

# Celtic Influence on English Relative Clauses?

*Erich Poppe*  
(Philipps-Universität Marburg)

## 1. The Problem

In recent discussions of the Celticity of Standard English, various formal features of English relative clauses have been attributed to Celtic influence. Thus, Tristram lists prepositional relative clauses and zero-relatives among an admittedly tentative “number of salient morpho-syntactic features of Present Day Standard English and Present Day Welsh” which she takes to be “the result of the significant typological disruption which affected both Anglo-Saxon and Brythonic when they came into contact” (Tristram 1999: 19):

The English relative particle *that* cannot be preceded by a preposition. The preposition is therefore placed after the verb of the relative clause. The same is true in Welsh, where the relative particle precedes the verb and the preposition follows it. The Welsh pronoun in the clause final position may be inflected for person and number and is therefore stressed. (Tristram 1999: 23f.)

Both Welsh and English can have relative clauses without relative particles. In English, these are sometimes called “contact clauses”. Different constraints obtain in Welsh and English for this type of relative clause. In Welsh, there is no restriction as to whether the relative antecedent is a subject or object, whereas in Present Day Standard English contact clauses are only permitted for object antecedents, while subject antecedents were common in historical English and are still common in various regional Englishes. (Tristram 1999: 24)

Tristram refers to Preusler (1956) and Molyneux (1987) for relative clauses with hanging/stranded prepositions and again to Preusler (1956) for zero-relatives/contact clauses as the sources which advance and support these proposals. White (2002: 169) gives zero-relatives in his “list of possible Brittonicisms, direct or indirect indications of Brittonic influence in English,” with two examples, *the man I know* and *the question I am looking into*. Filppula, et al. (2002: 9) identify Preusler (1956) as the scholar who introduced contact clauses/zero-relative clauses as well as preposition stranding with relative *that* into the discussion of Celtic models for linguistic features of English.

In order to assess the validity of the hypothesis of Celtic influences on English relative clauses, it is necessary to go back to the authors quoted as authorities in this matter, namely Preusler and Molyneux, and to have a closer look at their arguments and at possible counter-arguments.

## 2. Preusler

Preusler (1956) singled out three characteristics of English relative clauses which he thought are due to Celtic influence, namely contact clauses, preposition stranding, and anaphoric possessive pronouns in genitival relative clauses – the last feature has not played a role in subsequent discussions of the Celticity of English relative clauses, because it does not occur in Standard English.

With regard to contact clauses, Preusler argued that Welsh has special relative forms of verbs which are used without a relative particle and that these provided the trigger for English contact clauses in the language of English-speaking Britons:

Die kymrischen relativsätze haben ... oft kein relativum, sondern werden durch bestimmte verbformen gekennzeichnet. Im munde englisch sprechender Briten konnte sich also leicht der sog. contact-clause einstellen, der im heutigen Englisch so beliebt ist *she might have become the woman you expected her to be*. (Preusler 1956: 337)

Relevant examples and further discussion are provided in the context of his treatment of Welsh cleft sentences:

Soll ein betontes Wort an die Spitze treten, so tritt eine relativische Umschreibung ein: das hervorzuhebende Wort wird Prädikatsnomen der (oft nicht ausgedrückten) Kopula und Beziehungswort eines Relativsatzes, der die eigentliche Aussage enthält. ... Im Britischen fehlt die Kopula meist; der Nachdruck ist gering. All dies gilt seit Alters. Heute treten besondere Verbformen, die dem Relativsatz eigentümlich sind, ohne Relativpartikel, oder Relativpartikeln mit anderen als Relativen Verben auf. Während *y mae John yn gryf* (= ist Johann + Partikel + stark) die gewöhnliche, nichts hervorhebende Wortstellung zeigt, wird der Satz bei Voranstellung des Subjekts zu *John sydd yn gryf* (= [es ist] John [der] ist stark) ohne Relativ; ähnlich bei bestimmtem Prädikatsnomen *John yw y meddyg* (= [es ist] John [der] ist der Arzt). (Preusler 1956: 336f.)

On the basis of his examples such special relative forms appear to be *sydd*, and probably *yw* in (1.1) – contrast (1.2) with a relative clause with a particle.

- (1.1) *fy mrawd yw'r dyn sy'n canu*  
 (= mein Bruder [ist es, der] ist der Mann, [der] ist beim Singen) (Preusler 1956: 337)  
 'the man who is singing, is my brother'
- (1.2) *dyma'r genethod a fu'n canu*  
 (= [es ist] hier die Mädchen + Partikel + waren beim Singen) (Preusler 1956: 337)  
 'here are the girls who were singing'

With regard to the chronological horizon of the Welsh influence on English, Preusler seems to suggest a date in, or slightly prior to, the thirteenth century: “Doch hat sich der contact-clause im Englischen seit dem 13. jh. stark entwickelt” (Preusler 1956: 337).

