

A Construction-based View of Possessive and Local Case-marking in Middle and Modern Welsh Relative Clauses

Paul Manning
Department of Anthropology
Trent University

Abstract

Middle to Modern Welsh relative clauses feature two binary formal oppositions of complementizer selection and gap realization that have typically been taken to be in some sort of parallel distribution, in such a way that a single independent variable (traditionally, constituent structure ‘depth’) can account for the realization of both. It is demonstrated that the two formal variables cross-cut one another distributionally, in such a way that no one single independent variable can account for both sets. This paper shows that the first set of complementizer selection in many construction types, particularly relativization on notional ‘possessors’, behaves in a manner that resembles case-marking as well as construction-type marking, so that relativization on objects of prepositions in possessive constructions coding possessors behaves in a manner systematically different from either objects of true locative prepositions or objects of prepositions that mark ‘experiencers’. Although complementizer selection and gap realization are not correlated distributionally, complementizer selection in possessive clauses enters into correlation with other variables of morpho-syntactic form, including PP NP word order, that are also diagnostic of clauses coding notional ‘possession’. It is argued that only a construction-based or ‘coding view’ of syntax can take account of these data.

Introduction

Middle and Modern Welsh affirmative relative clauses feature two cross-cutting formal oppositions: (1) a distinction between ‘DIRECT’ (*a*) (examples 1, 3) and ‘OBLIQUE’ (*y(d)*, *y(r)*) preverbal particles or

complementizers (or suppletive morphology coding the same opposition) (examples 2, 4); and (2) a distinction between what may be called ‘non-pronominal’ (1, 2) and ‘pronominal’ (3, 4) realization of the notional ‘gap’ in the relative clause. These two oppositions are found in precisely the same form in the formation of relative clauses, various kinds of clefts, and constituent questions, and in this paper I will (admittedly awkwardly) refer to this family of constructions, for which no other name exists, indifferently by the name of ‘relatives’, and I will call the process by which they are formed ‘relativization’, reserving ‘relative clause’ (RC) for actual relative clauses (Manning 2001). Other possible terms, such as wh-dependencies, for example, imply that there are the equivalent of wh-words involved in all of them, which is not the case (wh-words typically occur only in wh-questions in Middle Welsh (MW) and Modern Welsh (Mod.W)). A more preferable alternative might be A’-dependencies, and hence, A’-dependency formation, which is quite awkward stylistically.

As the following Middle Welsh examples illustrate, all possible combinations of these variables are robustly attested; similar data can be found for Early Modern Welsh (see also Manning 1996; Willis 1998: 81–2, 2000).¹

- (1) *Yr erchwys_i [a ladyssei Ø_i y carw]*
 The pack DIR had.killed Ø the stag
 ‘The pack that had killed the stag.’ *PKM* 2.15
- (2) *y noss_i [y keueist y mab Ø_i]*
 The night OBL you[SG].got the boy Ø
 ‘The night thou didst find the boy.’ *PKM* 23.25
- (3) *y rei_i [a ellir [eu_i kyffelybu] yr deu bechawt]²*
 the ones DIR can[IMP] their liken to-the two sin
 ‘Those which can be likened to the two sins.’ *SG* 30
- (4) *y peth_i [y galler [y_i gassau]]*
 the thing OBL can[IMP] its hate
 ‘The thing that may be hated.’ *LIA* 86³

However, the syntactic literature on Modern Welsh, both prescriptive and descriptive, has usually assumed that an empirical correlation between these two formal systems is the norm, so that a specific complementizer entails a specific manner of gap realization (Manning 1996; Willis 2000). Direct complementation is assumed to correlate with non-pronominal realization of the gap (as in example 1), and Oblique complementation is assumed to correlate with pronominal realization of the gap (as in example 4). From this perspective, data that violate this expectation are either considered ‘anomalous’ (examples like 3) or simply not dealt with at all (examples like 2). In many such accounts (following the original generative analysis of Awbery 1977) the alleged correlation between these two sets of variables is explained by a single independent variable, namely, the (surface-level) constituent structure-based distinction between ‘Direct’ and ‘Indirect Dominance’ of extraction site by the S node (I use the traditional generative syntactic terminology and node labels to indicate that no syntactic formalism is at issue), such that one set of complementizer and gap realizations is found in ‘direct’ environments (e.g. 1, 2), and another in ‘indirect’ environments (3, 4). I note in passing that the original success and analytic attractiveness of this analysis depend crucially on assuming a ‘flat’ constituent structure for VSO clauses, as implied by the ‘dominance’ terminology.

As can be seen, however, from examples 1–4, there is no correlation between the complementizer type and manner of gap realization (see also Manning 1996, Willis 2000). *A fortiori*, it cannot be the same independent variable that explains both of these dependent variables. In this paper I will argue that the independent variable that is often invoked to explain this alleged correlation (Direct and Indirect Dominance at the surface level of syntactic structure, or similar locality condition) is empirically inadequate for conditioning the choice of complementizers, but fares somewhat better in conditioning the manner of gap realization. Therefore, although the existing accounts may provide adequately for gap realization, they cannot in principle do so for complementizer selection with the same independent variable.

Secondly, I will give an account of relative types that represent a lapse in the correlation (including so-called ‘anomalous relatives’), making explicit appeal to the notion of ‘construction type’ (Goldberg

1995), that is, conventional associations of grammatical categories (specifically and differentially encoded ‘meaning’) and formal categories (distinctive formal categories like complementizer type and word order, for example) (Silverstein 1993; Manning 2002), in order to predict the distribution of complementizer types in a specific domain of relative formation: clauses which involve extraction of the object of a preposition in a clause headed by the verb ‘to be’. I will motivate three separate construction types on both formal and functional grounds: (1) constructions which involve ‘grammatical’ or ‘functional’ prepositions, whose value is entirely determined by their diacritic role within a specific construction; (2) predicative possessive constructions where the possessor is marked by a preposition; and (3) true locative prepositions. Given their importance to what follows, I give an especially detailed formal and functional delineation of the class of possessive constructions, both in terms of their internal organization and their external relations to other, formally similar constructions (like locatives). Each of these construction classes will be shown to have a specifiable effect on complementizer selection when the construction in question is relativized. Moreover, attributive possessive constructions will be shown to behave like predicative possessive constructions for these purposes. These facts imply that the independent variable relevant for complementizer selection as a whole is a matter of (functional) grammatical categories (referring to the type of grammatical relation coded by the preposition, case-marking), rather than a matter of purely formal categories (constituent structure depth). Essentially, the traditional intuition that this is a case-marking opposition is correct.

In addition, I will give an empirical account of a specific type of ‘anomalous’ relative, the *a(g)*-relative, which occurs only when possessors (both attributive and predicative) are relativized. This relative (as Awbery 1977 correctly argues; Manning 2001) involves a promotion or advancement by which possessor arguments (objects of prepositions) are promoted to subjects of the clause (Keenan and Comrie 1977: 95–6). I will also show that patterns of construction-specific word-orders found in predicative possessive constructions allow us to argue for limited patterns of inheritance of word-order patterns, thereby showing that word-order rules, as well as constituent relations of hierarchical inclusion, are in the

class of potentially construction-specific phenomena. That is, both constituent structure and word order are categories of signifier *form*, that is, they are capable of specifically and differentially signalling some signified *content*. That is, they are ‘formal categories’ which serve to specifically and differentially code some ‘grammatical categories’ within the framework of some constructions that link these two orders (Silverstein 1993, 1995; Manning 1995, 1997, 2002). I will show that *formal* categories as diverse as word order, complementation and other overt clausal morphosyntax can come to be aligned as quasi-equivalent categories inasmuch as they are parallel and complementary means of coding the same functional, *grammatical* categories. Different formal categories can serve as functionally equivalent case-markers because, though unrelated qua formal categories, they are complementary exponents of related meaningful grammatical categories, like heteroclitic verbal conjugations which use unlike formal means, such as verbal morphology or periphrastic constructions, to express essentially similar grammatical categories of Tense or Aspect. In essence, then, I am arguing that we can construct *syntactic paradigms* with relationships between syntactic formal categories organized by intersecting sets of grammatical categories, in much the same way that traditional grammars organize morphological categories of form in terms of intersecting sets of grammatical categories (Silverstein 1993; Manning 2002).

Lastly, I will show that the opposition between Direct and Oblique complementation, though not determined distributionally by constituent structure, nevertheless interacts with constituent structure to produce specific environments in which minimal contrasts of complementation can be shown to have relatively concrete coded values, signalling categories relevant primarily to case-marking. In short, in this paper I will argue that certain distinctive features of Middle and Modern Welsh relative clauses in complementation and word order that have been largely assumed to be predictable on the basis of other empirical or imputed autonomous formal properties of clauses in fact serve as a somewhat oblique and extremely complex system of case-marking.

Which Welsh?

Since Welsh is a language with a long literary history of attestation, and exists in many different varieties, it is important to specify exactly which variety of Welsh is being discussed at any point. This is not merely a matter of specificity, but has important theoretical consequences. The variety of Welsh most often discussed under the term ‘Modern Welsh’, namely the modern literary standard, is in fact a heterogeneous mixture of relatively early texts (e.g. the Bible of 1588) and texts that use these texts as a model but are in fact the product of greater or lesser rationalization and standardization. By the nineteenth century, spoken Welsh had diverged so much from this literary register that the ‘Welsh’ speech community can be described as being in a state of diglossia, so that the literary version of Modern Welsh is acquired more or less as a second language in adulthood. Moreover, even the literary standard was itself a heteroglossic welter of variation until the middle of the twentieth century at least. Any one of these distinct varieties could with justification be called ‘Modern Welsh’.

Therefore, the data in this paper will be drawn mainly from an extensive survey of Late Middle Welsh prose texts, with occasional references to *Early Modern Welsh* (henceforth Mod.W) where it differs materially from Middle Welsh (henceforth MW). Since the ‘Modern Welsh’ I will be discussing here is not identical to the new print standard of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries which bears the same name, or to modern colloquial Welsh (Willis 2000), I naturally make no use of data collected from living persons or from texts or normative grammars written in the last two centuries. For the purposes of this paper late Middle and Early Modern Welsh display similar enough syntactic behaviour to be treated as a single language for the purposes of analysis, with some minor differences that will be flagged.

The data-set in question offers several advantages in methodological terms. Modern standardized versions of literary Welsh exist in a diglossic relationship with the modern colloquial language (Manning 1997, 2004; Willis 1998, 2000), which does not appear to be the case with the Early Modern Welsh data. Importantly, the reflexes of relativization considered here in Modern Literary Welsh are almost entirely absent from the contemporary colloquial language, therefore the relativization system of

this language, which is learned as a second language and confined primarily to literary domains of use, shows the heavy influence of the theories of the standardizers and cannot be considered to be a direct continuation of the same relativization system considered here, but rather a modern reconstruction of it (Willis 2000; see in general Manning 2004). The use of relative particles in this version of the language represents the secondary acquisition of a diglossic version of the language based on a heterogeneous collection of models from early Modern Welsh prose and poetry (themselves already diverging considerably), as well as from textbook expositions by language reformers who had their own specific ideas about what the phenomenon in question was (Manning 2004). Indeed, as Willis (2000) in effect argues, the simplicity and directness of the correlations between gap realization and complementizer selection in many accounts of Modern Welsh may be simply the result of the simplification of syntax that results from Modern Literary Welsh being learned as a second language from prescriptive grammars. The variation found in usage until the late twentieth century, similarly, may simply index the heterogeneity of literary models used in the acquisition process. Similarly complex patterns of variation attend every aspect of the syntax of the Modern Welsh. As is well known, even simple declarative clause structures notoriously show complex patterns of variation resulting from mixtures of archaic, colloquial, poetic and prose registers (Manning 1997, 2004; Currie 2000; Willis 1998). Therefore, with Willis (2000), I would suggest that the assumed homogeneity of Modern Literary Welsh as an empirical object is suspect, and should be demonstrated rather than assumed.

