castles all sá rp in area were
‘to burn all the castles that were nearby’
(1300.ALEXANDER.NAR-SAG,.1104)

### Table 9. Order of Old Icelandic sá, allr/hver, and N in relative and nonrelative contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Context?</th>
<th>Q &gt; N &gt; sá</th>
<th>N &gt; Q &gt; sá</th>
<th>other 4 orders</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>39 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>81 (78%)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>23 (22%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other four logically possible word orders, in which sá precedes either N or Q, can occur in both relative and nonrelative contexts. Thus as with adjectives, linearizations of N, Q, and sá in which sá is the final element are limited to relative clauses, suggesting that sá here is a relative pronoun, or at least a cataphoric demonstrative.

N > Poss > sá and Poss > N > sá. Cooccurrence with a relative clause has no effect on certain word orders in DPs with sá and a possessive or genitive: these occur with near-equal frequency in relative (49%) and nonrelative (51%) contexts. The two orders in which sá is at the end of the string, however, occur only when a relative clause follows: N > possessive > sá (24a) and possessive > N > sá (24b), as seen in Table 10.

(24) a. hann hafðilausa látið menn Sturlu þá er teknir voru …
he had loose let menn Sturla’s sá rp taken were
‘he released Sturla’s men that had been captured…’
(1250.STURLUNGA.NAR-SAG,409.756)
b. sýnast láta hans mildiverk það er eitt var af mörgum öðrum.
appear let his mercy sá rp one was of many others
‘(God wanted to) let his mercy appear, which was one of many.’
(1210.THORLAKUR.REL-SAG,.490)

### Table 10. Order of Old Icelandic sá, possessor, and N in relative and nonrelative contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Context?</th>
<th>N &gt; Poss &gt; sá</th>
<th>Poss &gt; N &gt; sá</th>
<th>other 4 orders</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (46%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>29 (54%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, we find that sá can precede an N or its modifier in both relative and nonrelative contexts, but string-final sá occurs only in the presence of a relative clause, suggesting a specialized function of introducing relative clauses.

N+DEF > sá. Finally, sá can occur with an N that has the clitic definite article -inn. When sá precedes the definite N, this order occurs about equally frequently in relative and nonrelative contexts (Table 11). However, the order N-inn > sá occurs only before a relative clause, as in 25.

(25) norður eftir forskála-num þeim sem til kirkju er.
north toward antechamber-the sá rp at church is
‘north toward the antechamber that belongs to the church’
(1250.STURLUNGA.NAR-SAG,448.2148)
There is one exception (not counted in Table 11), in which sá follows the definite-marked N but is not in a relative context. This is because sá precedes the free-standing determiner hinn plus an adjective, and thus it is actually of the type N > sá > Adj discussed above.

(26) Hvort hefir hírð-in sú in danska eigi allfast staðið fyrir þér? 'Has not that Danish bodyguard stood firmly before you?'

As in the other constructions discussed in this section, while sá before a definite N or a modifier of a definite N can occur freely in relative and nonrelative contexts, sá at the end of a string containing a definite-marked N only occurs in relative contexts and is thus either a cataphoric demonstrative or a relative pronoun.

3.4. Prosodic arguments for sá as a relative pronoun. Having investigated the various word-order constellations in which sá can appear, I now examine prosodic arguments that sá is more closely associated with the relative clause than with the matrix N. I do this in two ways. First, in prose texts, a comma can indicate a boundary between two intonational phrases, which may correspond to a clause boundary (Selkirk 2005). (For more on the mapping of syntactic phases onto prosody, see Kratzer & Selkirk 2007.) Similarly, in Old Norse poetry, it has been argued since Kuhn 1933 that clause boundaries often correspond to line breaks; for example, Gade (1995:209–10) finds that clauses usually start at the beginning of odd lines and often terminate at the end of even lines. Second, sá and er can cliticize, forming a single prosodic unit, which may be spelled as sás. In poetry, even if the manuscript spells er separately from sá, the strict syllable-counting and stress rules of Old Norse poetry can help determine whether er was actually a clitic in the spoken performance of the poem. These two prosodic criteria are the clearest indication of whether sá in a particular instance is a cataphoric demonstrative or a case-attracting relative pronoun.

According to Lindblad’s study of Old Norse (ON, including Old Swedish and Old Danish) relative clauses, punctuation in manuscripts tends to precede sá er, which would indicate that manuscript writers perceived of sá as being in the relative clause rather than the matrix DP. Moreover, manuscripts often spell sá er as a single word sás (Lindblad 1943:163), indicating the cliticization noted above. Although he gives no numbers for Old Icelandic, Lindblad (1943:163–64) finds that punctuation in Old Swedish laws precedes sá er over 200 times but intervenes between sá and er only eighteen times.

I tested Lindblad’s claim in Old Icelandic prose by querying the position of commas with respect to sá and er. However, my study of IcePaHC yields very different results from Lindblad’s, as shown in Table 12. The comma is placed between sá and er 187 times, more than three times more frequently than comma placement before sá and er, which occurs just fifty-six times. If taken at face value, this would indicate that there are 187 cases in which sá is part of the matrix DP as a cataphoric demonstrative and fifty-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Context?</th>
<th>N-\text{inn} &gt; \text{sá}</th>
<th>\text{N-\text{inn}} &gt; \text{sá}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no relative clause</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Order of Old Icelandic sá and definite-marked N in relative and nonrelative contexts.
six in which it is probably a relative pronoun (or perhaps the head of an appositive DP). However, three caveats are in order. First, the majority of instances where sá is followed by a relative clause (1,759 of 2,228, i.e. 79%) do not contain a comma at all; thus punctuation is at best a very minor criterion for the status of sá. Second, the results vary wildly by text: most texts have few or no examples of punctuation before the relative clause, a few texts (Hómillubók, Jartein, Alexander) strongly prefer the comma between sá and er, and other texts (Jómsvikingar, Marta) strongly prefer the comma before sá er. Third, many of the texts in IcePaHC are based on normalized editions, and thus comma placement between sá and er may reflect the grammatical intuitions of a modern Icelandic editor rather than those of the Old Icelandic writer; this may help explain some of the variation among texts. Thus while the fifty-six instances of comma placement before sá er in IcePaHC suggest that these cases involve a relative pronoun, there are many more relative clauses in which the punctuation does not help disambiguate the status of sá.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>&gt; sá &gt; RC</th>
<th>sá &gt; , &gt; RC</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>no comma</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150.FIRSTMAR.GRAM.SCI-LIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150.HOMILUBOK.REL-SER</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210.JARTEIN.REL-SAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210.THORLAKUR.REL-SAG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.STURLUNGA.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.THETUBROT.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260.JOMSVIKINGAR.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.GRAGAS.LAW-LAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275.MORKIN.NAR-HIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.ALEXANDER.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310.GRETTIR.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.ARNÍ.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.BANDAMENNM.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.FINNBOGÍ.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.MARTA.REL-SAG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400.GUNNAR.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400.GUNNAR2.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400.VIGLUNDUR.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450.BANDAMENN.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450.ECTORSSAGA.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450.JUTRREL-BIB</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450.VILHJALMUR.NAR-SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475.AEVINTYRÍ.NAR-REL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480.JARLUMN.NAR-SAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>56 (3%)</td>
<td>187 (8%)</td>
<td>226 (10%)</td>
<td>1,759 (79%)</td>
<td>2,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Commas in Old Icelandic DPs containing sá and a relative clause.19

Turning now to ON poetry, Lindblad (1943:162) also investigates relative clauses in poetry and finds that sá tends to occur in the same line as the relative clause. Taking the metrical break to indicate a syntactic boundary, Heusler (1950:161) claims that when sá immediately precedes the relative clause, it belongs to the relative clause. He shows that sá can occur in the unstressed, line-initial position, arguing that this sá is a ‘proclitic’. In Sapp 2018, I have conducted a comprehensive examination of relative clauses

19 The ‘other’ column includes some instances where the comma separates the main clause from the subordinate clause but is not adjacent to sá, as in 15. In other cases, the punctuation is irrelevant to the status of sá (e.g. occurring after the relative clause).
in Eddic and skaldic verse. While the data from that study are quite complex, the following brief discussion supports the claims by Lindblad and Heusler. In the Eddic corpus, which consists of anonymous, undated poems, there are just four relative clauses with sem but 367 clauses with er. In the skaldic corpus, of which I examine only datable poems by known skalds, there are nine relative clauses with sem and 294 with er. More than half of these clauses are preceded directly or indirectly by the pronoun sá, with a small number preceded by hinn and none by þessi. Of those with sá, the vast majority have sá adjacent to er and in the same poetic line, confirming Lindblad’s finding. In fact, there is a strong tendency for sá and er to be in anacrusis, that is, in the unstressed position at the beginning of the poetic line.