By contrast, the data-set I am considering (late Middle to early Modern Welsh) does not show the same extensive rationalization of heterogeneous sources. This does not, however, mean that I am talking about an entirely different language. Since part of the model for the modern rationalized variety of the language called Modern Welsh includes Early Modern Welsh texts, such as the Bible translation of 1588, there is some overlap empirically between the two kinds of Modern Welsh, adding to the analytic confusion. Indeed, so far from being standardized, given the extensive range of models ranging over more than five centuries, Modern Literary Welsh showed considerable variation in

relativization and elsewhere until fairly late in the twentieth century. Willis (2000: 542–3) points out that the kind of variation in relativization I discuss here was attested in normative Welsh grammars through the first half of the twentieth century (for example Richards 1938: 66–7), and was not stated as a definitive rule for Literary Welsh until just a few decades before the first Generative analysis of the phenomenon was made. In fact, the wider range of the data considered by Awbery better corresponds to that found in Richards (1938) than it does to later grammars of the Standard. For these reasons, Willis treats the modern literary language as being a secondary formation, essentially a set of calques based on the colloquial language, with additional prescriptive rules added on to this that add relative particles absent from the spoken language, for example (Willis 2000: 53). As Willis points out, the correlations that are found in the contemporary literary standard are characteristic of neither Colloquial Welsh nor Early Modern Welsh, and the opposition between *a* and *y(r)* is absent from the colloquial language. For these reasons, Willis (2000) has chosen to look at the colloquial language, while I have chosen to inspect the period from Late Middle to Early Modern Welsh as the best in which to determine what the original function of these particles might actually have been. It is this period of the language that provides perhaps the best illustration of the syntactic oppositions that motivated the earliest generative accounts (Awbery 1977), which are absent from the modern colloquial language (Willis 2000). Indeed, part of the value of Awbery's initial description of Modern Welsh is that the main points of its analysis in empirical terms are correct for Middle to Early Modern Welsh. Hence, inasmuch as the Modern Standard Welsh data-set is rather heterogeneous (containing both texts from what might be called a living tradition with 'native speakers' and texts that reflect the ideologies of language reformers and rationalizers with no 'native speakers'), I have chosen to reconsider existing theories of 'Welsh relativization' using a more homogeneous data-set, one which, however, overlaps with the data-set used by Awbery (inasmuch as the Bible of 1588 and texts from that period are simultaneously products of the tradition I am discussing and serve as models for the modern standardized version of the language). On the overlap between Early Modern Welsh (1400–1600) and Modern Welsh (1400–present day), see also Willis (forthcoming). It is this

substantial empirical overlap that provides, I believe, for the relevance of this more clearly specified data-set to the evaluation of theories of relativization, like Awbery's, that concern themselves with 'Modern Welsh'. My sample here derives from texts that cover two periods, Late Middle and Early Modern Welsh (particularly examples from the 1588 Bible translation), from the fourteenth century to the sixteenth century, discussing the latter only where it differs materially from the former.⁴

A final note on what I will *not* discuss. Given the finite corpus, the data is not sufficient to consider in any detail long-distance dependencies or extractions from embedded clauses which are attested routinely in the modern literary standard. I will therefore be considering only the role of relativization in case-marking of simple relative clauses, concentrating particularly on those that involve differential case-marking in clauses that mark possession and location, since this is an area where the Middle to Early Modern Welsh data-set proves to be the most interesting. From the perspective of a certain kind of theoretical proclivity, my analysis, cast in an unfamiliar framework, may seem to be lacking in theoretical rigour, and no doubt includes gaffes of various kinds, regarding forms of representation that are no longer allowed amongst respectable syntacticians. I invite such readers to read this paper, then, either as an exploration of a history of ideas, or as an empirical excursion in what might be called 'mere descriptivism' or some other harmless activity. However, should the data show that Welsh is somewhat more 'exotic' and surprising than the standardizers ever imagined, I shall be pleased.

The formal typology of Welsh relatives

Middle and Modern Welsh relative clauses involve two interlocking sets of formal (or 'dependent') variables (see Silverstein 1993, 1995; Manning 1995, 1997 and below for the specific sense of 'form' intended here). The first opposition is between the 'Direct' complementizer *a* ('DIR' followed by lenition (a^l)) and the 'Oblique' complementizer, $y(d)$, $y(r)$ ('OBL'), the former variant being somewhat more characteristic of Middle Welsh (MW), the latter Modern Welsh (Mod.W, in the Modern standard it is the main variety that is found), as well as the relatively archaic form *yt*. The former occurs in subject and object relatives (example 1 above), while the

latter occurs in, e.g., adverbial NP relatives (example 2 above) (cf. Rouveret 1994: 381). Note that if we limit our sample to only these, holding all other things equal, then the complementizer chosen appears to code straightforwardly the opposition between arguments (Direct) and non-arguments of the verb (Oblique), hence the names for the categories. The Direct complementizer *a* is realized by partial suppletion in some forms of the verb ‘to be’ (MW *bot*, Mod.W *bod*, the variation is purely orthographic) (5), and is optional before some other forms.

(5)		Present	Imperfect
	MW	<i>(ys)syd</i>	<i>(a) oed</i>
	Mod.W	<i>sydd</i>	<i>(a) oedd</i>

The Oblique complementizer has several forms (6) from MW to Mod.W: *yt* (followed by lenition), *y(d)*, *y(r)*, with, once again, considerable variation, all three being found in Middle Welsh. This particle is also found as an Affirmative clause-marker in non-relatives (labelled AFF in this function).

(6)	Early MW	<i>yt</i> [əd ^l]
	MW	<i>yd</i> [əð] / ___ V, <i>y</i> [ə] elsewhere
	Mod.W	<i>yr</i> [ər] / ___ V, <i>y</i> [ə] elsewhere

Cross-cutting this complementizer opposition, the ‘gap’ vacated by ‘extracted’ material is coded either by nothing (what I will call ‘null realization’ or ‘Ø’) (1–2) or by some AGR-like pronominal material (what I will call ‘pronominal realization’ or ‘AGR’). The manner of realization of the AGR-like material is straightforwardly determined by the categorial type of the lexical head of the phrase that contains the gap. Thus, with phrases headed by verbal nouns and nouns, the AGR-material is realized as a pronominal possessive proclitic to the VN (7) or N (8).

- (7) *dillat_i* [y *gallewch* [**eu_i** *gwisgaw*]]
 clothing OBL you.can their wear
 ‘Clothing which you can wear.’ SG 249
- (8) y *rei_i* [y *mae* [**eu_i** *kyrff*] yn-y *vynnwent honn*]]
 The ones OBL is their bodies in-the cemetery this
 ‘Those whose bodies are in this cemetery.’ SG 309

With prepositional phrases headed by an inflectable preposition (e.g. *yn* ‘in’), the AGR-material is realized by an inflected form of the preposition (*yndaw* ‘in it’) (9). With uninflectable prepositions (e.g. MW *a(c)*/Mod.W *a(g)* ‘with’), the material is realized by an independent pronominal form (10). The formal opposition between (9) and (10) has been a central focus of the later generative literature, see for example Rouveret (1994: 382ff.), Willis (2000), for reasons that largely emanate from within assumptions of the explanatory framework. For this discussion, the empirical generalizations based on the morphological properties of the head (inflectable versus non-inflectable preposition) seem to be the simplest way to explain this formal difference.

- (9) *a-r* *castell_i* [y *mae hi* yn *trygyaw* [**yndaw_i**]]
 and-the castle OBL is she pt. stay in.it
 ‘And the castle she was living in.’ SG 279
- (10) y *cledyf_i* [y *llas* *penn ieuan vedydywr* [**ac ef_i**]]
 The sword OBL cut. IMP head John Baptist with it
 ‘The sword that John the Baptist’s head was cut off with.’ SG 362

In Middle and Early Modern Welsh, the marginal status (noted above) of certain relative types (examples 2, 3) within the syntactic literature is not based on empirical rarity or exceptional status with respect to the ‘normal’ relatives (1, 4). In many cases, in fact, the anomalous variant is normal or obligatory, in the case of examples (3, 4, repeated here as 11, 12), which involve extractions of objects of verbal nouns. For example, the

‘expected’ Oblique complementizer *y(d)/y(r)* is found only with the verb *gallu* ‘can’, e.g.

- (11) *y rei [a ellir [eu kyffelybu] yr deu bechawt]*
 the ones DIR can[IMP] their liken to-the two sin
 ‘Those which can be likened to the two sins.’ *SG* 30
- (12) *y peth [y galler [y gassau]]*
 the thing OBL can[IMP] its hate
 ‘The thing that may be hated.’ *LIA* 86

However, with most complement-taking verbs only the ‘anomalous’ variant is attested in my MW and Early Mod.W corpus. Note that whether the complement-taking verb is passive or not makes no difference in MW, inasmuch as impersonal passives do not change the role of the notional object to syntactic subject.⁵

- (13) *pan yw mahumet [a dylyir [y alw] yn Duw]*
 that is Mahumet DIR ought[IMP] his call pt. God
 ‘That it is Mahumet whom one ought to call God.’ *YCM* 92.28
- (14) *dy dryc ewyllys di . . . [a allafi [y odef] yn hawd]]*
 your ill will you . . . [DIR I-can [its suffer] pt. easy
 ‘Your ill will . . . I can suffer easily.’ *SG* 409
- (15) *beth [a vynny di ymi [y wneuthur] mwy]*
 what DIR want-you you to-me its do more
 ‘What else do you want me to do?’ *SG* 103
- (16) *y tri [a daroed y beredur [eu bwrw] yr llawr]*
 the three DIR happened to Peredur their throw to-the ground
 ‘The three that Peredur had thrown to the ground.’ *SG* 58

Therefore, the marginalization of such constructions such as these that feature a Direct complementizer in environments where an Oblique is

‘expected’ is not based on empirically observable correlations, but is, rather, the result of a theoretical tradition whose explanatory strategy rendered the latter ‘normal’ and the former ‘exceptional’ (see also Manning 1996; Willis 2000). It is to be added here that the exceptional quality of such constructions in late Modern Literary Welsh is partially the circular result of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Rather hasty philological generalizations about Middle to Modern Welsh (the authoritative model) on the empirical level became the basis for prescriptive generalizations in the grammars for the Modern Standard. In this standard construction process, it should be added, philological arguments about the nature of ‘Celtic’ played an important deciding role, where Irish was in general the best measuring-rod of ‘Celticness’ (Manning 2004). This unquestionably played a role in marginalizing SVO word order as ‘abnormal’ with respect to the ‘normal’ (‘Celtic’, because typical of Irish) VSO word order in these same reform projects (Manning 1997, 2001, 2004; Currie 2000; Willis 1998).

The result is a grand tradition, from traditional grammarians (e.g. Richards 1938) to theoretical syntacticians (e.g. Awbery 1977; Harlow 1981, 1983; Borsley and Roberts 1996) and linguistic typologists (for example, the literature building on Keenan and Comrie’s typology of relatives 1977; see Tallerman 1990, 1994), that had originally attempted to explain both these dependent variables in terms of one single independent variable, typically a notion like ‘Direct Dominance’ (‘DD’), where the position relativized upon is immediately dominated by the S node in the surface structure tree (therefore notional Subjects and Objects in this VSO language), and ‘Indirect Dominance’ (‘ID’, every other position), inspired (in Harlow’s case) by the parallel correlation in Irish (McCloskey 1979) (Table 1). Obviously, this explanatory strategy became established at a time (prior to Sproat 1985) when all or most syntactic theories assumed that VSO clause structure was ‘flat’, that is, subject and object positions were immediately dominated by what was then called the ‘S’ node at all or at least some levels of representation. This makes its tenacity in later generative accounts all the more perplexing.

In this paper I make the assumption, following Awbery, that the ‘flat’ structure for VSO languages is the correct one, for both empirical and theoretical reasons. I also assume that (NP and PP) adverbials and core arguments like subject and object are both dominated immediately by the

traditional S-node. First of all, while many syntactic theories do not countenance flat structures for VSO languages at any or most levels of representation, there remain a fair number of theories that do, particularly mono-stratal theories of grammar, such as Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar and its descendants. In relation to Welsh, specific empirical arguments have been made within these and similar theoretical traditions arguing for a flat VSO structure for Welsh, most recently Carnie (2005) and Borsley (2006). Because I am working in a slightly different tradition, my argument for positing a flat structure requires a slight modification of their positions. In my account I will adopt Dowty's suggestion (1996, derived from Currie 1963) that we distinguish between two types of structure. (1) There is, on the one hand, constituent structure as a matter of empirically discoverable *form* ('phenogrammatical constituents'). This is analogous, therefore, to other varieties of form, such as morphological coding of grammatical categories, or coding via alternations of word order, and so on. (2) There is, on the other hand, constituent structure that has been posited to reflect semantico-syntactic relations as a kind of diagrammatic icon ('tectogrammatical constituents'). Such structure is motivated by making syntactic constituency relations into a diagrammatic icon either of semantic relations of predicates and arguments, operators and operands, or, alternatively, in terms of some other set of equivalent principles of autonomous syntax, such as parallelisms of constituency across distributions, so that, for example, a VP node can be tectogrammatically motivated for all distributions (even if only as an underlying form) if it can be found phenogrammatically in some distributions. Therefore, under Dowty's 'mono-stratal' view of phrase structure as signifier, *phenogrammatic constituency*, it is incoherent to posit a VP 'across the board' on the basis, of say, subject-object asymmetries. I remain agnostic or indifferent about relatively abstract or underlying forms of *tectogrammatic constituency*, though I suspect that many multi-stratal theories of syntax may well be able to accommodate a logical distinction of the sort posited by Dowty.

The 'formal' independent variable in question (DD versus ID positions, Direct and Indirect relatives) was, at the time it was proposed by Awbery, formal in a strong sense: that is, based on empirically discoverable constituent structure arrangements, or 'phenogrammatical' constituents (Currie 1963; Dowty 1996), as opposed to non-empirical

constituent structure imputed on the basis of logical, semantic or universal X-Bar relations of constituents motivated by principles of autonomous syntax, that is, ‘tectogrammatical’ constituents. By ‘form’ and ‘formal’ I mean ‘having perceptible formal exponents’, that is, differentially perceptible and systematic differences of morpho-syntactic form (see Silverstein 1993, Manning 1997 for the terms and their genealogy). Form in this sense is a semiotic notion, referring to regular and perceptible aspects of the *signifier*, rather than the *signified*. All form is ‘phenogrammatical’ in this sense, and only such constituent structure as is capable of being involved in a semiotic process as a signifier can be treated as ‘form’ in this sense; ‘phenogrammatical’ stands to ‘tectogrammatical’ as an order of signifiers to an order of signified, essentially. Because constituent structure in this paper is usually ‘phenogrammatical’, I have chosen to represent it with a traditional phrase structure *koine*, whose benefit is precisely that it does not incorporate tectogrammatical information or considerations.

Returning to the data, cast in this form, we see that even a statement of phrase structure as independent variable in such phenogrammatic terms does not predict complementizer realization for Middle (or Early Modern) Welsh (see above examples 1–4), nor does it hold for other Brythonic Celtic languages (Middle Breton (henceforth MB) and Middle Cornish (henceforth MC)).

Table 1. Expected distributions of complementizers and gap realizations in Welsh (Harlow 1981, 1983), compared with Irish (McCloskey 1979)

	Direct Dominance	Indirect Dominance
Welsh	N' [_S L ... Ø ...]	N' [_S y(r) ... [xp ... AGR ...] ...]
Irish	N' [_S a L ... Ø ...]	N' [_S a N ... [xp ... AGR ...] ...]

Both of the formal oppositions here (DIR versus OBL complementizer, Ø versus AGR gap realization) are found in the other Brythonic Celtic languages, with similar distributions (see Manning 2001 for examples). Null gap realization in Brythonic Celtic correlates well with DD

environments, and AGR gap realization with ID environments. The one place where the former correlation does *not* hold is for objects of non-finite VN constructions in MB and MC (for details and a possible explanation of the non-correlation, see Armstrong 1987, Manning 2001). Complementizer choice, however, correlates with neither.

If there is no empirical reason to posit an absolute correlation between these variables, the motivation is presumably theoretical. I will deal here only with the earliest theoretical treatment (Awbery 1977), partially because it has the widest empirical coverage of any theory to date, with honourable mention going to Harlow (1983); Willis (2000), while noting variety of data taken account of here, citing Manning (1996), nevertheless ultimately discusses a different variety of Welsh which lacks the complementizer alternation entirely, and partially because of its historical importance; all subsequent theories in all paradigms build off of this seminal article. That is, all subsequent accounts (except Willis 2000) accept the basic empirical correlations posited (for theoretical rather than empirical reasons) by Awbery, even though their authors have modified the underlying structure explaining these alleged correlations. In effect, it was the strength of Awbery's theoretical analysis, rather than her equally laudable empirical breadth of description, that provided the basis of her taxonomy of relatives. But the taxonomy has outlived the theory that gave birth to it. In fact, Willis (2000) is perhaps the first generative account to jettison the typology altogether – partially on the basis of data derived from Manning (1996), to which he unfortunately incorrectly attributes a typology similar to that of Rouveret (1994) – but still does not discuss the problem of 'anomalous relatives'. In the absence of a more recent account that is empirically adequate, I engage with what remains the fullest empirical account to date, which is also the first account (Awbery 1977). However, it is not my intention to replace a 'missing' empirically adequate generative account, or update the existing one, but rather to demonstrate the utility of a coding approach to the phenomenon. In effect, as I will show, Awbery's account, empirically speaking, is the only adequate one to date, and all later accounts are at best a theoretical restatement of a subset of her conclusions. I hope that any criticisms I may make of Awbery's account will be taken bearing in mind that I

regard it to be the only account that even verges on being empirically adequate within the literature.

Awbery's generative account revised the traditional grammarians' essentially diachronic opposition between 'proper' hypotactic relatives and 'improper' paratactic relatives (e.g. Richards 1938, Lewis 1948; see also Evans 1976) into one based on an opposition between 'movement' and 'non-movement' relatives (see also Manning 1996; Willis 2000). Like many traditional accounts, Awbery identified the Direct particle *a* with a relative pronoun, which would be inserted in a deep structure NP position (by a relative pronominalization transformation, cf. Awbery 1977: 159) and then moved to complementizer position by a movement transformation (ibid.: 162). Such 'movement' relatives would feature the Direct particle *a* in complementizer position and null realization of the 'gap' vacated by the relative pronoun.

The opposite group, 'non-movement' relatives, according to Awbery, have no relative pronoun, but instead insert the Oblique complementizer in the complementizer position (by means of a complementizer insertion transformation, Awbery 1977: 176), and insert AGR-like material in the deep structure NP position (via a separate pronominalization transformation, ibid.: 179). Such relatives will have the Oblique complementizer and AGR in the gap site.

The effect of these rules is that the 'relative pronoun' *a* is made to be in complementary distribution with the AGR realization of the gap, rather than the Oblique complementizer $y(r)$. This is done by placing the structural descriptions of the two pronominalization rules in complementary distribution: relative pronominalization applies in Direct Dominance environments; other forms of pronominalization ('AGR') occur elsewhere (see above, Table 1). The absence of AGR in movement relatives is the result of the movement of the relative pronoun *a*, while the Oblique complementizer in 'non-movement' relatives is the result of insertion of the complementizer $y(r)$.

Awbery's account deals well with such sentences as exhibit the desired correlation (e.g. examples 1, 4), but there exists in MW and Mod.W a sizeable class of 'exceptions' (e.g. examples 2, 3) to her analysis. Some of these lapses Awbery called 'anomalous relatives' (Awbery 1977), a tendentious characterization that has remained current

in the literature ever since (e.g. Rouveret 1994: 423–4). I wish to show that these relatives are only theoretically anomalous, and certainly not empirically so.

There are in fact a number of types of relatives rendered anomalous by Awbery's analysis (only some of which are actually referred to as 'anomalous' by Awbery). The first type is not actually discussed by Awbery (to my knowledge it is first mentioned by Rouveret 1994: 381), involving extracting an adverbial NP (example 2 above), as opposed to a subject or object NP (example 1 above). Under the style of analysis adopted by Awbery, positing a 'flat' VSO structure of the clause, presumably both of these environments are 'Direct Dominance', where the gap is immediately dominated by the S-node. The former type is anomalous in that it involves an Oblique complementizer and null gap realization, as opposed to a Direct complementizer and null gap realization. There is here a difference of complementizer, but the same null gap. Already this is a lapse in the ideal correlation. The opposition between the particles is beginning to look here, not like an opposition reflecting constituent structure, but like an autonomous opposition coding something like the opposition between direct (subject and object) and oblique (adverbial) case.

A second type of anomalous relative is found in Indirect Dominance environments. Such environments share across-the-board AGR-realization of the extraction site, but in many cases we find apparently free variation in complementizer type (Early Mod.W examples from Evans 1968: 324), as in the minimal pair below, where (17) has the Oblique complementizer, and (18) the Direct complementizer (compare these with parallel MW examples 3, 4 above).

- (17) *rhai yhonynt_i [yr ydys [yn [*i*_i llugru] drvvy ofn]]*
 those of.them OBL is.IMP pt. their corrupt through fear
 'Those of them who are being corrupted through fear' (Evans 1968: 324)
- (18) *svyddogion_i . . . [a ydys [yn [*i*_i llugru] drvvy gariad]]]*
 officers . . . DIR is.IMP pt. their corrupt through love
 'Officers who are being corrupted through love' (Evans 1968: 324)

This particular set of ‘anomalous’ relatives is extremely common in the data. The ‘anomalous’ relative of the type (3, 18) is in fact the dominant pattern for this clause type in both MW and early Mod.W. The ‘normal’ pattern (4, 17) is rather rarer, however their marginalization has allowed later syntacticians to relegate this data-set to a footnote, an afterthought, as a class of putative ‘exceptions’. Consequently, treatment of these relative types in the following syntactic literature has been sporadic at best.⁶

From even this short survey of the intellectual history of the study of Modern Welsh relativization it can be seen that there are grave problems with the accepted wisdom of an empirical correlation of complementizer selection to gap realization, and therefore with the explanation of these two formal features by a single explanatory variable. In particular, the data so far adduced (Table 2) shows that:

1) The distribution of complementizers (Dir *a*, Obl *y(d)/y(r)*) and ‘gaps’ (\emptyset , AGR) is orthogonal: it is possible to find all four possible formal interactions, none of them is marginal, rare, or exceptional in my corpus (DD: [Dir, \emptyset] in example (1), [Obl, \emptyset] in example (2), ID: [Dir, AGR] in example (3), [Obl, AGR] in example (4)). Therefore they cannot be conditioned by the same independent variable (ID versus DD), since it is impossible for a single independent variable to predict differing results for each of its dependent variables (true also for MB and MC, Manning 2001).

2) The distribution of pronominal ‘gaps’ (\emptyset , AGR) correlates well with constituent structure depth, that is, the opposition between extraction sites which are directly dominated by the S node in Awbery’s scheme versus those that are not, where DD = \emptyset (in examples (1, 2)), ID = AGR (in examples (3, 4)); complementizer selection does not (Table 3, compare with Table 1 above). One can conclude that retention of (surface) constituent structure as an independent variable for determining gap realization is valid, however this is to be expressed theoretically (true also with one exception for MB and MC, Manning 2001).