(27) þaðan koma doggvar, / þær-s í dala falla
thence come dews       sá-RP in dales fall
‘From there come the dews, which fall in the dales’ (Völuspá 19)

The fact that sá and er are so often in anacrusis suggests that in these cases, sá is a relative pronoun. First, the line-initial position suggests that sá is at the beginning of the relative clause. Second, sá in anacrusis is unstressed; according to Diessel (1999:121), relative pronouns must be unstressed, while demonstratives can be stressed. While these first two criteria are also compatible with a demonstrative analysis (sá could be an unstressed demonstrative that acts as the antecedent of the relative clause), the third criterion is unambiguous: sá and er form a prosodic unit, with many examples such as 27 in which er appears in its clitic form s. Following Harbert’s (1992) analysis of the Gothic relative clitic -ei, I argue that sá is in the Spec-CP of the relative clause, with er in C (to be refined in §4 below).

In other instances of sá, the pronoun is not adjacent to er and is probably a (cataphoric) demonstrative. Sometimes, sá immediately precedes the relative clause, but a line break intervenes as in 28. If the metrical division is equivalent to a clause boundary, such examples are not relative pronouns. In other examples like 29, another word intervenes between sá and the relative clause, even more clearly ruling out the interpretation that it is a relative pronoun.

(28) í ey þeiri / er Algræn heitir
in island sá       RP A. is.called
‘in the/that island, which is called Algræn’ (Hárbarðsljóð 17)

(29) a. hvé sá hestr heitir / er hverjan dregr
how sá horse is.called      RP each  drags
‘what the/that horse is called, that each (day) drags … ’ (Vafþräðnismál 17)

b. Bíti-a þer það sverð / er þú bregðir
bite-not you sá sword    RP you draw
‘May the/that sword that you draw not bite for you’ (Helgak. Hund. II 33)

Thus we see evidence in Eddic and skaldic poetry, some of which predates the earliest Icelandic prose, for both the original use of sá as a demonstrative, as in 28–29, and for the new use of sá as a relative pronoun, as in 27.

The numbers from the Sapp 2018 study of the poetic corpora and a comparison with the data from IcePaHC are shown in Table 13. (This excludes instances of pronouns other than sá and particles other than er.)

20 Relative clauses in Eddic poetry were extracted from the Greinir skáldskapar (Karlsson et al. 2012). Those in skaldic poetry come from The skaldic project (Clunies Ross et al. 2012). See Sapp 2018 for details on how the relative clauses were identified and coded.
The data in Table 13 suggest that relative sá was already possible in early Eddic and skaldic poetry, and thus the reanalysis of sá took place before the emergence of Old Icelandic prose and increased in frequency from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. In the twelfth century, relative sá is at its most frequent in both skaldic poetry and in prose, although it is somewhat more frequent in verse than in prose (a difference that merits further investigation). Finally, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, relative sá declines in both skaldic verse and in prose.

While the punctuation data from IcePaHC are inconclusive, punctuation in other ON manuscripts (Lindblad 1943) and metrical evidence from older poetry suggests that sá and er are closely associated phonologically and together serve to signal the beginning of a relative clause. If the metrical breaks and other poetic features such as the contraction of sá and er into sá’s can be taken to give a clue to syntactic structure, this would mean that sá is in the relative clause—in other words, it is a case-attracting relative pronoun.

3.5. Arguments that sá is not a relative pronoun. In this section, I discuss arguments by Wagener (2017), as well as one argument by a referee, that sá is not a relative pronoun.

Wagener (2017) investigates relative clauses in a corpus of five ON texts from the thirteenth century. This includes only one Old Icelandic text (Laxdæla Saga, which is not in IcePaHC) and four Old Norwegian texts of various genres. While Wagener cites Faarlund (2004:2) that there are ‘no known syntactic differences’ between Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian, it is unclear whether differences between Wagener’s results and my own are due to the difference in the country of origin of the texts or to the smaller size of his corpus. Nevertheless, Wagener’s study is particularly relevant to the current article, because (like my study but unlike earlier scholarship) he pays close attention to the semantics and distribution of sá in relative and nonrelative contexts. Wagener makes two findings that suggest a relative-like use of sá. First, in Wagener’s corpus the majority (78%) of relative clauses occur with sá (Wagener 2017:63). Second, while he claims that sá in nonrelative contexts has ‘unique reference’ (see §2.1 above) and always precedes the N in his corpus, he finds that in relative contexts sá can have nonunique reference, in which case it tends to occur after the N (Wagener 2017:124). Moreover, indefinite quantifiers and numerals with no head N cannot serve as antecedents of relative clauses unless sá is present, and in such cases sá does not have unique reference (Wagener 2017:114). These findings are consistent with the corpus data presented above and thus compatible with my contention that sá has a specialized function of introducing relative clauses, even serving as a relative pronoun in some in-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENRE (DATE)</th>
<th>er only</th>
<th>sá nonadjacent to er</th>
<th>adjacent sá + er</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eddic poetry (900–1200?)</td>
<td>125 (36%)</td>
<td>72 (21%)</td>
<td>151 (43%)</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th c. skaldic</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (62%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th c. skaldic</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th c. skaldic</td>
<td>13 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>70 (78%)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th c. skaldic</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>73 (87%)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th c. skaldic</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th c. skaldic (one poem)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>11 (61%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th c. prose (1150)</td>
<td>89 (15%)</td>
<td>82 (14%)</td>
<td>431 (72%)</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th c. prose (1200–1275)</td>
<td>172 (23%)</td>
<td>209 (28%)</td>
<td>369 (49%)</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th c. prose (1300–1350)</td>
<td>231 (24%)</td>
<td>230 (24%)</td>
<td>506 (52%)</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>650 (22%)</td>
<td>614 (21%)</td>
<td>1,649 (57%)</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Position of sá vis-à-vis er in all three genres.
stances. Because these data suggest a nondemonstrative function of ́sá, Wagener devotes an entire chapter to argue against the hypothesis that ́sá can be a relative pronoun. I address each of Wagener’s arguments in turn.

First, Wagener (2017:132) notes that purportedly relative ́sá can be inserted or omitted in all syntactic functions, meaning that the rules for deleting relative ́sá are arbitrary; he claims that this is a problem because the rule for deleting relative pronouns in English is nonarbitrary: namely, subject relative pronouns may not be deleted. There are two arguments against this assertion. First, there is one context in which ́sá cannot be deleted: recall Wagener’s own finding mentioned above, that ́sá is obligatory when the antecedent contains an indefinite quantifier but no noun. Second, the deletion of Old Icelandic ́sá is fundamentally different from the deletion of English relative pronouns, because Old Icelandic relatives have double complementation. According to Rizzi 1990, deleting a relative marker in subject relative clauses leaves the empty subject position without a governor. But in Icelandic, deleting ́sá still leaves the relative complementizer ́er, which can govern the subject position. Indeed, the following example from Alemannic (like Bavarian, a German dialect that allows double complementation) shows that the pronoun can be deleted in subject relative clauses.

(30) dea Mo (dea) wo seine Schu verlora hot
the man (the) his shoes lost has
‘the man who has lost his shoes’ (Brandner & Bräuning 2013:132)

Wagener’s second argument is that there appears to be complementary distribution of pre-N ́sá (which I argue is a demonstrative) and post-N ́sá (arguably a relative pronoun in some instances). There are no examples in Wagener’s corpus nor in my own of strings like ́sá N ́sá er, which to Wagener (2017:133) suggests that there is only one kind of ́sá in ON. This is in contrast to closely related languages like Gothic, Old English, Old High German, and Modern German, which have demonstrative pronouns that are homophonous with relative pronouns, illustrated by the Old High German (OHG) example in 31.

(31) Ist this ther betalari, ther hier saz blinter
is this the beggar here sat blind
‘Is this the beggar who sat here blind?’ (Offrid, cited in Wagener 2017:133)

However, there is probably a semantic reason why the string ́sá N ́sá is ruled out in ON, while strings like ther N ther are possible in other Germanic languages. As Wagener notes, when demonstrative pronouns occur with relative clauses, ‘the presence of a restrictive RC [relative clause] neutralizes the distinction between a demonstrative and a definite article, reducing the former to the latter’ (2017:74–75). In fact, that is precisely what has happened in the OHG example above; while pre-N ther can be either a demonstrative or a definite article, only the article reading is possible in 31. Crucially, in the languages that Wagener mentions as allowing ther N ther ... strings, the demonstrative pronoun that is homophonous with the relative pronoun can also serve as a definite article (Harbert 2007:142). In ON, however, ́sá cannot serve as an article, because that function is occupied by -inn/inn. The unavailability of ́sá to be ‘reduced’ to an article may explain why ON has the construction hinn N ́sárel ... or N-inn ́sárel ... (as in 25) but never ́sá N ́sárel.