Table 3. Attested distributions of complementizers and gap realizations in MW

	Direct Dominance	Indirect Dominance
Normal relatives	NP [_S <i>a</i> . . . Ø . . .]	NP [_S <i>y(r)</i> . . . [_{xp} . . . AGR . . .] . . .]
‘Anomalous relative’	NP [_S <i>y(r)</i> . . . Ø . . .]	NP [_S <i>a</i> . . . [_{xp} . . . AGR . . .] . . .]

Nor are ‘anomalous relatives’ exceptional in that they are ‘rare’ or unusual. They are perfectly ordinary and commonplace empirically, and often obligatory. For Middle Welsh, as many examples of the one type as the other can be found simply by consulting the standard grammars (Evans 1976), just as they can be found for many versions of Modern Welsh (Richards 1938; see Willis 2000 for the marginalization of the type in more recent normative Welsh grammars).

Relative particles and case-marking

The inherited argument about complementation in Modern Welsh, then, is that it is predictable on the basis of some other formal variable, and in itself codes no additional grammatical categorial information. This argument, whatever form it takes, requires much special pleading about certain correlations being ‘anomalous’ when in fact they are not. I argue instead that traditional grammarians were right: the opposition is one of case-marking, *modulo* syntactic environment (DD versus ID). In DD environments, these complementizers mark the opposition between arguments (Direct *a*) and non-arguments (Oblique *y(d)/y(r)*) of the verb, which is otherwise unmarked by constituent structure. For the other grammatical relations (those in ID environments), both complementizers are possible, but at a greater degree of delicacy (those environments involving relativization on the object of a preposition), we find that here too the complementizers code something like a ‘case-marking’ opposition between grammatical and local cases.

In ID environments in MW, we find that at first glance all environments show variation of complementizer selection. However, if we look specifically at relativized objects of prepositions construed with the verb ‘to be’ (MW *bot*, Mod.W *bod*), we find that this variation resolves itself into three formal groupings with discrete meanings. Within the structurally defined set of ID domains limited to extractions from PP, then, there are three formal classes of grammatical constructions, according to complementizer (DIR, OBL or both) selected: (Class A) Direct complementizer only: constructions with maximally ‘grammatical’ prepositions (19); (Class B) both Direct and Oblique complementizers: clauses whose prepositions mark notional Possessors of various sorts (20–1, 26–7, 35); (Class C) Oblique complementizers only: clauses whose prepositions mark notional Location (36–40). This class is residual or unmarked, it is the ‘elsewhere’ class: in the last instance it contains all those uses of prepositions that do not conform to the other classes.

These classes can be individuated by reference to lexical preposition only, *modulo* its constructionally regimented value (e.g. ‘Experiencer’ (26), Possessor (27–31), Location (32–41)). Thus, we will find the same preposition participating in different construction types, but showing different complementizer selection properties in each. What is important here is that the participation of a given preposition in a given construction type under relativization can in itself specifically and differentially *code* (be the only overt marker of) meaningful grammatical categories, like the difference between possessor and location, a distinction which is latent and uncoded in normal clauses.⁷

I therefore delineate these *grammatical categorial* classes (for example, notionally possessive versus locative), based on their differential participation in different *formal categorial* patterns (for example, direct complementizer versus oblique complementizer) (for the distinction see Silverstein 1993).

The first group (Class A) are those constructions which select the Direct complementizer *a* only when the prepositional object is relativized (19). This is a fairly heterogeneous group semantically, and is unified by the fact that the prepositions in each construction are maximally ‘grammatical’, in that they do not contrast with any other preposition in that environment, or have any identifiable ‘sense’ independent of their

role of marking an argument within that construction. Moreover, since they occur in the context of adjectival predications, they cannot be interpreted as having anything resembling a ‘local’ sense. They resemble locative expressions the least, therefore. Thus, in a construction that occurs with adjectives denoting intensional states of affect, the ‘experiencer’ is marked with the preposition *gan* ‘with’. Objects of this preposition (in both MW and early Mod.W), when relativized, show only the Direct complementizer (19) (this behaviour is without exception for all texts consulted):

- (19) *Arthur*_i [*a vu ryued ganthaw*_i]
 Arthur DIR was strange with.him
 ‘Arthur was surprised.’ *SG* 178

The second group (Class B), which shows both complementizer types, includes all prepositions used to mark notional ‘possessors’ in possessive constructions. I have given one example with each complementizer type for each possessive construction, the (a) variant with the Direct *a* complementizer, the (b) with the Oblique one (20–1; 26–7; 35). Some of these prepositions (*gan* ‘with’, *y* ‘to’) can be used as grammatical ‘markers’ in other constructions, others (*yn* ‘in’, *ar* ‘on’) can be used with a more concrete ‘local’ meaning in others.

The first two prepositions, *y* ‘to’ and *gan* ‘with’, are used for basic possessive relations that may or may not be partitive (expressing part–whole relations as semantic hyponyms of ‘possession’). Both show free alternation between Direct and Oblique complementizers.

- (20a) *Madawc uab maredud*_i [*a oed idaw*_i *Powys*]
 M. son M. DIR was to.him Powys]
 ‘Madawg son of Maredud had Powys.’ *BR* 1.1
- (20b) *Pwy bynnac*_i *yma* [*y bu dev benn idaw*_i]
 who ever here OBL was two head to.him
 ‘Whoever had two heads in this life.’ *LIA* 60.26

- (21a) *pw y bynnag_i [a uo ganthaw_i ieith eglur-da]*
 Who ever DIR be with.him language clear-good
 ‘Whoever has good clear speech.’ *LIA* 135.8
- (21b) *y uorwyn_i [yd oed y daryan genthi_i]*
 the maiden OBL was the shield with.her
 ‘The maiden who had the shield.’ *SG* 193

The opposition between these two prepositions as possessive markers in MW resembles the opposition between so-called ‘alienable’ and ‘inalienable’ possession (Nichols 1988; Heine 1997). In MW, *y* ‘to’ is obligatorily used with body parts (of humans) (20b), and non-movable possessa of non-alienable title, like land (e.g. 20a), as well as kin terms (22).

- (22) *un mab a oed ymi*
 one son DIR was to-me
 ‘I had one son.’ *SG* 233.19

But in MW this preposition is also the default marker of possession, occurring optionally with possessa of all kinds (example 23, compare with 21b above):

- (23) *a pha ryw daryan a oed idaw ef*
 and what kind shield DIR was to.him.him
 ‘And what kind of shield did he have?’ *SG* 294.13

Gan ‘with’, by contrast, is closely associated in MW with portable, alienable possessa (cf. 21b) in the early period (coding something like contingent momentary physical possession (Heine 1997: 34)). By Early Mod.W *gan* ‘with’ wins out as the default possessive marker, found

optionally with possessa found only with *i* ‘to’ in MW (kin terms) (24–5), and obligatorily everywhere else (also 53a, b below).

- (24) *Y mae imi bump o frodyr*
 AFF is to.me five of brothers
 ‘I have five brothers.’ Luke 16.28
- (25) *Yr oedd gan ryw wr ddau fab*
 AFF was with some man two sons
 ‘A certain man had two sons.’ Luke 15.11

These two possessives are tightly integrated with each other and express core possessive notions (Langacker 1995: 57; Heine 1997: 39–41).⁸ These prepositions, unlike those that follow, lack local uses with this verb, and differ semantically from locative constructions in that they do not code anything specific about the relative location of possessor and possessum (hence these two may occur facultatively with locative PPs expressing the physical disposition of the possessum).

In contrast, the remaining possessive prepositions (*ar* ‘on’, *yn* ‘in’) mark quasi-locative, part–whole relations of one kind or another (26–7). Like the previous two possessives, these occur with both complementizer types as a diagnostic of their status as ‘possessives’ and not pure locatives.⁹ Of the two, possessives with *yn* ‘in’ most closely resemble locatives and are most weakly integrated in the class of possessives.

- (26a) *y rei_i [a oed arnunt_i ouyn mawr amdanaw]*
 those DIR was on.them fear great about.it
 ‘Those who were very afraid about it.’ SG 328
- (26b) *neb_i o-r [y bo y eisyau arnaw_i]*
 any of-the OBL be its want on-him
 ‘Anyone of those that need it.’ BBCS 10.415

- (27a) *fforest_i [a oed ynd_i mwy noc ymdeith*
 forest DIR was in.it more than journey
deudiwarnawt o hyt]
 two-day of length
 ‘A forest which had in it a length of more than two days’
 journey.’ *SG* 60
- (27b) *o vaen_i . . . [yr oed yndaw_i kwbyl o holl liweu y byt]*
 of stone OBL was in.it all of all colours the world
 ‘Of stone which had in it all of the colours of the world.’ *SG* 121

What distinguishes these partitive-possessive uses from ‘local’ uses of the same preposition is the contiguity, coterminousness or notional ‘part-whole’ relation between possessor and possessive (also a core possessive notion according to Langacker 1995). The class of ‘part’ relations coded by each preposition shows considerable internal diversity (as is common to part-whole relations in general, Chaffin and Herrmann 1984: 136), but specifically does not include body parts of humans (coded by *i* ‘to’). Thus, the class of possessa occurring with the preposition *ar* ‘on’ includes predicate-like abstract nouns coding temporary subjective states of affect (*ovyn* ‘fear’ (26a), *eisyew* ‘desire’ (26b)), non-localizable conditions, properties and qualities (33), including diseases, as well as perceptually abstractable part-relations of appearance, form, dress, colouration or taste (28–9), as well as body parts of non-humans (52 below) (Manning 1992):

- (28) *aniueil a elwir manticora a gosged dyn arnaw*
 animal DIR called.IMP Manticora with face man on.it
 ‘An animal called a Manticora having the face of a man.’ *DB* 31
- (29) *a phob ryw vlas yssyd ar y dwfr hwnnw*
 and every kind taste DIR.is on the water that
 ‘And that water has every kind of taste.’ *LIA* 167.1

The preposition *yn* ‘in’ typically codes possession of a similar set of ‘part-like’ relations, including notional ‘ingredients’, ‘materials’ and other

semi-localizable interior properties (27a, b, 40–1), as well as, for example demonic possession or diseases (30, Mod.W example).

- (30) *dyn ag ynddo ysbryd aflan*
 man with in.him spirit unclean
 ‘A man having an unclean spirit (in him).’ Mark 1.23

Both these constructions code the *non-distinctness* of possessor and possessum (part–whole relations). While the construction with the preposition *ar* ‘on’ codes mainly possession of ‘substanceless forms’, the construction with the preposition *yn* ‘in’ codes mainly ‘formless substances’. The fact that these are all in essence possessive constructions is demonstrated by the fact that these local possessives are occasionally absorbed into the more unmarked possessive construction with *gan*. Compare the previous example with the following Mod.W example (31):

- (31) *dyn a chanddo ysbryd cythraulafan*
 man with with.him spirit devil unclean
 ‘A man having an unclean devil spirit.’ Luke 4.33

Compare the following MW possessive with *gan* ‘with’ (32) with those in example (40a, b) below from the same text, which show *yn* ‘in’ with possessa of the same type:

- (32) *ar neb a uo ragor ganthaw or dayar*
 and.the one DIR be more with.him of.the earth
 ‘He who has more of the earthen material.’ *LIA* 130

Moreover, as with *i* ‘to’ and *gan* ‘with’, these two local possessives show some overlap with those possessa that can be classified simultaneously as

non-localizable abstracted properties or subjective states (hence *ar* ‘on’) (33) or interior states or properties (hence *yn* ‘in’) (34).