Third, Wagener (2017:134) points out that unlike relative pronouns in other Germanic languages, ́sá nearly always agrees in case with its antecedent, except in the so-called learned style. Wagener dismisses the possibility outlined in §1 above that this
results from case attraction, because unlike in other case-attracting languages case attraction in ON is not subject to any morphosyntactic restrictions (only a stylistic one). The pervasive nature of Old Icelandic case attraction is an important point, which I account for in §4.

Fourth, Wagener (2017:136) points out instances in which post-N sá is modified by an adjective, a property unexpected if post-N sá is a relative pronoun.

(32) ek vilja spjót-it þat et gull-rekna er þú hefir í hendi
    ‘I want the spear the sá the gold-decorated RP you have in hand
    ‘I want the golden spear that you have in your hands.’

(33) þa likiumc vér dyri þvi er á ut-löndum er er hætir lutolupus
    then liken we animal sá RP in foreign-lands is RP is.called lutolupus
    ‘then we are like the animal that is in foreign lands that is called lutolupus’

Wagener correctly notes that modified þat in 32 cannot be a relative pronoun, but must be a demonstrative. However, this example does not pose a challenge to the relative-pronoun analysis of nonmodified instances of sá; recall from Table 7 above that there are seventy-one examples of post-N sá in non-relative-clause contexts. Thus the post-N position of sá is a necessary but not a sufficient criterion for identifying the relative-pronoun use of sá. Examples of post-N sá such as 32 are simply evidence that the older demonstrative function of sá continues alongside the newer relative use.

Wagener’s final argument is based on the fact that in his corpus, when relative clauses are stacked, only the first relative clause contains sá (Wagener 2017:138).

(33) þa likiumc vér dyri þvi er á ut-löndum er er hætir lutolupus
    then liken we animal sá RP in foreign-lands is RP is.called lutolupus
    ‘then we are like the animal that is in foreign lands that is called lutolupus’

Wagener cautiously concludes that the presence of sá before only the first stacked relative clause indicates that sá is part of the antecedent DP rather than the relative clause itself. In my corpus, however, there are indeed stacked relative clauses in which both clauses (as in 34) or only the second clause (as in 35) begin with sá.

(34) Var í þessu liði ein blóðsjúk kona, sú er hann segir eftir orðum
    was in this crowd a hemorrhaging woman sá RP he says after words
    Ambrósiusar Mörtu verið hafa, sú er blódfallssóttí pindi um sjó
    Ambrose Marta been have sá RP hemorrhage suffered for seven
    ár years
    ‘In this crowd there was a hemorrhaging woman, whom he says according
    to Ambrose to have been Martha, who suffered from hemorrhage for
    7 years … ’

(35) Kóngur-inn fékk ...
    king-the received Þórir son Hákon-ar er var ererkibiskup fyrir Jón
    ‘The king received … Thorir son of Hakon, who was archbishop before
    Archbishop Jon, who was well able to hear church law on his behalf … ’

While it is possible to interpret the second sá as the head of a DP in apposition to the antecedent N, the occurrence of such clauses weakens Wagener’s argument somewhat.

In addition to Wagener’s objections, a referee points out that predicative adjectives in relative clauses appear in the nominative, even when sá is in a different case. Indeed,
there are thirteen instances of this in IcePaHC texts from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, including the following one cited by the referee.

(36) að vér farim í dag á merkur og skóga, þá er oss eru nálægst-ir
      closest-nom
‘that we go today to the forests and woods that are closest to us’
(1260.JOMSVIKINGAR.NAR-SAG,.698)

The fact that the adjective nálægstr agrees in gender and number with skóga and þá, but not in case, indicates that there is a null subject in the relative clause that is responsible for assigning nominative case to the adjective. This means that þá cannot be treated as the subject of the relative clause, which has raised into the relative pronoun position. If þá were indeed the subject of the relative clause, we would expect it to trigger accusative case on the predicate adjective, but there are no such examples in IcePaHC. This presents a serious challenge to my contention that sá can be a relative pronoun. In order to maintain the view that sá is a relative pronoun in examples like 36, I need a refined analysis of the derivation of relative pronouns in Old Icelandic, which is presented in §4.4 below.

In conclusion, many of Wagener’s findings are compatible with the relative-pronoun analysis, while the strongest arguments against sá as a relative pronoun either can be explained independently or are based on empirically incorrect data, possibly due to the smaller corpus size. While Wagener comes to a different conclusion, I believe that these facts confirm my own findings above that demonstrative sá behaves semantically and distributionally differently from the sá that introduces relative clauses. Two challenges remain: the pervasive nature of Old Icelandic case attraction with sá and the fact that predicate adjectives are always nominative regardless of the case of sá. These two facts have to be accounted for by my analysis of sá in §4.4.

3.6. Summary: the status of sá. This section has argued that in Old Icelandic, sá sometimes functions as a relative pronoun. In §3.1, we saw that while the other demonstratives rarely precede relative clauses, the majority of instances of sá precede a relative clause; thus its most common function is to anticipate a relative clause (if a cataphoric demonstrative) or to stand in for the relativized argument (if a relative pronoun). This is confirmed by the semantic evidence presented in §3.2, which showed that when preceding a relative clause, sá can lack its usual semantics. Distributionally, §3.3 shows that sá can precede elements in the antecedent DP regardless of whether a relative clause is present (i.e. when it is a demonstrative), but its appearance after the antecedent N and other modifiers is limited to relative contexts, suggesting that post-N sá has the function of introducing relative clauses. Crucially, sá can extrapose with the relative clause and fails to trigger weak inflection on an adjective in the antecedent DP, so in at least some instances it is unambiguously in the relative clause. This is supported in §3.4 by evidence from punctuation and poetry: sá forms a prosodic unit with er at the beginning of the relative clause. Finally, while Wagener (2017) argues that sá is not a relative pronoun, I find that many of his findings are consistent with the relative-pronoun analysis, while other arguments can be dismissed or explained independently. Thus alongside its original function as a demonstrative (sometimes a cataphoric demonstrative anticipating a relative clause), sá has been reanalyzed in many instances as a relative pronoun. The biggest remaining obstacle to this analysis of sá as a relative pronoun are the case facts, which are taken up in the next section.
4. Case attraction in early Icelandic. The traditional argument against sá as a relative pronoun has been the fact that it agrees with its antecedent in case; however, this can be viewed as case attraction, a widespread phenomenon in the older Germanic languages. Section 4.1 discusses case attraction in some other Germanic languages, and §4.2 compares this to the situation in medieval and early-modern Icelandic. Four syntactic analyses of case attraction are reviewed in §4.3. I then present my own analysis utilizing a split CP and the notion of phases (§4.4) and argue that case attraction represents an intermediate stage in the development of relative pronouns out of demonstrative pronouns (§4.5).

4.1. Other Germanic languages. Case attraction occurs to differing degrees in many of the older Germanic languages. In Gothic, for example, Harbert (1989, 1992) finds that case attraction occurs only in free relatives, and headed relatives consistently fail to show case attraction even when the Greek model has it. In the Gothic free relative construction, the relative pronoun can occur either in the case of the matrix-clause argument or in the case of the relativized argument, subject to the obliqueness hierarchy (genitive > dative > accusative > nominative): of the two potential cases, the pronoun will appear in the more oblique one (Harbert 1989:146). In 37, the relative pronoun represents the subject of the relative clause, but the case required by the matrix verb ‘read’ is accusative, and thus the pronoun appears in the accusative. In 38, the relative pronoun represents the direct object of the relative clause, so despite the fact that the relative clause functions as the subject of the matrix clause, the pronoun appears in the accusative here too.

(37) a. [þo-ei \_ ist us Laudeikaion] jus ussiggwaid (Gothic)
   SA.ACC-RP [e].NOM is from Laodicea you read
   ‘And read (the one) that is from Laodicea’
   (Col. 4:16, cited in Harbert 1992:111)

   b. [þan-ei frijo-s ] siuks ist
   SA.ACC-RP love-2SG [e].ACC sick is
   ‘(The one) whom you love is sick’
   (John 11:3, cited in Harbert 1989:111)

OHG and Middle High German (MHG) have case attraction in free relatives as in Gothic, but also in headed relatives (Pittner 1995:198). As in Gothic, case attraction in OHG and MHG is subject to the obliqueness hierarchy; note, however, that in MHG only the genitive case can override another case (Harbert 1992:112). In both 38 and 39, the relative pronoun is in the genitive because the matrix antecedent is genitive, even though in both cases the pronoun represents the subject of the relative clause.