(33) *heb chweith halogrwyd pechawt arnadunt*
 without any pollution sin on.them
 ‘Not having any pollution of sin.’ SG 91

(34) *heb chweith halogrwyd yndaw*
 without any pollution in.him
 ‘Not having any pollution.’ SG 289

In terms of both distinctive form (complementizer selection under relativization) and distinctive content (specifically and differentially coding core possessive notions, forming a coherent, interlocking system of possessive constructions as opposed to locative constructions), these constructions as a group can therefore be identified as ‘possessive constructions’. But it is not in the first instance on the basis of any a priori functional ground that we do so, but on the basis of a distinctive formal feature, one which occurs only in relativization. The formal opposition between possessives and locatives as a class is rather weakly and obliquely coded. There is no overt marker that attends all instances of the class across all distributions (especially with possessives using *yn* ‘in’), but only a covert marker based on properties in some rather marked distributions (relativization).

On this combination of formal and functional bases we may also add relativizations on attributive nominal possessors, which obviously code *functionally* among other things core possessive concepts, and which also exhibit this same *formal* variation with respect to complementizers, and pattern with this class with regard to selection of another anomalous relative type as well (see below) (35a, b):

- (35a) *y marchawc_i [a oed yn deu hanner [y_i daryan]]*
 the knight DIR was pt. two halves his shield
 ‘And the knight whose shield was in two halves.’ *SG* 284
- (35b) *y rei_i [y mae [eu_i kyrff] yn-y vynnwent honn]]*
 The ones OBL is their bodies in-the cemetery this
 ‘Those whose bodies are in this cemetery.’ *SG* 309

The third group (Class C), locative constructions, show only the Oblique complementizer when the object of the preposition is relativized (36–7). This class has many of the same prepositions as are found in possessive constructions (*yn* ‘in’ (36), *ar* ‘on’ (37)), but here the usage is clearly not to mark (part–whole) possession, but rather simple location (where the object and the location remain distinct entities).

- (36) *y llestyr_i [yd oed y greal yndaw_i]*
 the vessel OBL was the Grail in.it
 ‘The vessel which the Grail was in.’ *SG* 39
- (37) *y-r maes_i [yr oed y llew arnaw_i]*
 to-the field OBL was the lion on.it
 ‘The field which the lion was on.’ *SG* 266

Unlike possessive constructions, the members of this group are not delimited, and this class is something of a default class; nor do the local meanings of these prepositions change significantly when they are used in various constructions with different verbs. Moreover, such local prepositions always select the Oblique complementizer when their object is relativized, irrespective of syntactic context (38–9).

- (38) *yr eistedua_i [yr eistedawd Iessu grist yndi_i]*
 the seat OBL sat Jesus Christ in.it
 ‘The seat that Jesus Christ sat in.’ *SG* 49

- (39) *nyt amgen nor vort_i [y roet seint greal arnei_i]*
 not other than-the table OBL.place.IMP Holy Grail on.it
 ‘None other than the table the Holy Grail was placed on.’ *SG* 49

Clearly these classifications cannot be reduced to, or projected from, the specific lexical properties of the preposition involved, unless we were to hypostatize each constructional invocation of a given preposition as a distinct lexeme (i.e. *yn* ‘possessive’ versus *yn* ‘locative’). Rather, it appears to be the constructionally regimented value of the preposition as coding either primarily ‘possession’ (including part–whole relations) or primarily ‘location’ that determines complementizer selection class. I am therefore arguing that the prepositions’ semantic and syntactic value in each case is at least partly a product of the specific construction type of which it is a part (for ‘construction’ see also Zwicky 1987, 1994; Goldberg 1995; Michaelis and Lambrecht 1996; Fillmore 1999).

Thus, the formal criterion of complementizer selection under relativization allows us to individuate three classes of prepositions, and consequently, three separate construction types: ‘Grammatical’ (maximally non-predicative prepositions), ‘Possessive’ and ‘Locative’ (maximally predicative prepositions). Since a single lexical preposition may appear in more than one class, complementizer selection is not predictable on the basis of lexical properties of the preposition. Rather, it is the construction type which the preposition participates in that determines the complementizer choice. Thus, while MW possessive and locative constructions are similar in lexemic make-up, they are not reducible to each other. Rather, they can be distinguished in a number of ways syntactically, including not merely complementation, but also, for example, word order.

Word order and relativization

So far I have dealt with only one variety of anomalous relative, one involving the Direct complementizer *a* and pronominal realization of the gap (40a, b). In fact, within the domain of possessive constructions, there are two very common sorts of anomalous relative in MW and Mod.W, a

Since the first type is not restricted to possessive constructions, and involves no further formal modification, I will call this a ‘basic’ anomalous relative. Since the second is restricted to possessive constructions (Class B) and involves internal formal modification of the clause structure (the inserted preposition MW *a(c)*/Mod.W *a(g)*) I will call this form of anomalous relative the ‘*a(g)*-relative’. This relative, as Awbery analyses it (correctly), involves a kind of promotion of the object of PP to subject, and thus is a relativization strategy that renders a relatively inaccessible position more accessible to relativization (Keenan and Comrie 1977, Croft 1990; see also note 5 here for a parallel promotion construction with VN objects found in all the Brythonic languages). In effect, a ‘phantom’ construction is introduced, whereby the input to the relativization derivation is replaced by a formally distinct but isosemantic construction, which can feed a different relative formation rule. How exactly one would wish to capture this insight in any number of contemporary models, other than the one entertained here, I leave to syntacticians who subscribe to those models.

The *a(g)*-relative occurs with all and only the (Class B) possessive constructions introduced above, both with relativization on prepositional possessives (41–4, compare with 20–1, 26–7 above), always with NP PP word order, as well as with relativization on attributive possessives (45, compare with 35 above), where word order is irrelevant.

- | | | | | | |
|------|------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|---|
| | | | NP | | PP |
| (42) | <i>Y-r</i> | <i>neb_i</i> | [<i>a</i> | <i>vo</i> | [<i>a</i> |
| | to-the | anyone | DIR | be | with |
| | | | | <i>boly</i> | <i>calet</i> |
| | | | | belly | hard |
| | | | | | to.him |
| | | | | | ‘Anyone who has a hard belly.’ <i>H</i> 16.278.21 |

- | | | | | | | |
|------|----------|------------------------|------------|----------------|---|----|
| | | | | NP | | PP |
| (43) | <i>y</i> | <i>rei_i</i> | [<i>a</i> | <i>oed</i> | [<i>a-r</i> | |
| | the | those | DIR | was | with-the | |
| | | | | <i>anreith</i> | <i>ganhunt_i</i>] | |
| | | | | treasure | with.them | |
| | | | | | ‘Those who had the treasure.’ <i>SG</i> 375 | |

- (44) *a-r trydyd_i [a oed [ac un mann arnaw_i]]*
 and-the third DIR was with one spot on-him
 ‘And the third had one spot.’ *SG 91*
- (45) *a-r gwaew_i. . . [a vyd [a-e_i benn yn waetlyt vyth]]*
 and-the spear DIR will.be with-its head PP bloody ever
 ‘And the spear whose head will always be bloody.’ *SG 206*

By (Early) Mod.W, as Awbery has pointed out, these two anomalous relative types are in formal complementary distribution based on word order (a complementarity she achieves by giving these constructions parallel derivational histories, 1977: 198–200). In basic anomalous relatives, the prepositional phrase whose object is relativized occurs obligatorily in the order V PP NP. In *a(g)*-relatives, this prepositional phrase occurs in the normal order V *a(g)* NP PP (as it did in Middle Welsh). In relatives with the Oblique complementizer, either order may occur.

Because she wishes to produce this empirical complementarity as a theoretical function of parallel derivations, Awbery assumes that the relativized NP in *both types* of anomalous relative is a derived subject, so that the two types deviate relatively late in their derivational histories. However, this is untrue, as the verb agrees with the relativized ‘subject’ NP only when *a(g)* is present (46), and never does in the anomalous relative where word-order inversion has applied (producing PP NP word order) (MW examples) (47). Therefore, since all and only *a(g)*-relatives involve promotion to subject, it seems likely that the derivational process by which *a(g)* is inserted is identical to the one in which promotion to subject occurs (Manning 2001).¹⁰

- (46) *a [gwalchmei a sagamor]_i [a oedynt_i heuyt a*
 and G. and S. DIR were.PL also with
govit arnunt_i]
 sorrow on.them
 ‘And Gwalchmai and Sagamor also were in sorrow.’ *SG 381*

- (47) *y rei_i [oed arnunt_i y ovyn]*
the ones DIR.was.SG on.them his fear
‘Those that were afraid of him.’ SG 301

Therefore, the word-order complementarity between these two types does not result from their sharing any underlying derivational commonality, but rather is due to their surface formal complementarity and functional equivalence. Word-order oppositions (PP NP (marked) versus NP PP (unmarked)) in this construction come to code the same grammatical categorial oppositions as other morphosyntactic formal categories (the inserted element *a(g)* with promotion of possessor to subject). In the anomalous relative marked word order (PP NP) codes ‘Possessive’, in the other this opposition is coded morphosyntactically (by the presence of the particle *a(g)*, residually by the NP PP word order this particle requires).

In MW, the word-order complementarity between these two types is not as clean as it is in Mod.W. In MW we do indeed find *a(g)*-relatives exhibiting a uniform NP PP order (see above 41–4), but basic anomalous relatives (as well as their ‘normal’ kin) may exhibit either relative ordering of NP and PP (48a, b).

- (48a) *dynyon_i [a vo tra sychet arnunt_i]*
men DIR be excess drynesson.them
‘Men who have an excess of dryness.’ H 16.84.5

- (48b) *y rei_i [a oed arnunt_i; ouyn mawr amdanaw]*
those DIR was on.them fear great about.it
‘Those who were very afraid (had great fear) about it.’ SG 328

Awbery’s word-order generalizations take effect only in (Early) Mod.W, where basic anomalous relatives show only PP NP order (49), while relatives with *a(g)* show only NP PP word order (50). Here PP NP word order (without *a(g)*) has come to act formally as an equivalent to the

unambiguous marker of possession represented by NP PP word order with *a(g)*.

- (49) *y rhai_i* [sydd **arnynt_i** *newyn a syched*]
 the/those DIR.is on.them hunger and thirst
 ‘Those who have hunger and thirst.’ Matt. 5.6

- (50) *a-r hwn_i* [sydd **a** *syched arno_i*]
 and-the this DIR.is with thirst on.him
 ‘He who has thirst.’ Rev. 22.17

Therefore, one major change in anomalous relative structure from MW to Mod.W is the development of complementary word-order patterns between these two anomalous relative patterns. These changes make word-order alternations the equivalent of the element *a(g)* with promotion of possessor to subject in case-marking of the possessor relation.

As noted above, while some of the formal variables introduced above are specific to ‘relative’ constructions, these word-order generalizations are not. The variation between NP PP and PP NP word orders found in non-anomalous relatives is general in MW finite clauses (51a, b).

- (51a) *nyt oed arnunt neb ryw anhyfrydwch o-r byt*
 not was on.them any kind grief of-the world
 ‘They do not have any grief at all.’ SG 334

- (51b) *nat oed chweith ovyn nac argysswr arnunt*
 not was either fear nor terror on.them
 ‘They do not have any fear or terror.’ SG 347

MW basic anomalous relatives, as well as normal relatives, simply inherit this very general feature from the normal word-order possibilities of this type of clause. There is a substantial statistical tendency for PP NP word order in such clauses, and some possessive constructions in modern dialects have obligatory or optional PP NP word orders (Manning 1992; see Heine (1997: 41) on the putative universal tendency this illustrates). These word-order tendencies by construction type are only potentialities in MW to Mod.W, but there is an increasing tendency for PP NP word order to become a marker of possessive construction *across all distributions*, not merely relatives. Possessives (any preposition) in MW show 65% PP NP word order in normal clauses (90 out of 139 in my sample), 52% in relatives (25 out of 48 in my sample), whereas locatives with *yn*, for example, show only 7% (1 out of 13 in my sample). By Early Mod.W, such possessives show 87% PP NP word order (133 out of 153 in my sample) in normal clauses, and 83% in relatives (44 out of 53 in my sample).¹¹

Furthermore, by this period traditional grammarians, such as Davies in his *Dictionarum Duplex* (1632), give these constructions as translations of Latin *habere* 'to have', and give PP NP word order as the citation order. An exception here would be possession marked with *gyda* 'with', which shows NP PP order in modern dialects and seems to be not well integrated into the class in Middle Welsh (while possessives with *gan* 'with' form the core of the possessive class in MW and show almost invariant PP NP word order in modern dialects). Also here *yn*-possessives do not stand out as a class clearly from *yn*-locatives, as a peripheral member of the class (not mentioned by Davies (1632) as a possessive marker, for example), but the differences are striking. These associations in MW and Mod.W operate at a subcategorical level, unlike, for example, word-order oppositions in relatives to be discussed below.

These tendencies, emergent globally, may explain the alignment of unlike and unrelated formal variables into complementary patterns, so that either PP NP word order OR *a(g)* relativization (with NP PP word order only) serve as formal expressions of membership in the possessive class. In MW, there is a slightly greater tendency for PP NP word order to correlate with Direct complementation in relatives (60%, 9 out of 15 possessive constructions), with 47% PP NP word order where the

complementizer is Oblique (16 out of 34 possessive constructions in sample). By Mod.W, however, this slight tendency has turned into a *categorical* association of PP NP word order to Direct complementation in relatives (40 out of 40 in my sample). Oblique relatives show a tendency to polarize themselves: only 37% of these show PP NP word order (4 out of 13 in my sample). By Mod.W, the emergent pattern in relatives is that categorical PP NP word order and Direct complementation pattern together (clauses that are positively marked as being possessive), while with Oblique complementation either word order is possible. The uniformly positively marked group (Direct complementizer entails PP NP word order) emerges in Mod.W as a *categorical* correlation, and it is this ‘anomalous relative’ that stands in complementary distribution with the *a(g)*-relative, which has Direct complementation, marking it as a possessive, and NP PP word order (unmarked for possessiveness), but that has the morphological marker *a(g)* specific to possessives. This is the sort of formal complementarity that Awbery observed as being valid for Mod.W in general and sought to capture by giving these two constructions parallel derivational histories.

The word-order variation in MW and Mod.W contrasts with that found in clauses containing the particle *a(g)*. In MW and Mod.W, *a(g)*-relatives show a restricted NP PP word-order pattern (41–4). This is to be explained as an inheritance from an incorporated construction that gives this relative its distinctive ‘modified’ structure. This incorporated construction is a phrase introduced by the preposition MW *a(c)*/Mod.W *a(g)*) ‘with’ which serves as an adnominal relative construction, and which also shows rigid NP PP word order in MW (52, see also 28, 33–4). The NP modified by the structure must be co-referential with the possessor of the lower clause. I will call this structure a (non-finite) *a(g)*-phrase:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|--|
| | <i>a(g)</i> | NP | PP | |
|--|-------------|----|----|--|
- (52) *adar_i . . . a deu benn arnunt_i*
 birds with two heads on.them
 ‘Birds . . . having two heads.’ *FfBO* 45.14

The *a(g)*-relative (41–4, Table 4d) in MW to Mod.W incorporates this non-finite *a(g)*-phrase (52) (Table 4b), inheriting all of its properties, including its word-order restrictions (NP PP word order). I will call this set of inherited features the ‘incorporated *a(g)*-phrase.’

Table 4: Word-order patterns for all possessive construction types from MW to Mod.W. (Relations of inheritance given by connecting brackets, relations of opposition given by arrows.)

	MW	Mod.W
(a) Finite clause	BOTH	BOTH*
(b) <i>a(g)</i> -phrase	NP PP	BOTH
(c) Basic (anom.) relative	BOTH	PP NP
(d) <i>a(g)</i> -relative	NP PP	NP PP

*Note: Normal finite possessive clauses begin to show PP NP as unmarked word order increasingly in Mod.W and many dialects.

By Mod.W, two basic changes happen in the word-order inheritance patterns that obtain in MW (Table 4). First, the word order of the basic anomalous relative (Table 4c) enters into complementary distribution with that of the *a(g)*-relative (Table 4d), so that the first takes PP NP word order and the second continues with NP PP word order. At this point, PP NP word order comes to mark ‘possessive construction’ *unambiguously* (with NP PP word order being unmarked) in the one type of anomalous

relative, just as much *a(g)* insertion (with residual NP PP word order) does in the other.

Secondly, the word-order possibilities of the two sorts of *a(g)*-phrase, unincorporated (Table 4b) and incorporated (Table 4d), diverge. The unincorporated *a(g)*-phrase begins to show both word orders (the PP NP word order presumably because these non-finite clauses also tend by and large to code ‘possession’ (53a, also 30–1 above), the NP PP word order because they are clauses introduced by *a(g)* (53b), which in MW had rigid NP PP word order (52), inheriting the variation that is general in the language. The incorporated *a(g)*-phrase, on the other hand, retains the rigid NP PP word order.¹²

- | | | | |
|-------|---|----|--|
| | <i>a(g)</i> PP | NP | |
| (53a) | <i>Oeni . . . a chaddoi saith gorn</i> | | |
| | lamb with with.him seven horn | | |
| | ‘A lamb having seven horns.’ Rev. 5.6 | | |
| | <i>a(g)</i> NP | PP | |
| (53b) | <i>cynffonaui . . . a phennau ganddynti</i> | | |
| | tails with heads with.them | | |
| | ‘Tails having heads.’ Rev. 9.19 | | |

Not only are these word-order developments specific to relative constructions, but they are specific to a sub-class of relative types, namely, relativized possessive constructions. By Mod.W, in one type of ‘anomalous’ relativized possessive construction, it is word order (PP NP) and not morphology that specifically marks ‘possessive’, while in the other, it is morphology (*a(g)* insertion) and not word order (NP PP word order is simply the unmarked order) (Table 4). The rigid complementarity between word-order inversion and *a(g)*-insertion (formal categories of a very different order) as alternate markers of ‘possessive’ that develops by Mod.W is not to be explained in terms of underlying parallelism of formal categories (specifically, shared derivational history, as Awbery does), but rather in terms of surface complementarity of formal categories along with parallelism of grammatical categories that these otherwise unrelated

formal categories encode (possession). The fact that *a(g)*-insertion (marking possessive relatives) entails NP PP word order in MW (where word order of these constituents is otherwise free) allows the marked PP NP word order to become categorically, rather than statistically, associated with marking possession in the remaining anomalous relatives wherever the former pattern does not occur. By Mod.W specifically Direct complementation without *a(g)* insertion entails PP NP word order (as Awbery notes), since both of these formal traits are associated with each other as markers of possessives.

Conclusions

In this paper I have addressed the empirical adequacy of a long-standing proposal in the treatment of Modern Welsh relative clauses, which has served as the basic analytic strategy to date in a wide variety of frameworks. According to this proposal, the two primary formal variables implicated in relative clause formation, complementizer selection (Direct, Oblique) and manner of gap realization (\emptyset , AGR), are correlated in particular ways, such that Direct complementizers and Null gap realization pattern together, and Oblique complementizers and AGR gap realization pattern together. The basic analytic strategy of this tradition has been to explain both of these formal dependent variables in terms of a single independent variable (also formal): the constituent structure relation of Direct versus Indirect Dominance. Some authors have additionally provided some accounting of such relatives that represent a lapse in this correlation, which have more generally been neglected under the suggestive term ‘anomalous relatives’.

A thorough review of the data from Middle and Early Modern Welsh indicates that there are serious flaws with this hypothesis as it relates to these varieties of Welsh, and it must be rejected (see also Manning 1996, Willis 2000). In particular, in this paper I have shown that:

1) The distribution of complementizers (Dir *a*, Obl *y(d)/y(r)*) and ‘gaps’ (\emptyset , AGR) is orthogonal: it is possible to find all four possible formal interactions, none of them being marginal (Direct Dominance: [Dir, \emptyset], [Obl, \emptyset], Indirect Dominance: [Dir, AGR], [Obl, AGR]).

Therefore they cannot be conditioned by the same independent variable (ID versus DD).

2) The distribution of pronominal ‘gaps’ (\emptyset , AGR), unlike complementizers, correlates well with ‘Dominance’, DD = \emptyset , ID = AGR.

3) Complementizer selection in Direct Dominance environments correlates with grammatical role of relativized NP: Subjects and Objects take the Direct complementizer, Adverbial NPs take the Oblique complementizer. With respect to Direct Dominance environments, we can say that complementizer choice codes straightforwardly and transparently a case-marking opposition between arguments and non-arguments. In Indirect Dominance environments we find considerable variation in complementizer selection, but to isolate subcategories where this variation is concretely meaningful we must refer to constituent structure, and in particular the head of the phrase from which the extraction occurs (Verbal Noun (VN), Noun (N) or Preposition (P)). In extractions from non-finite verbal nominal phrases (VNP) in MW and Mod.W, we find that either complementizer is possible, and similarly for extractions of possessive modifiers of NP. Hence, VNP and NP extractions behave the same in MW, which is not the case for Middle Cornish and Middle Breton (Manning 2001).

4) If we restrict our attention to relativized objects of prepositions, we find three separate constructional classes which differ according to complementizer selection. These classes are not specifiable on the basis of the lexical properties of the preposition, since the same preposition may occur in more than one of these classes. Rather, I have argued that it is the value of the preposition as determined by the construction type of which it is a part that regulates class membership. Thus, objects of ‘grammatical’ prepositions whose value is primarily as a marker of a construction type and which add no additional semantic nuance always take the Direct complementizer *a*. Conversely, objects of prepositions used in a purely locative sense always show the Oblique complementizer *y(d)*, *y(r)*. Between these two poles are prepositions used to mark possessors in various sorts of possessive or part-whole relations: these take either complementizer type.¹³

5) Within the class of possessive constructions in MW, a second formally distinguishable structural type of ‘anomalous relative’ (having

the Direct *a* complementizer and AGR ‘gap’, but incorporating a kind of non-finite adjoined clause) is possible. This *a(g)* relative always has NP PP word order, a property it inherits from the non-finite *a(g)* clause it incorporates. By contrast, basic anomalous relatives in MW inherit basic finite clause word orders (both NP PP and PP NP). In Mod.W, basic anomalous relatives became restricted to PP NP word order, placing them in complementary distribution with the *a(g)* relative (NP PP). This correlation is limited to possessive constructions, and therefore the emergent word-order correlations of Mod.W crucially implicate notions of constructional individuation and inheritance, *pace* principles like ECPO which disallow construction-specific word orders (Gazdar et al. 1985, Zwicky 1987).

Therefore, a re-examination of these data show that both constituent structure and word order play equivalent roles as dependent (*formal*) variables in a construction-based account (for parallel accounts in a framework that explicitly labels itself ‘Construction Grammar’ see Zwicky 1987, 1994; Goldberg 1995; Michaelis and Lambrecht 1996; Fillmore 1999; see Manning 2002 for a comparison), that is, as categories of differentially perceptible *form* that systematically and differentially *code* grammatical categorial oppositions of referential and predicational meaningfulness (a ‘coding view’ of grammar, Silverstein 1993, 1995; Manning 1995, 1997, 2002). That complementary distribution can be induced on such incommensurable formal categories as morphology and word order shows that case-marking is not an operation of autonomous syntax mapping formal categories to other formal categories (with formal categories as independent and dependent variables). Rather, in the case-marking found here, as elsewhere, formal complementarities (the dependent variable) are organized by functional oppositions of grammatical categories (the independent variable) that they can be said to *code*.