(38) annuzi min-es fater [thes dar in himile ist] (OHG)
   face my-GEN father,GEN DER.GEN [e].NOM RP in heaven is
   ‘The face of my father who is in heaven’ (Tatian 96:1, cited in Harbert 1992:110)
(39) ere … des dienst-es [des iu wirt getan] (MHG)
   honor the service-GEN DER.GEN YOU.DAT is [e].NOM done
   ‘… the honor of the service, that is done to you’
   (Karl der Gr. 9666, Harbert 1992:110)

Turning to Old English (OE), Mitchell (1985:88) notes that the pronoun se is frequently ambiguous between demonstrative and relative and reviews scholarship that argues for each interpretation. Mitchell cites instances of se both as an unambiguous demonstrative (1985:93) and as an unambiguous relative (1985:95–96). Harbert (2007) pays most attention to se in free relatives; unlike in Gothic, in OE free relatives se always bears the case assigned by the matrix clause (Harbert 2007:467).
befæste hē ðā lære þæ−m his wordum ne gelīefan] (OE)
confirm he the teaching se.dat rp [e].nom his words not believed
‘Let him confirm his teaching to those that didn’t believe his words’
(CP 25.2, cited in Harbert 2007:467)
Harbert concludes from this that OE se in free relatives is a demonstrative, not a Gothic-type relative pronoun with case attraction. In headed relatives, by contrast, Ringe and Taylor (2014:467–68) identify se as the relative pronoun, and claim that the case of the pronoun most frequently reflects the relativized function, as in 41. However, they also note that case attraction occurs (2014:470). In 42, the second þone must be a relative pronoun, because the matrix antecedent is already determined by the first þone; although it is the subject of the relative clause, it agrees with the accusative antecedent.

(41) … is an byrnde munt, þone menn hatað Ethna] (OE)
is a burning mountain.nom se.acc men call e.acc Etna
‘(In Sicily) is a burning mountain which men call Etna’
(Ælfric’s lives of saints 217.2152, cited in Ringe & Taylor 2014:468)
(42) … ge secead þone hælynd [þone þe on rode ahangen wæs] you seek the savior.acc se.acc rp [e].nom on cross hung was
‘… you seek the savior who hung on the cross’ (OE)
(Mt (WScp) 28.5.2139, cited in Ringe & Taylor 2014:471)

There is some evidence for case attraction in Old Saxon (OS). According to Buzzoni (2016:63), it occurs mainly in the C manuscript of the Heliand.21 Thus one can find examples in the Heliand both with and without case attraction, but it is not clear exactly what conditions favor and disfavor attraction. Clearly, a study of the complete Heliand that takes manuscript variation into account is needed. Nevertheless, a few stray examples combed from the literature will illustrate the possibilities in OS. Case attraction is possible in both free relatives (43a) and headed relatives (43b).

(43) a. … bôtta [þem thâr blinde wârun] (OS)
healed the.dat rp [e].nom blind were
‘(So he … ) healed those who were blind’
(Heliand 2357, cited in Wilhelmy 1881:10)
b. that barn god-es, [thes sie ni mahtun … farstandan] that child God-gen the.gen they not could [e].acc … understand
‘that Son of God, whom they could not understand (in their hearts)’
(Heliand 2371, cited in Wilhelmy 1881:10)

However, there are also examples where case attraction does not take place. The lack of case attraction in 44a could be explained by the case hierarchy: the case required by the relative clause is dative and thus overrides the nominative case of the antecedent. But no such explanation is possible for 44b, because the nominative case should be overridden by the genitive case of the antecedent.

(44) a. brûdi Iudeo-no, [them gio barn ni uuard ódan … ] women.nom Jews-gen the.dat ever child not was [e].dat bestowed
‘Jewish women, to whom a child was never bestowed’
(Heliand 5525, cited in Klinghardt 1884:24)

21 Despite Buzzoni’s claim, the Taeger (1984) edition of Heliand does not indicate any differences in the case of the relative pronouns in 43a–b between manuscripts C and M. Note also that 44a does not show case attraction even though it is from C.
b. he beginna **thero** girnæan, [**thiu** imu gegangen ni scal].

he begin her.**gen** desire the.**nom** [e]**nom** him belong not shall

‘that he begin to desire the one who shall not belong to him’

(Heliane 1481, cited in Roehrs 2000:4)

Thus based on these examples from the literature, OS does not seem to have consistent case attraction, but further study is needed.

### 4.2. Case attraction in Old Icelandic and beyond.

The situation in Old Icelandic shows some similarities to and differences from case attraction in the other older Germanic languages. Case attraction in Old Icelandic occurs with all kinds of relative clauses, not just free relatives. Unlike most of the Germanic demonstrative/relative pronouns, Old Icelandic **sá** is nearly always in the case of the antecedent. The exceptions to case attraction are argued by Nygaard (1905) to be related to register, occurring in the Latinate ‘learned style’ as in 45, where **þeim** appears in the dative case required by the preposition **af** rather than the genitive case of the antecedent.22 Nygaard (1905:262) notes that this very rarely occurs in the popular style, as in 46, where **þeir** appears in the nominative despite its accusative antecedent **dverga**.23

(45) fjórir eru hættir hugningen-ar, af **þeim** er við kem-sk hugr

four are dangers thought**-gen** by SÁ**.DAT RP** against comes**-PASS mind

‘There are four dangers of thought, with which the mind is confronted … ’

(Hom. 18, 2, cited in Nygaard 1905:264)

(46) Málar **dverga** / … telja, / **þeir** er sótto / frá salar steini …

tale is dwarves**.ACC** list SÁ**.NOM RP** sought from hall.**GEN** stone

‘The tale will list the dwarves … who from the hall’s stone sought [thrones]’

(Völuspá 14, cited in Nygaard 1905:262)

Turning to my results from IcePaHC, in the whole corpus there are only thirty-four examples of a non-case-matching **sá** and N.24 Of these, just six occur in the Old Icelandic period, all from the learned-style Hómiljúbók.

(47) … friðsamt ríki **son-ar** Guðs lifanda, **sá** er frið gerði …

peaceful kingdom son**-GEN** God’s living SÁ**.NOM RP** peace made

‘ … the peaceful kingdom of God’s living son, who made peace … ’

(1150.HOMILIUBOK.REL-SER,.996)

This would appear to confirm Nygaard’s claim that nonattracting **sá** is limited to the learned style. However, Wagener (2017:128) points out that this type of relative clause should be considered marginal, an effect of translation rather than a genuine feature of ON grammar. Indeed, nonattracting **sá** is marginal even within the Old Icelandic Hómiljúbók, occurring in just six out of nearly 500 relative clauses.

The remaining twenty-eight examples of nonattracting **sá** in IcePaHC are from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. The eleven examples from the sixteenth century are all from religious texts (mostly in translations of the New Testament). This could arguably be a continuation of the Old Icelandic learned style, which Wagener (2017)

---

22 Nygaard (1905) cites the Old Norwegian homily book. Neither this example nor any of his other examples of nonattracting **sá** are found in IcePaHC (which draws instead on the Old Icelandic homily book).

23 This example and the two others that Nygaard gives are from Eddic poetry.

24 The query (NP idoms D*) AND (NP idoms N*) AND (NP idoms CP-REL*) does not yield any instances of case conflict between antecedent N and **sá**, because the IcePaHC taggers would have put non-case-matching D and N in separate NPs. Therefore, I searched for examples where **sá** and the relative clause were coded in a separate NP from the antecedent (coded as appositions, i.e. (NP-PRIN idoms CP-REL) and read through the results to identify the nonattracting examples. I did not look at texts from the twentieth or twenty-first centuries, because Modern Icelandic **sá** is no longer a relative pronoun.
claims is a translation phenomenon. Thráinsson (1980:69–70), finding similar examples in sixteenth-century Bible translations, maintains that these represent a genuine change in Icelandic grammar toward nonattracting relative pronouns. In the following example, the relative pronoun is in the dative, required by the verb ‘ride’ in the relative clause. Interestingly, the example lacks er.

(48) Er eg ecke þijn Asna, þeirre þu hefur riðeð
am I not your donkey. NOM SÁ.DAT you have ridden [e].DAT
‘Am I not your donkey, whom you have ridden?’

(Numbers 22:30, cited in Thráinsson 1980:70)

Therefore, one cannot rule out that nonattracting relative pronouns in sixteenth-century Icelandic, as in Old Icelandic, are a product of translation. This view is bolstered by the fact that these eleven unambiguous instances of nonattracting sá occur alongside nearly 800 instances of sá that are case-attracting or ambiguous (e.g. when the matrix and relative cases are the same).

However, one does begin to find unequivocal evidence for nonattracting relative pronouns in the seventeenth century. There are sixteen unambiguous examples from this century in my database, and all of them are from biographical or fictional works without a foreign-language model (Olafur Egilsson, Indiafari, and Ærmann).25

(49) Einn … átti sér ung og dægilega kvínn-u, sú er Anna
one refl young and pretty wife-ACC SÁ.NOM RP Anna
hét.
was.called
‘One (tailor …) had a young and pretty wife, who was called Anna.’

(1661.INDIAFARI.BIO-TRA,36.280)

These sixteen clear instances of nonattracting sá are also far outnumbered by case-attracting and ambiguous examples, which total over 700. Thus it seems that after the Old Icelandic period, non-case-attracting relative sá developed even in non-Latinate texts, although it continued to be used alongside case attraction. Interestingly, this is also the period when relative hverr ‘who’, which is also nonattracting, is at its peak use (recall Fig. 1).

In Old Icelandic, case attraction with sá does not obey a case hierarchy, as can be seen in examples like the following, where an oblique case required by the relative clause is overridden by nominative case from the matrix clause. In 50a, the relativized argument is the direct object of ‘made’, but sá is nominative due to case attraction to its antecedent dagur. In 50b, the relativized argument is the possessor (presumably genitive, but tagged in IcePaHC as an indirect object), but sá is nominative because of the antecedent Guð.

(50) a. Sjá er dag-ur sá, er Drott-inn gerði.
this is day-NOM SÁ.NOM RP Lord-the made [e].ACC
‘This is the day that the Lord made.’

(1150.HOMILIUBOK.REL-SER,.574)

b. Guð feðra vorra, sá er þú boðaðir
God.NOM fathers our SÁ.NOM RP you.NOM proclaimed kraft
[DP strength [e].GEN]
‘God of our fathers, whose strength you proclaimed ... ’

(1450.JUDIT.REL-BIB,.157)

25 In addition, there is one nonattracting sá from the eighteenth-century text KLIM, a translation of Ludvig Holberg’s Latin novel Niels Klim’s underground travels.
In this brief survey, we have seen that one Germanic language has case attraction only in free relatives (Gothic), while the others, including Old Icelandic, have case attraction even after an overt antecedent. We have also seen that some languages obey a case hierarchy when the cases conflict (Gothic, OHG, and MHG), while the picture in OE and OS is less clear. Old Icelandic *sá*, however, is not subject to a case hierarchy, but consistently shows case attraction, a situation most similar to OE free relatives (but not limited to free relatives in Old Icelandic). Nonattracting *sá* is mostly limited to translated texts in the older period but appears in various genres by seventeenth-century Icelandic. This is summarized in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Relative Clause Types</th>
<th>Attraction Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>free relatives only</td>
<td>consistent case hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old High German</td>
<td>free and headed relatives</td>
<td>consistent case hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid. High German</td>
<td>free and headed relatives</td>
<td>only genitive overrides other cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>free relatives</td>
<td>consistently shows matrix case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>headed relatives</td>
<td>case attraction only occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Saxon</td>
<td>free and headed relatives</td>
<td>in manuscript C, unclear how consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Icelandic</td>
<td>free and headed relatives</td>
<td>consistently shows matrix case in popular style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Case attraction in the older Germanic languages.

4.3. Previous analyses of case attraction. In §3, I argued that in many instances *sá* is a relative pronoun. In §4.2, I showed that unlike in other Germanic languages, Old Icelandic case attraction with *sá* is pervasive—not limited to free relatives and not subject to a case hierarchy. In examples where *sá* is clearly in the matrix clause because it does not immediately precede the relative particle—15, 18, 19, 21, and 29 above—the case of *sá* is obviously under agreement with the antecedent N. However, another mechanism for case assignment is called for in examples where *sá* is more likely in the relative clause; this is especially clear when *sá* is nonadjacent to the antecedent N, as in 14a, 20, and 27.

If I am correct that these latter examples involve *sá* as a relative pronoun, case assignment in such examples becomes mysterious. Under the conventional generative analysis of relative pronouns (e.g. Carnie 2013:370), a relative pronoun originates in the relative clause in the position of the argument it represents and raises by wh-movement to Spec-CP. Therefore, it should be in the case of its trace in the relative clause. In case-attraction languages, however, the relative pronoun agrees with the antecedent instead. I discuss four approaches to case attraction in the generative framework—Harbert 1992, Áfarli 1995, Bianchi 2000, and Roehrs 2000—before discussing my own analysis in §4.4.

Harbert (1992) considers case attraction in Gothic to be a special instance of exceptional case marking—case assignment across a clause boundary (in this case CP). He argues that in Gothic free relatives, the pronoun is in the Spec-CP of the relative clause, because the relativizing suffix -ei (in C) cliticizes to the pronoun (1992:115). Harbert claims that the case assigner in the matrix clause can assign case down into the Spec-CP of the embedded relative clause. This raises the question of why some languages allow case attraction but others do not. Harbert, working within the barriers framework, argues that NP is usually a barrier to external government, ruling out case attraction in most languages. Case attraction, then, is possible only in languages like Gothic whose ‘NPs are transparent to government’ (Harbert 1992:126); that Gothic DPs are transparent to external government can be seen in examples like the following, where a possessor is extracted from a DP.26

---

26 I have not found any examples of extraction from DP in IcePaHC.
Jesus ... [þiz -ei weis kunþedum [attan jah aiþein [ti]]] (Gothic)

‘Jesus, whose father and mother we knew’ (John 6:42, cited in Harbert 1992:125)

Harbert’s account has one important implication for Old Icelandic: like -ei in Gothic, Old Icelandic er cliticizes to sá (see the poetic evidence in §3.4 above). Therefore, relative sá is likely in Spec-CP of the relative clause (to be refined below). If Harbert’s idea is correct, sá in such cases cannot be a cataphoric (correlative) pronoun, because it would be in the matrix clause and cliticization should not take place across the clause boundary. While I accept Harbert’s basic assumptions that the case-attracting relative is in the highest Spec of the relative clause but is assigned case from across the clause boundary, the differences between attraction in Gothic (limited to free relatives and subject to the case hierarchy) and Old Icelandic (pervasive case attraction), as well as his outmoded theoretical framework, make Harbert’s analysis less appealing for Old Icelandic.

Áfarli (1995) proposes a very different account in an attempt to capture both case-attracting relatives (in the popular style) and nonattracting relatives (in the learned style) in ON. He claims (1995:538) that a learned-style relative clause is either a complement or adjunct of the antecedent N (the exact position of relative clauses being a matter of some debate in the generative literature), but in any event this structural relationship does not result in agreement. In the popular style, however, Áfarli claims that the relative clause is attached in the specifier position of the antecedent noun, so that the relative pronoun can receive case from the antecedent noun through Spec-head agreement. In the example below, the relative pronoun þeim in CP receives dative case through Spec-head agreement.

(52) a. hann bió í firði þeim er Fibuli heitir á Norðmœri
   he lived in fjord sá rp Fibule is.called in Nordmøre
   ‘he lived in the fjord that is called Fibule in Nordmøre’

   (Gisla Saga, cited in Áfarli 1995:541)

   b. NP
      Nʹ CP
         Cʹ
            C IP
               firði þeim er Fibuli heitir ...

   (modified slightly from Áfarli 1995:541)

There are a number of problems with Áfarli’s account. First, the Spec-head agreement illustrated in 52 is spurious, as the pronoun in question is not the specifier of NP; rather, the relative clause is the specifier of NP, and sá is the specifier of the relative clause. Second, Old Icelandic does not otherwise have specifiers on the right (and according to Kayne (1994), specifiers are universally on the left). Third, the claim that some relative clauses in a language are in specifier positions while others are complements or adjuncts is not well motivated, being simply an ad hoc mechanism to account for the case difference. As Wagener (2017) points out, learned-style relative clauses are a translation phenomenon in ON and thus need no separate structural account.

More recently, Bianchi (2000) has proposed an analysis of case attraction that is based on Kayne’s (1994) approach to relative clauses. In this approach, the relative clause is not a modifier/adjunct of the antecedent N. Rather, the relative clause is a CP complement of the matrix D. As the complement of the matrix D is a CP, there is no an-
tecedent N in the matrix DP; instead, what is traditionally called the antecedent noun is actually part of the relative clause (Bianchi 2000:61). This noun and the relative pronoun together raise to the Spec-CP of the relative clause; then the antecedent noun raises to the Spec of the relative pronoun (Bianchi 2000:61).

(53) a. notant-e iudic-e quo nosti 'judging the judge whom you know'  
(Horace, cited in Bianchi 2000:58)

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D}_{[abl]} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{DP}_i \\
\text{NP}_{[abl]} \\
\text{iudice} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{t}_{NP} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{nosti} \\
\text{t}_i \\
\text{quem}_{[acc]} > \text{quo}_{[abl]}
\end{array}
\]

In this analysis, both the antecedent noun and the relative pronoun are governed by the matrix D and can thus be assigned the case of the matrix DP (Bianchi 2000:68). Under this view, then, the case not only of the relative pronoun but also of the ‘antecedent’ is subject to case attraction.