Notes

1. The various generative accounts use the terms ‘complementizer’, ‘particle’, ‘relative pronoun’ for these items, so I will do the same, since nothing in particular is at stake. (For data-source abbreviations, see note 4.)
2. The specific example here used to illustrate this particular correlation differs from that used in Awbery (1977), where the minimal pairs illustrating the correlations illustrated in (3) and (4) would be:

(54a) *y dyn a ddysgwyliwn amdano*
 the man DIR I-waited for.him
 ‘The man I was waiting for.’

(54b) *y dyn y dysgwyliwn amdano*
 the man OBL I-waited for.him
 ‘The man I was waiting for.’

3. An anonymous reviewer has suggested that A'-dependencies on the object of a VN show the Direct relativization pattern only when the object has been raised to subject, as in a passivization, and that we do not get examples like the following:

(55) **y dyn yssyd y brenhin wedi y welet*
 the man DIR.is the king after his see
 ‘The man whom the king has seen.’

But this is incorrect, since the extractions on the object of VN very robustly show direct relativization, whether or not they are promoted to subject by passivization, as they do in the other Brythonic Celtic languages. The nature of the auxiliary verb or construction that takes the VN complement seems to play an important role here, but passivization does not, inasmuch as verbal noun objects do not become subject if the complement-taking verbs governing them are passivized, Middle Welsh having an impersonal passive. As the reviewer points out, these are marginal in contemporary versions of Mod.W, though not in Early Mod.W. These constructions in Brythonic Celtic may indeed sometimes involve a

kind of promotion, but of a different kind (see below footnote 5, see also Armstrong 1987, Manning 2001: ch. 6). See examples 13–16.

4. The pattern is found with minor changes through the Middle Welsh (MW) period, and continued into the Early Modern Welsh period (the period of the Bible translation, for example), including all the texts cited here, especially *Y Seint Greal* (SG) of the end of the fourteenth century, from which most of the data cited here derives. My data derives from the edition of Williams (1876), and the page and line numbering refers to that edition and not the more recent edition of Jones (1992). The pattern is continued into the Modern Welsh period with the Bible (1588), which served as a major (though not exclusive) model for various forms of literary Welsh in the nineteenth century. The data given here are derived from complete text counts from the above mentioned works, as well as a number of other MW works I have also considered. These are (with editions used, approximate date of composition and, if cited in the present paper, abbreviations used) *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (PKM, c.1225 (Williams 1930)), *Kyfranc Llud a Lleuelys* (c.1200–50 (Williams 1910)), *Breudwyt Maxen Wletic* (c.1150–1200), *Breudwyt Ronabwy* (BR, c.1220–5 (Richards 1948)), *Hafod 16* (*H* c.1400 (Jones 1955–8)), *Chwedyl Iarllles y Ffynnon* (c.1200 (Thomson 1968)), *Brut Dingestow* (c.1200 (Lewis 1942)), *Ystoria Bown de Hamtwn* (c.1250–75 (Watkin 1958)), *Chwedleu Odo* (c.1350–1400 (Williams 1958)), *Ffordd y Brawd Odrib* (*FfBO*, c. 1450–1500 (Williams 1929)), *Chwedleu Seith Doethon Rufein* (c.1350 (Lewis 1958)), *Delw y Byd* (*DB*, c.1250 (Lewis and Diverres 1928)), *Ystoria de Carolo Magno* (*YCM*, c.1275–1325 (S. J. Williams 1930)), as well as various texts collected in *the Elucidarium*, also known as the *Llyuyr Agkyr Llandewivrevi* (*LIA*, which includes texts dating anywhere from 1300–1500 (Morris-Jones and Rhys 1894)). Cornish data cited are from *Beunans Meriasek* (*BM*, Stokes 1872), *Origo Mundi* and *Ressurexio* (*O* and *R* (Norris 1968 [1859])). The generalizations here hold for all of these texts. Dates given are from Evans (1976); for the editions used see the bibliography. Numbers following the abbreviation refer to the page and line of the standard edition. Some examples have been culled from various texts published over the years in the *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* (*BBCS*) and these are cited by volume, page (and line, where appropriate).

5. Ironically, the proper analysis of extraction of VN objects in Middle Welsh tends to confirm that these constructions should actually normally take the Direct complementizer. As Armstrong (1987) demonstrates, the AGR-like material represented by *y* in MW routinely fails to show the correct mutations if it is to be analysed as a possessive pronoun. The correct analysis, he suggests, is that this is in fact originally a preposition *y* 'to' which has been re-analysed variably as a possessive pronoun. This suggests that this construction parallels those found in Cornish and Breton, where the cognate preposition *the/da* 'to' is routinely inserted in such constructions when the object of VN is relativized, and such constructions always take Direct complementation (Armstrong 1987; Manning 2001). In Middle Cornish, for example, this insertion occurs optionally (absent in (56a) and present in (56b) (for more Middle Cornish examples see Manning 2001: ch. 6):

(56a) *guelen a pren [a wraf [synsy Ø]]*
 rod of wood DIR I-do hold
 'A rod of wood I do hold.' O 1444

(56b) *an peth [a ruk [the [prenna Ø]]]*
 the thing DIR did to buy
 'The thing he has bought.' BM 2746

What appears to be happening is that, since alternate template for the expression of a VNP with a NP complement in those languages include both [_{VNP} VN NP] as well as NP [_{PP} *the/da* VN], inheritance of this alternative construction renders the NP object of VN accessible (from IDD to DD). In effect, this is a 'raising-to-object' construction; for details see Manning (2001). This would at the same time explain the lack of AGR, since the extraction would then be from an accessible position. In this case with VN objects, as with the anomalous relative type involving the insertion of *a(g)* and promotion of the PP possessor object to subject, we are looking at an 'advancement process' (Keenan and Comrie 1977: 95–6) or 'promotion' construction or strategy (Croft 1990: 199), common in relativization. How any specific contemporary theory deals with these (a matter which will change, much as the seasons do) is not my special concern; what they will have to show regardless is how a candidate

construction (VN plus object, possessive construction) is modified to promote the argument that will be relativized to a more accessible position, in this case, using available construction types that express more or less the same grammatical relations.

6. Accounts that lack any treatment of anomalous relatives of any kind include Harlow (1981), Sells (1983), Rouveret (1990). Sadler (1988: 116–17, 252, n. 3) briefly gives examples but nothing in the way of analysis. Interestingly, sometimes the same author (Harlow 1981, 1983; Rouveret 1990, 1994) will in one account mention, and in another account ignore, these phenomena, yielding the impression that empirically some relatives are more basic, others more exceptional. Rouveret (1994: 376–9; 1990) describes the expected correlation initially as an ‘strict complementarity’ that therefore must be explained, and only after providing the analysis of this ‘normal’ data shows that the complementarity is, so far from being strict, non-existent (Rouveret 1994: 423–3; Rouveret 1990 never mentions any exceptions). Moreover, no accounts aside from Awbery cover in any way the word-order complementarities discovered by her. I note here that Willis (2000) cites my earlier work (Manning 1996) on a number of occasions, once with respect to noting my reservations, on empirical grounds, about the applicability of the accepted typology, which he also rejects. However, he also attributes to me, incorrectly, a typology of relatives similar to that of Rouveret (1994), which I rather explicitly reject in my paper, and on another occasion, misattributes to Manning (1996) observations on the constructed nature of literary Welsh which I in fact made a year later in Manning (1997).
7. An anonymous reviewer has complained that my account ‘lacks firm proposals’. This is because the theory of grammar I employ is not that employed by the majority consensus of syntacticians, and in fact makes several assumptions about the nature of syntactic representation that are fundamentally different from those assumed by the majority view. The best I can do here is attempt to clarify that the difference is a principled one, and hope that syntacticians may accept that dissenting views enrich the field overall. The theoretical framework I assume is one in which the formal categories of grammar (overt surface-level phrase structure as well as distinctive morphological patterns) are strictly segregated from the meaningful grammatical categories that the former specifically and

differentially communicate or *code* (Silverstein 1993). I have made similar analyses of case-marking in Welsh non-finite verbal noun constructions (Manning 1995) as well as in expressive nominal constructions (Manning 2002). An example of the difference between this sort of analysis and the more usual one may be of use. With respect to the case-marking of notional subjects of intransitive verb nouns, I have argued, for example, that in order to understand the differential case-marking in Middle Welsh (A or O marking, a *formal category*), one needs to refer to a complex intersection of *grammatical categories*: (1) a semantic classification of verbs as Telic or Atelic, and Stative versus Active (i.e. the standard aktionsart categories of Activity [Atelic, Active], Achievement and Accomplishment [Telic, Active], and States [Atelic, Stative], as well as (2) the semantic properties of the subject, in this case whether it is human or not in reference [+/-Human]. Willis (forthcoming), by contrast, 'slightly simplifies' my analysis into a syntactic version of these categories (unaccusative and unergative), which provides only two ill-specified syntactic categories of verbs where the analysis requires at least three to provide sufficient independent variables to account for the three dependent variables (A-marking only, O-marking only, and variable marking). In addition, noting my observation that the subject is relevant for marking (that is, activities which normally require A-marking take O-marking just in case the subject is [-Human], and so on for variable verbs), he notes that it would be 'more in keeping with the typology of ergative systems' to assume that a quasi-syntactic feature, namely [+/-pronoun], is the operative variable here. First of all, this controverts the data I adduced and is therefore simply false. The examples adduced in Manning (1995: 181) show pronouns with [-Human] reference differ in case-marking from pronouns with [+Human] reference in the case contexts, for example. This illustrates along the way that one does need a classification of nominal reference with more categories than the 'syntactic' opposition [+/- pronoun]. More importantly, the definitive and original typology of ergative constructions on which my analysis relies comes from the same tradition I am using (Silverstein 1976), which requires a rather complex array of classification of referential categories of the noun phrase (a referential hierarchy, often referred to mistakenly as a 'animacy hierarchy') to analyse adequately case-marking

oppositions typologically (see Silverstein 1981, 1987 for details). This misunderstanding illustrates, I believe, a basic divide between those theories that keep grammatical ('semantic', if one prefers) categories strictly separate from categories of form (formal or morphosyntactic categories), but which posit an explicit relationship of *coding* between them, versus those theories in which independently definable semantic categories (aktionsart, for example) are translated as syntactic categories (unaccusative, unergative, for which there is no existing universal non-circular definition that defines the class; cf. Manning 1995 and references there) into syntactic representations, without full admission that the resulting representations are mixtures of form and meaning.

8. I am following Langacker's polycentric prototype (1995: 57) for possession (treating 'ownership, kinship and part/whole (especially body-part) relations' as being core members of the possessive category.
9. For this class of relativization on possessors in locative-possessive constructions, my MW text sample shows, with the preposition *ar* 'on', 8 Direct, 2 Oblique, and 3 *a(g)*-relatives. The preposition *yn* 'in' shows 6 Direct, 7 Oblique and 2 *a(g)*-relatives. For Mod.W texts, possessive constructions with *ar* show 3 Direct, 1 Oblique and 4 *a(g)*-relatives, possessives with *yn* show 0 Direct, 3 Oblique and 2 *a(g)*-relatives. By contrast, relativization on *yn* used locatively we find only Oblique relativization (16 MW examples, 4 Mod.W).
10. An anonymous reviewer claims that examples like (40) do not occur in Modern Literary Welsh, but again, this example is simply a modification of those anomalous relatives that Awbery does cite involving possessive constructions, and which in fact are robustly attested in Early Modern Welsh sources, such as the 1588 Bible. Awbery explicitly discusses such examples and gives them a parallel derivational history, but the agreement data adduced here indicates rather strongly that they are different. The reviewer also notes that no current syntactic theory would allow one to insert *a(g)* in the middle of a derivation. I here only use derivational terminology, including talk of 'insertion', suggested by Awbery, as a way of expressing formal differences between two distributionally parallel constructions.