This is a theoretically interesting explanation for the case-attraction phenomenon, but only if one assumes Kayne’s unconventional structure of relative clauses. Wagener (2017), while not arguing specifically against Bianchi, argues that Kayne’s (1994) complement-of-D analysis for relative clauses is undesirable for four reasons. First, because relative clauses are not obligatory, they are probably adjuncts, not complements (Wagener 2017:51). Second, relative clauses are semantically equivalent to adjectives and should receive a similar analysis (Wagener 2017:52). Third, the antecedent N agrees in case with the matrix D, which is straightforward if NP is the complement of D but not if NP raises from within the relative clause (Wagener 2017:52). Finally, Wagener argues that an antecedent N raised from within the relative clause should not be able to select the appropriate matrix determiner, but it clearly can: the sugar I bought vs. *a sugar I bought (Wagener 2017:53). With Wagener’s objections in mind, I believe that a Kaynean analysis of case attraction raises more questions than it answers.

A far simpler approach to case attraction is that by Roehrs (2000), which only requires the assumption of a split-CP system (Rizzi 1997). Roehrs proposes that case-attracting relative pronouns and nonattracting relative pronouns are located in different projections within the CP domain of the clause. Nonattracting pronouns are arguments of the relative clause and are thus in the canonical position for relative pronouns, which both Rizzi and Roehrs identify as Spec-ForceP. Roehrs argues that case-attracting pronouns, although part of the relative clause, are simply connecting elements that do not have a theta role and are thus generated in a higher Spec position. Roehrs connects this structurally higher position to case attraction by employing Rizzi’s idea of AgrP. While Rizzi himself does not propose an AgrP on top of ForceP, Rizzi (1997:321) states that if any head has substantial agreement features, ‘an independent Agr projection can crop up on top of it’.  

A referee points out that much recent work within minimalism no longer assumes AgrP for reasons detailed by Chomsky (1995:349ff.). However, AgrP continues to be used for agreement within the DP in studies.

---

27 A referee points out that much recent work within minimalism no longer assumes AgrP for reasons detailed by Chomsky (1995:349ff.). However, AgrP continues to be used for agreement within the DP in studies.
The distinction between ForceP and AgrP relates to the case of the relative pronouns in the following way. Beginning with true, nonattracting pronouns, Roehrs argues that these are generated in the position of the relativized argument (in the embedded clause) and raise to Spec-ForceP. Assuming that relative clauses are adjoined to the antecedent DP, they are within the case-checking domain of the antecedent; however, Roehrs assumes that ForceP is a barrier to government, thus blocking agreement between the antecedent and the relative pronoun in Spec-ForceP. As a result, true relative pronouns in ForceP show the case of their argument position within the relative clause. Case-attracting relative pronouns, by contrast, have agreement features that cannot be attributed to the case of the relativized position in the embedded clause (namely agreement in case with the antecedent), and it is these agreement features that necessitate AgrP atop ForceP. Being outside ForceP, there is no barrier to government by the antecedent DP, and thus relative pronouns in AgrP agree in case with the antecedent. Although Roehrs (2000) employs notions such as government and barriers that are no longer commonly assumed in syntactic theory, his main claim—that case attraction results from a higher structural position associated with agreement features—is the basis for my own analysis below.

### 4.4. A split-CP, phase-based account

Turning finally to my analysis, I build on Roehrs’s (2000) distinction between ForceP and AgrP, with two differences. One difference is that I divide the splitting of CP into two stages: at first, case attraction in Old Icelandic necessitates the projection of AgrP atop ForceP, but relative *sá* can only be inserted into Spec-AgrP. Later, relative *sá* may appear in either Spec-AgrP or Spec-ForceP, resulting in competition between case attraction and nonattraction. The second difference is that I update the analysis of case assignment to Spec-AgrP vs. Spec-ForceP using Chomsky’s (2001) notion of phases.

Beginning with Old Icelandic, let us first recap the arguments from §3 for demonstrative vs. relative *sá*. Many of the semantic and word-order data are compatible with either a cataphoric-demonstrative (correlative) analysis for *sá* or a relative-pronoun analysis, but there are a few strong arguments for each view. The first argument on the demonstrative side is that case attraction is nearly universal in Old Icelandic, with the exception of the so-called learned style (which Wagener 2017 dismisses as a product of translation). Second, *sá* fails to trigger agreement in case with predicate adjectives (see such as Cinque 2010). AgrP (and similarly InflP) are especially useful for explaining diachronic changes to syntax that have a morphological effect: besides the current study, this idea is employed by Roehrs (2013) to explain the addition of pronominal morphology to German determiners and by Roehrs and Sapp (2016:281–82) to explain the addition of adjectival inflection to certain quantifiers in German.
36 above), ruling out the possibility that sá raises from the argument position into the CP layer. If sá is a cataphoric demonstrative, it would be in the same DP as the antecedent N. Alternatively, a referee suggests that cataphoric sá could be the head of its own DP in apposition to the DP containing N, which would leave sá rather than N as the antecedent of the relative clause.28

While a demonstrative-pronoun analysis can account for many instances of the sá that precedes relative clauses, this analysis is not sufficient to account for all of the data. There is clear evidence that sá is a relative pronoun in some cases. First, sá can extrapose with the relative clause as in 14a and 20, indicating that it forms a constituent with the relative clause; at least in examples 14a and 20 that constituent appears to be the relative CP. Second, post-N sá fails to trigger weak inflection on an adjective in the antecedent DP, as in 22, suggesting that sá is not in the antecedent DP. Third, as shown in §3.4, sá forms a prosodic unit with er at the beginning of the relative clause and can even host cliticized er.

These facts, taken together, indicate that although sá does not raise from the position of the relativized argument inside the relative clause, it is nevertheless inside the relative clause in many instances. I therefore adopt the analysis by Roehrs (2000), in which case-attracting relative pronouns are inserted into the highest specifier of the CP layer. This can be illustrated with 36, repeated here as 55.

(55) a. merkur og skóga, þá er oss eru nálægst-ir [36] forests and woods.acc sá.acc rp [e],nom us are closest-nom
   ‘… forests and woods that are closest to us’

In this example, the case-attracting pronoun sá is inserted into Spec-AgrP. The subject position of the embedded clause is occupied by a null pronoun, with which the predicate adjective agrees in case. (I remain agnostic as to the exact location of the relative particle er and to the possibility that the null pronoun wh-moves to Spec-ForceP.) As in

28 The referee speculates that the apposition analysis is particularly suited for nonrestrictive relative clauses. This would make the prediction that restrictive relative clauses would begin with er alone, while nonrestrictive relative clauses would have sá er. However, this prediction is not borne out. There are many restrictive relative clauses with sá; for example, in 3 the relative clause explains the function of the earls, and in 4 the relative clause disambiguates Herod the Great from other kings by that name. Conversely, there are nonrestrictive clauses without a demonstrative, such as 7. The apposition analysis is problematic for another reason: the majority of Old Icelandic relative clauses begin with sá, but it seems very unlikely that the majority of Old Icelandic relative clauses are in appositive DPs.
Roehrs 2000, I maintain that the case agreement between relative sá and the antecedent N necessitate the projection of AgrP above ForceP. However, pace Roehrs 2000, there is little evidence in Old Icelandic for true, nonattracting pronouns; thus at this stage, relative sá only occurs in the case-attracting position Spec-AgrP.

By the seventeenth century, we have genuine competition between case-attracting and nonattracting sá, which can be captured in the split-CP analysis as Roehrs (2000) proposed: case-attracting sá continues to occur in the higher projection Spec-AgrP, while true relative sá moves to Spec-ForceP.

(56) a. … unga og dægilega kvinn-u, sú er Anna hét. \([= 49]\)
   young and pretty wife-acc sá.nom rp Anna was.called
   ‘One tailor … had a young and pretty wife, who was called Anna.’

b. NP
   N
   kvinnu
   AgrP
   Agrʹ
   Agr
   ForceP
   súi
   Forceʹ
   Force
   er
   TP
   t₁ Anna hét

Interestingly, in these two centuries there is only one example of a predicate adjective in the nominative ‘disagreeing’ in case with nonnominative sá. Aside from this exception, the fact that predicate adjectives now always agree with relative sá hints that both attracting and nonattracting sá may be raising from the relativized argument position into the CP layer.

Turning now to my analysis of the case distinction between case-attracting relative pronouns in Spec-AgrP and true relative pronouns in Spec-ForceP, I capture this using phase theory. Phase theory accounts for why certain operations are limited to particular parts of the syntactic derivation. Chomsky 2001 proposes two phases: vP (the domain of the verb and its arguments) and CP (the clause). Derivation takes place within the phase, and then all material except the phase edge is spelled out to phonological form (PF). Thus the phase domain, once spelled out, is no longer accessible to syntactic operations; Chomsky calls this the phase impenetrability condition. The phase impenetrability condition allows us to update Harbert’s (1992:115) argument concerning cliticization of relative particles and the position of the relative pronoun (sá-s in ON, þiz-ei in Gothic): cliticization indicates that the pronoun and the particle are in the same phase, so with the particle in C, the pronoun must be in Spec-CP.29 Because this cliticization occurs with both case-attracting and nonattracting pronouns, even case-attracting pronouns must be within the phase (i.e. CP) of the relative clause. But under a split-CP analysis, exactly which projection of the CP layer is the phase boundary? Totsuka (2013) argues that Force is the highest head of the CP domain and is thus the phase head. However, Bošković

29 I thank a referee for suggesting this line of inquiry.
(2014) claims that phases can vary, depending on how many functional projections are present; he calls this ‘the-highest-phrase-is-a-phase approach’. If, as I have argued, AgrP is the highest projection of the relative clause in Old Icelandic and into early-modern Icelandic, I propose that Agr rather than Force is the phase head at these stages of the language. This would make Spec-AgrP a phase edge, and thus pronouns inserted in Spec-AgrP are accessible to an agreement relation with the antecedent to which they are adjoined. Pronouns that move into Spec-ForceP, by contrast, are not at the phase edge and thus not accessible to operations outside the relative clause; they therefore maintain the case of the argument position in which they are generated.

This analysis provides an account for the synchronic variation between attracting and nonattracting relative pronouns: relative pronouns in Spec-AgrP are in the phase edge and thus undergo case attraction, while pronouns in Spec-ForceP are not at the phase edge and are thus impervious to case attraction. However, the following question remains: Why do Old Icelandic relative pronouns have the agreement features that necessitate projecting AgrP in the first place? In the next section, I argue that this state of affairs is a consequence of the reanalysis of demonstrative pronouns to relative pronouns.

4.5. Reanalysis from demonstrative to relative sá. The intuition that case attraction is a consequence of the way relative pronouns developed from demonstratives can be found as early as Erdmann 1874:53. Within the generative framework, Pittner (1995) sketches the development as follows, where ‘NP’ represents the antecedent and ‘pro’ a null relative pronoun.

\[(57) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{NP}_i \{pro\}_i \ldots \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{NP}_i \text{correlative pronoun}_i \{pro\}_i \ldots \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{NP}_i \{(cor)relative pronoun\}_i \ldots \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{NP}_i \text{relative pronoun}_i \ldots
\end{align*} \]

In 57b the ‘correlative pronoun’ (what I describe as a cataphoric demonstrative) is in the matrix clause and as such shares the case of the matrix NP. In 57c the pronoun has been reanalyzed as part of the relative clause but still agrees in case with the antecedent: I have labeled this a case-attracting relative pronoun (Pittner calls it a ‘(cor)relative’ as it behaves syntactically like a relative but morphologically like a correlative). In the final stage of the development (57d), the pronoun is both morphologically and syntactically a true relative pronoun. While my terminology differs somewhat from Pittner’s, this is the basic insight I adopt.

Turning now to Old Icelandic, the main development is from demonstrative sá to (case-attracting) relative sá. In the learned style and in texts after the Old Icelandic period, there is evidence for a further development of sá to a nonattracting relative pronoun. My analysis for each stage is illustrated in 58, which updates the structures in 5 using the split-CP analysis argued for here.

\[(58) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{demonstrative:} \quad \{sá\} \text{NP}_i \{sá\} [\text{CP} \text{pro}_i \text{C er/sem} \ldots e_i \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{case-attracting relative:} \quad \text{NP}_i [\text{AgrP} \text{sá}_i \text{[ForceP er/sem} \ldots e_i \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{nonattracting/true relative:} \quad \text{NP}_i [\text{[ForceP er/sem \ldots ti}_i
\end{align*} \]

The demonstrative represented in 58a can have either the original deictic function or the cataphoric (correlative) function, in which sá merely anticipates a following relative clause (keeping in mind that demonstrative sá remains a possibility at all times, into Modern Icelandic). Note that demonstrative sá can precede or follow the antecedent noun, and that the deictic and cataphoric uses of sá cannot be distinguished by word order alone. The cataphoric use of sá originated well before the emergence of Old Icelandic prose, being found in runic inscriptions from the Common Norse period. In the follow-
ing inscription, I assume that Ketiley had only one husband by that name (which happens to be missing from the inscription), so sa must not have any extralinguistic deixis.

(59) … þiakn al kup-an þan is hana ati
  man all-good-ACC SÅ.ACC RP [e].NOM her.ACC had
  ‘Ketiley made this monument for … a very good man, who was her husband’

(Birde Herrestad, DR 293, ca. 1000–1050, in Rundata 3.0)

Before the earliest Old Icelandic prose appears, reanalysis takes place: postnominal cataphoric sa in 58a is reanalyzed as a case-attracting relative, 58b. This reanalysis was facilitated by the semantic ambiguity between cataphoric demonstratives and relative pronouns and by the high frequency of post-N sa, often putting it in a position immediately preceding the relative clause. So the reanalysis of the post-N cataphoric demonstrative sa to case-attracting relative sa involves a reanalysis of the clause boundary.

(60) (cataphoric) demonstrative pron. → relative pronoun
  hljóð þau [CP er eigi finna-st] → hljóð [AgrP þau [ForceP er eigi finnast
  sounds SÅ RP not find-PASS] = 14b
  ‘(every language has) sounds that are not found (in other languages)’

As in Gothic (Harbert 1992), the fact that Old Icelandic er cliticizes to sa in poetry indicates that the pronoun is in the relative clause. Following Harbert’s analysis of Gothic, let us assume that sa is in the highest Spec position of the relative clause. However, we now have a mismatch between morphology and syntax: syntactically, sa is in the relative clause, but morphologically, it continues to agree in case with the antecedent. This case agreement with the antecedent cannot be attributed to the pronoun’s function in the relative clause; thus as argued above this agreement feature causes sa to project AgrP above ForceP in all Old Icelandic relative clauses with sa. At this stage, there is no good evidence for nonattracting sa (recall that there are only a handful of examples in the learned-style Hámillubók). Thus it appears that all Old Icelandic relative clauses introduced by sa have the structure in 55.

The final stage in the development of Icelandic sa, from a case-attracting relative pronoun illustrated in 58b to a nonattracting, German-style relative pronoun as in 58c, is first attested in the early-modern era. As we saw in §4.2, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some Icelandic authors use sa as both a case-attracting and a non-case-attracting relative pronoun. While this seems to have begun with Biblical translations and is thus arguably a product of language contact, by the seventeenth century this has spread to other types of texts, representing genuine language change. We thus have evidence for the final stage of the development illustrated in 58c. In terms of structure, this requires reanalyzing the position of sa from the agreeing position in Spec-AgrP down into the canonical position for relative pronouns in Spec-ForceP, as illustrated in 56. While, the AgrP/ForceP distinction was eventually collapsed in languages like German, leading to nonattracting pronouns only, in the history of Icelandic, sa disappears as a relative pronoun before that development is realized. Perhaps the development of relative sa might have proceeded all the way to a purely nonattracting pronoun had it not been completely replaced by the relative complementizer sem in Modern Icelandic.

It should be noted that by the seventeenth century, there are as many as three types of sa cooccurring: demonstrative sa (with deictic and cataphoric functions), case-attracting sa, and true relative sa. In other words, the reanalyses discussed in this section do not result in the loss of the source of the reanalysis. While it may seem unparsimonious to claim that all three types of sa were present at a single stage of the language, this is not an unusual situation for words of category D. For example, German der can be a
definite determiner, a demonstrative pronoun, or a relative pronoun; in spoken German, prosody and context disambiguate the three subcategories.

Consequently, sá continues to occur as a demonstrative into Modern Icelandic. This occurs even in the presence of relative clauses.

(61) Sá, er hann átti tal við, var Jón sá, er var að gifta sig ... sá RP he had talk with was J. sá RP was to marry refl

‘The one whom he had a talk with was that John who was to marry ...’

(1882.TORFHILDUR.NAR-FIC,.1169)

However, I contend that such Modern Icelandic examples of sá with a following relative clause are demonstratives rather than relics of the earlier use as a relative pronoun. According to Thráínsson (2007:88), post-N demonstrative sá occurs in Modern Icelandic in ‘bookish’ style, so sá in examples like Jón sá can be considered a demonstrative. If my contention is correct that Modern Icelandic sá is always a demonstrative, then no explanation is required for the fact that at this stage of the language it agrees in case with the antecedent noun rather than the relativized argument.