11. The counts used in Table 4 and Table 5 are based on a corpus of the MW texts listed in note 3 above. The Modern Welsh counts derive from the New Testament (1588) as well as from *Peri Mewn Adfyd* (1590).
12. The Mod.W unincorporated *a(g)* clause shows the following tendency for PP NP word order: *i*-possessive 3/3 (100%), *gan*-possessive 17/25 (68%), *ar*-possessive 2/3 (66%), *yn*-possessive 1/2 (50%).
13. Interestingly, in Middle Cornish, a closely related language which in most ways shows a similar pattern of variation in this respect to MW in the formal variables involved and their patterning (Table 2; for examples see Manning 2001), this same opposition is remobilized with a homologous value in cleft-like frontings of VNP (which behave similarly to NPs in many other syntactic respects in MC). With VNPs that are complements of the auxiliary verb *gruthyl* 'do' we find only Direct complementation in VNP frontings (57) (which is the pattern with all such frontings in MW and MB, regardless of complement-taking verb), while with lexical complement-taking verbs (*care* 'love') we find only Oblique complementation (58).

(57) [seuel war tyr veneges]; [a wreth Ø_i]
 stand on groundblessed DIR you.SG do
 'You stand on blessed ground.' O 1407

(58) [gwelas ow map]_i; [y carsen Ø_i]
 see my son OBLI.would.love
 'I would like to see my son.' R 442

Here, the opposition between Direct and Oblique complementation *locally* has the value of coding the opposition between 'auxiliary' and 'lexical' complement-taking verb. There is only one 'true' auxiliary in MC (*gruthyl* 'do'). VNP complements of this verb when fronted show only the Direct complementizer in MC (57). By contrast, for example, VNP complements of lexical verbs are constructed exclusively with the Oblique complementizer (58). The lexical verb *mynnes* 'will, shall, wish', which is undergoing auxiliation as an alternative expression of future tenses, displays a correspondingly ambivalent formal behaviour by showing both patterns (Direct in (59a) as with auxiliary verbs (57), Oblique in (59b) as with lexical verbs (58)).

- (59) a. *mones*, [**a** *vanna* Ø_i *rygthy*]
 go DIR I.will before.her
 'I will go before her.' *BM* 4016
- (59) b. *mones*, [**y** *fannaf* Ø_i *lemmyn*]
 go OBL I.will now
 'I will go now.' *BM* 173

The coded opposition between two types of VNP extractions (complement of auxiliary (48) versus complement of lexical verb (49)) is homologous with the case-marking opposition in MW and MC between NP arguments (1) and NP non-arguments (2), and the MW opposition between objects of 'non-predicative' (13) and 'predicative' (30–3) prepositions. The variation found with MC *mynnes* 'will, wish' (50a, b), reflecting its equivocal status between auxiliaries and lexical verbs, parallels the variation of possessive prepositions in MW (14–15; 20–1), reflecting their equivocal status between predicative and non-predicative prepositions.

References

- Armstrong, J. (1987) On some Middle Welsh relative constructions. *Studia Celtica* 22–3, 10–28.
- Awbery, G. (1976) *The Syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Awbery, G. (1977) A transformational view of Welsh relative clauses. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 27, 155–206.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Borsley, R. (1996) *Modern Phrase Structure Grammar*. Cambridge, MA.: Oxford University Press.
- Borsley, R and Roberts, I. (eds) (1996) *The Syntax of the Celtic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Borsley, R. (2006) On the nature of Welsh VSO clauses. *Lingua* **116**, 462–90.
- Bromwich, R. and Evans, D. S. (eds) (1988) *Culhwch and Olwen*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Carnie, A. (2005) Flat structure, phrasal variability and VSO. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* **9**, 13–31.
- Chametzky, R. (2000) *Phrase Structure: From GB to Minimalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Chaffin, R. and Herrmann, D. (1984) The similarity and diversity of semantic relations. *Memory and Cognition* **12.2**, 134–41.
- Croft, W. (1990) *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Currie, H. (1963) Some logical aspects of grammatical structure. In Jakobson, R. (ed.), *Structure of Language in its Mathematical Aspect*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
- Currie, O. (2000) Word-order stability and change from a sociolinguistic perspective: the case of Early Modern Welsh. In Sornicola, R., Poppe, E. and Shisha-Halevy, A. (eds), *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dowty, D. (1996) Toward a minimalist theory of syntactic structures. In Bunt, H. (ed.), *Discontinuous Constituency*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Edwards, J. and Strathern, M. (2000) Including our own. In Carsten, J. (ed.), *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, D. S. (1968) The sentence in early Modern Welsh. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* **22.4**, 311–37.
- Evans, D. S. (1976) *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Evans, J. G. (1907) *The White Book Mabinogion*. Pwllheli: J. G. Evans.
- Fife, J. and Poppe, E. (eds) (1991) *Studies in Brythonic Word Order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1999) Inversion and construction inheritance. In Webelhuth, G., Koenig, J.-P. and Kathol, A. (eds), *Lexical and*

- Constructional Aspects of Linguistic Explanation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Gazdar, G., Klein, E., Pullum, G. K. and Sag, I. A. (1985) *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goldberg, A. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harlow, S. (1981) Government and relativisation in Celtic. In Heny, F. (ed.), *Binding and Filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harlow, S. (1983) Celtic relatives. *York Papers in Linguistics* **10**, 77–122.
- Heine, B. (1997) *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hendrick, R. (1988) *Anaphora in Celtic and Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jones, I. B. (1955–8). Hafod 16. *Études Celtiques* **6**, 46–75; **7**, 270–339; **8**, 66–97, 346–93.
- Jones, T. (1992) *Ystoryeau Seint Greal Cyfrol I*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Keenan, E. and Comrie, B. (1977) Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* **8**, 63–100.
- Langacker, R. (1995) Possession and possessive constructions. In Taylor, J. and MacLaury, R. (eds), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lewis, H. (1942) *Brut Dingestow*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Lewis, H. (1948) Y cymal perthynol afrywiog. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* **13**, 128–30.
- Lewis, H. (1958) *Chwedleu Seith Doethon Rufein*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Lewis, H. and Diverres, P. (eds) (1928) *Delw y Byd*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Lyons, J. (1967) A note on possessive, existential and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* **3**, 390–6.
- McCloskey, J. (1979) *Transformational Syntax and Model Theoretic Semantics: A Case Study in Modern Irish*. Dordrecht: Reichel.
- Macpherson, C. B. (1978) The meaning of property. In Macpherson, C. B. (ed.), *Property: Mainstream and Critical Positions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Manning, H. P. (1992) The history of possessive constructions from Middle to Modern Welsh. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Chicago.
- Manning, H. P. (1995) Fluid intransitivity in Middle Welsh: gradience, typology and ‘unaccusativity’. *Lingua* **97**, 171–94.
- Manning, H. P. (1996) What Welsh relatives are really like. *CLS 32: The Main Session*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Manning, H. P. (1997) The geology of railway embankments: Oxford Welsh and the ‘abnormal sentence’. *CLS 33, Papers from the Panels on Linguistic Ideologies in Contact*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Manning, H. P. (2001) Typology, history and ‘teratology’: The rise and fall of the SVO ‘abnormal sentence’ in Middle Welsh, Breton and Cornish. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chicago.
- Manning, H. P. (2002) Orderly affect: the syntactic coding of pragmatics in Welsh expressive constructions. *Pragmatics* **12**, 415–46.
- Manning, H. P. (2004) The geology of railway embankments: Celticity, Liberalism, the Oxford Welsh reforms, and the word order(s) of Welsh. *Language and Communication* **24** (2), 135–63.
- Michaelis, L. and Lambrecht, K. (1996) Toward a construction-based theory of language function: the case of nominal extraposition. *Language* **72.2**, 215–47.
- Morris-Jones, J. (1931) *Welsh Syntax: An Unfinished Draft*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Morris-Jones, J. and Rhys, J. (1894) *The Elucidarium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nichols, J. (1988) On alienable and inalienable possession. In Shipley, W. (ed.), *In Honor of Mary Haas*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Norris, E (1968 [1859]). *The Ancient Cornish Drama*. (Two vols.) New York: Benjamin Blom.
- Pollard, C and Sag, I. (1994.) *Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Richards, M. (1938) *Cystrawen y Frawddeg Gymraeg*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Richards, M. (1948) *Breudwyt Ronabwy*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

- Rouveret, A. (1990) X-bar theory, minimality, and barrierhood in Welsh. In Hendrick, R. (ed.), *The Syntax of the Modern Celtic Languages. Syntax and Semantics Volume 23*. San Diego: Academic Press
- Rouveret, A. (1994) *Syntaxe du gallois: principes généraux et typologie*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Sadler, L. (1988) *Welsh Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. London: Croom Helm.
- Sells, P. (1983) Relative clauses in Irish and Welsh. *York Papers in Linguistics* **10**, 159–72.
- Silverstein, M. (1976) Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In Dixon, R. M. W. (ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1981) Case-marking and the nature of language. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* **1**, 227–44.
- Silverstein, M. (1987) Cognitive implications of a referential hierarchy. In Hickman, M. (ed.), *Social and Functional Approaches to Language and Thought*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1993) Of dynamos and doorbells: semiotic modularity and the (over)determination of cognitive representation. In K. Beales et al. (eds), *Proceedings of CLS 29 Volume 2: The Parasession*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, M. (1995) Kiksht ‘impersonals’ as anaphors and the predictiveness of grammatical-categorial universals. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* **21**, 262–86.
- Sproat, R. (1985) Welsh syntax and VSO structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **3**, 173–216.
- Stokes, W. (1872) *Beunans Meriasek: The Life of Saint Meriasek, Bishop and Confessor*. London: Trubner and Co.
- Tallerman, M. (1990) Relativization strategies: NP accessibility in Welsh. *Journal of Linguistics* **26.2**, 291–314.
- Tallerman, M. (1994) VSO word order and consonantal mutation in Welsh. *Linguistics* **38.3**, 389–416.
- Tallerman, M. (1996) Fronting constructions in Welsh. In Borsley, R. and Roberts, I. (eds), *The Syntax of the Celtic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Taylor, J. (1989) *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thomson, R. L. (ed.) (1968) *Owein, or Chwedyl Iarlls y Ffynnawn*. Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Watkin, M. (1958) *Ystoria Bown de Hamtwn*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Whitney, W. D. 1971[1875] *PHUSEI* or *THESEI* – natural or conventional? In Silverstein, M. (ed.), *Whitney on Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, I. (1910) *Cyfranc Llud a Lleuelys*. Bangor: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Williams, I. (1930) *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Williams, I. (1958) *Chwedleu Odo*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Williams, R. (1876) *Y Seint Greal*. London: Thomas Richards.
- Williams, S. J. (ed.) (1929) *Ffordd y Brawd Odrig*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Williams, S. J. (ed.) (1930) *Ystoria de Carolo Magno o Lyfr Coch Hergest*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Willis, D. (1998) *Syntactic Change in Welsh*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Willis, D. (2000) On the distribution of resumptive pronouns and *wh*-trace in Welsh. *Journal of Linguistics* **36**, 531–73.
- Willis, D. (forthcoming). The diachrony of Brythonic Celtic syntax. In Borsley, R. D., Tallerman, M. and Willis, D. (eds), *The Syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zwicky, A. (1987) Constructions in monostratal syntax. *Chicago Linguistic Society* **23**, 389–401.
- Zwicky, A. (1994) Dealing out meaning: Fundamentals of syntactic constructions. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* **20**, 611–25.