5. Grammaticalization and cyclic change. I have proposed that case-attracting sá in Old Icelandic represents a transitional stage in a larger development from a demonstrative to a (nonattracting) relative pronoun, a development whose conclusion is obscured due to the rise of relative sem. In this section, I discuss how this development fits in with two broad conceptions of syntactic reanalysis: grammaticalization and cyclic change.

The notion that demonstrative pronouns can become relative pronouns is widely discussed in the grammaticalization literature. In fact, demonstratives may be the primary source of relative markers in the languages of the world (Heine & Kuteva 2002:115). However, the changes investigated in this article are potentially at odds with generative accounts of grammaticalization by Roberts and Roussou (2003) and van Gelderen (2004). In this view of grammaticalization, functional-class items result from movement of lexical items upward into functional projections. But the two structural reanalyses proposed here for sá appear to proceed downward in the tree structure: first from a cataphoric demonstrative in the matrix DP to a case-attracting relative pronoun in Spec-AgrP of the embedded clause, and later from Spec-AgrP to a true relative pronoun in Spec-ForceP. Indeed, both of these reanalyses share properties with changes identified by Roberts and Roussou (2003:208) as ‘downward reanalysis’ rather than (upward) grammaticalization. Neither of the two reanalyses proposed in this article involves a category change, because demonstrative, case-attracting relative, and true relative pronouns are all of category D. Nor is there any evidence for semantic bleaching (the demonstrative sá having already lost the ability to refer extralinguistically) or for phonological reduction. Thus while the reanalysis of demonstratives to relatives is frequently cited in the mainstream grammaticalization literature, the changes to sá in the history of Icelandic cannot be considered grammaticalization in the sense of Roberts and Roussou (2003) or van Gelderen (2004).

But if the development of sá from a demonstrative to a relative is not an instance of grammaticalization in the narrowest sense (being triggered neither by semantic bleaching nor by phonological reduction), why did sá come to be used as a relative in the first place? Perhaps this has to do with the weakening of sá itself, but with the weakness of er as a marker of relative clauses. If this is correct, the weakness of relative er meant that sá was needed to more clearly delineate the beginning of a relative clause. A similar development occurred in the history of English relative clauses, with the replacement of the OE relative complementizer þe by a demonstrative pronoun þæt, via a stage in which the two cooccurred (van Gelderen 2004:81–82).
(62) Old English: þe > þat þe > þat
Old Icelandic: er > sá er > sá
rel. particle rel. pron. + particle rel. pron.

There are several reasons why er was a less-than-perfect relative complementizer. First, relative er was phonologically light, as it could cliticize to the preceding pronoun (as in 27 above). Second, the particle er was an all-purpose complementizer, serving not only in relative clauses, but also as a marker of comparison (‘as’) and of various types of adverbial clauses (‘when’, ‘where’). The weakness and ambiguity of er gave rise to the need for accompanying words to disambiguate its function. When the complementizer of adverbial clauses, er could be accompanied by the adverb ‘then’ or ‘there’, and in relative clauses sá served the same purpose.

(63) a. þá er
   then RP
   ‘when’
 b. þar er
   there RP
   ‘where’
 c. sá er

In addition to its many functions as a complementizer, er was also homophonous with the third singular present tense of vera ‘to be’.

As to the final stage of the development illustrated in 62, I showed above that the re-analysis of sá to a true relative pronoun occurred in early-modern Icelandic, as attested by examples such as 48 and 49. Interestingly, in 48 there is no relative particle. This appears to be evidence for the final stage of the change: sá was able to serve as the sole relativizer in some clauses.30 However, as I claimed regarding sá as a non-case-attracting pronoun, the sole use of sá as a relative marker was overshadowed by the increasing predominance of relative sem.

The development in 62 can be considered a cyclical change, because the end stage of the development can be the input for a similar change. In fact, by Modern English the former relative pronoun þat has become a relative complementizer that, and it can even occur with a phrasal relative pronoun such as who (as in 2) and which (see van Gelderen 2004:87–89). This cycle is reminiscent of Jespersen’s cycle, in which a negative particle (e.g. French ne) is reinforced (ne ... pas) and ultimately replaced by the reinforcing element (Jespersen 1917). Van Gelderen (2011) proposes that there is a broader ‘linguistic cycle’, whereby lexical items become functional items and then disappear (i.e. grammaticalization), followed by the introduction of a new lexical item to fill the same function as the lost one (renewal). What the relative pronoun cycles illustrated in 62 share with Jespersen’s cycle, but not necessarily with other cycles of loss and renewal, is the fact that the word responsible for renewal cooccurs with the word that is eventually lost. In other words, there is a period of redundancy that precedes renewal. I call this kind of change renewal via redundancy.

As a final note, viewing sá er as part of a renewal-via-redundancy cycle helps explain changes with respect to the so-called doubly filled COMP filter (Chomsky & Lasnik 1977), which has been shown not to be universal because of examples like 1 and 2 above. Bayer and Brandner (2008) proposed that double complementation can be re-

30 Similarly, Pittner (1995) finds that the disappearance of relative particles in early-modern German coincides with the loss of case attraction on the pronoun.
duced to lexical variation in the features of the relative pronoun. Applying Bayer and Brandner’s proposal to the diachronic changes illustrated in 62, a language (like Modern English) that allows either a relative pronoun or a relative complementizer, but not both together, has a [− overt C] feature on the pronoun. When a pronoun is added to reinforce a weakened relative particle, this pronoun must have the feature [+ overt C] in order to allow its cooccurrence with the particle. Finally, when the pronoun alone suffices to mark the relative clause, the feature reverts to [− overt C] to disallow a doubly filled CP.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{rel. pronoun} & \text{or} & \text{rel. particle} \\
\text{rel. pronoun} & \text{and} & \text{rel. particle} \\
\text{[− overt C]} & \text{[+ overt C]} & \text{[− overt C]} \\
\end{array}
\]

The first change occurred before the emergence of Old Icelandic, resulting in doubly filled CPs with sá er (in relative clauses). The presence of double complementation in adverbial clauses like þar er ‘there where’ suggests that the [± overt C] feature can also occur on adverbs. The second change occurred in early-modern Icelandic, but has gone largely unnoticed because again the sá er construction was overshadowed by the new relative marker sem. Note, though, that Modern Icelandic continues to allow other types of double complementizers such as þegar að ‘when that’ (Larsson 2014:451). This seems to confirm the lexical nature of double complementizers: sá began to change to [− overt C] in early-modern Icelandic (just before disappearing as a relativizer), but the adverbs have remained [+ overt C] down to the present day.

6. CONCLUSION. This article has investigated changes to various relative markers in the history of Icelandic. Section 2 shows that the relative complementizer er and the pronoun sá, which often accompanies er, decline over time and are replaced by the complementizer sem. In §3, I argued on semantic and distributional criteria that the demonstrative pronoun sá in many examples has been reanalyzed as a relative pronoun. However, this relative pronoun shows pervasive case attraction in Old Icelandic and only begins to behave as a true, nonattracting relative pronoun in the seventeenth century, just before it is replaced by sem. In §4, I account for the case-attracting relative pronouns as a transitional stage between demonstrative pronouns and nonattracting pronouns. The development in Old Icelandic appears to be rather unusual, because this transitional stage coincides with the flourishing of Old Icelandic literature, thus leaving the misleading impression that demonstrative sá developed into a case-attracting relative pronoun but never became a true relative pronoun. In formal terms, I capture this development in a split-CP analysis, such that case-attracting sá is in Spec-AgrP, the phase edge of the CP system and thus accessible to agreement with the antecedent, while nonattracting relative pronouns are lower down in Spec-ForceP.

As discussed in §5, this study has three broader implications. First, although the grammaticalization literature discusses the reanalysis of demonstratives to relative pronouns, the reanalysis of sá from a demonstrative to a relative pronoun is less compatible with grammaticalization and more akin to downward reanalysis in the sense of Roberts & Roussou 2003. Second, unlike more straightforward instances of loss and renewal, the replacement of relative complementizers such as er by relative pronouns is not a straightforward development, but proceeds through a stage in which two relative markers are used in tandem (so-called double complementation). I have called this kind of change, of which Jespersen’s cycle is another example, renewal via redundancy. Third, double complementation can be accounted for by assuming that wh-moved subordinators, such as relative pronouns, have a [± overt C] allowing for the cooccurrence
of an overt complementizer. The fact that Modern Icelandic no longer allows double complementation in relative clauses but does allow it in adverbial clauses is evidence that this is a feature of individual lexical items rather than a more general principle such as the doubly filled COMP filter.
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