If I understand Preusler correctly, he also suggests that another argument for Celtic influences on English contact clauses is the occurrence in earlier stages of English of contact clauses with the antecedent in subject function, which he relates to the situation in Celtic where contact clauses with the antecedent in subject and object function can be realised without particles:

Noch eine besonderheit der entwicklung dieser fÜgung [i.e., relative clauses without particle] im Englischen spricht für keltischen einfluß. Im Keltischen findet sie sich ohne rÜcksicht darauf, ob das relativ einen nominativ oder einen akkusativ ausdrÜcken müßte; das moderne Englisch begrenzt die fälle, in denen es sich um den nominativ handelt, während die ältere sprache an solchen fällen überfluß hat. ... Die annahme, daß keltischer einfluß die entwicklung entscheidend gefördert habe, erklärt so auch diese besonderheit. (Preusler 1956: 338)

Perhaps confusingly, Preusler also acknowledges the possibility of Goidelic influences on regional variants of the English contact clause:

Bei dem unmittelbaren anschuß des attributsatzes geht das Nordenglische dem Südenlischen voraus ...; auch hier ist der gälische einfluß von früherer und stärkerer wirkung als der kymrisch-kornische. (Preusler 1956: 338)

Concerning prepositional relative clauses and stranded prepositions, Preusler’s arguments seem to rest on a perceived identical distribution in Welsh and English of two options for the construction of such clauses, namely both stranding and pied-piped, in which the preposition is drawn to the clause-initial relative marker. Preusler’s equation seems to have been Welsh *y(r)* ... *ar* + pers.pron. = English *that* ... *on* versus Welsh *ar yr hwn* = English *on which*.

Die englische relativpartikel *that* duldet keine präposition vor sich; die präposition wird an das ende gestellt, h i n t e r das verb ...; dasselbe gilt bei einem contact-clause ... . Das Kymrische zeigt, wieder seit alters, genau entsprechendes. Nach einer präposition steht das volle relativpronomen: *oddiamgylch yr ochrau yr oedd gwely y teulu, ar yr hwn yr eisteddid y dydd ac y cy[s]gid y nos* (= rundum die seiten + rel. + war bett der familie, auf welchem + rel. + man-saß den tag und + rel. + schlief die nacht). Sonst steht das relativ *y, yr* und die präposition in ihrer betonten (konjugierten) form am ende des satzes ...: *y wlad y daeth ef ohoni* (= das land + relativ + kam er von). (Preusler 1956: 338f.)

With regard to genitival relative clauses, Preusler (1956: 339) draws attention to the parallel construction of this type in Welsh and in older stages and regional varieties of English, which all use an anaphoric possessive pronoun in the relative clause referring back to the antecedent:

Das Kymrische verwendet statt des genitivs des relativs folgende fügung: *y weddw y lladwyd ei gwr yn y rhyfel* (= die witwe + relativ + man tötete ihren mann in dem krieg). Die fügung kommt schon ae. vor; Jespersen ... zitiert Elene 161 *Se god þe þis his beacen wæs* etc.; sie verbreitet sich stark im Me., wo sie bis ins 15./16. jh. häufig ist; die volkssprache bewahrt die alte tradition bis heute. (Preusler 1956: 339)

Preusler's terminology for the relative markers of Welsh is not quite consistent; he uses "partikel" for *a* and *y* (Preusler 1956: 337), but also "relativ" for *y(r)* (Preusler 1956: 338, 339), and he calls *yr hwn* etc. "volles relativpronomen" (Preusler 1956: 338).

### 3. Molyneux

Molyneux (1987) presents a competing and somewhat different analysis of the relation between Welsh and English prepositional relative clauses, presumably independently of Preusler, which collapses two features Preusler kept separate, namely the contact clause without a relative and prepositional relative clauses with stranded prepositions:

A further peculiarity of English is the use of relative clauses in which the relative is omitted and a preposition appears 'hanging' at the end of the sentence:

*The chair you are sitting on.*

... Once again, the English construction has an exact parallel in Welsh:

*The chair you are sitting on is shaky.*

*Y mae'r gadair yr ydych chi'n eistedd arni'n sigledig.*

lit. "Is the chair you are sitting on (it) shaky."

Note: Welsh has compound preposition-pronouns, *arni* means "on it."

(Molyneux 1987: 88)

Note that Molyneux's analysis rests on the assumption that the Welsh relative clause he quotes qualifies as a contact clause without a relative, in spite of the presence of a marker *y(r)*.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Preusler on Contact Clauses

In Preusler's view, Welsh relative clauses with special relative verbal forms and without particles provided the trigger for the rise of English contact clauses in the language of British learners of English. My main reservation is that the only specifically relative form in all verbal paradigms of Welsh is *sydd*, the third person singular present indicative of *bod* 'to be.' Although this form may be of high frequency, particularly because of its use in the periphrastic present exemplified in (1.1) above, I am not convinced that the presence of this single form, which is in competition with other and more frequent markers of relative subordination, is sufficient to provide the motivation for the spread of the contact

clause “(i)m munde englisch sprechender briten,” i.e. through imperfect language acquisition. Furthermore, *sydd* only occurs when the antecedent takes the role of the subject in the relative clause (cf. Thorne 1993: 258). The form *yw* as in (1.1) is not classified as a relative form in grammars of Welsh, but as the form of the copula used “(i)n a copula clause that selects Complement + Predicate + Subject structure” (Thorne 1993: 255), and (1.1) is therefore not a cleft sentence in the strict sense.

The analysis of Preusler’s position is further complicated by his passing reference to possible Goidelic influences on Northern varieties of English. Old Irish had a limited set of specifically relative verbal forms which are used with an antecedent with the function of subject or object and which are characterised by a specific ending. Such forms exist for simple verbs in absolute flexion for the third person singular, the impersonal singular, the first person plural, the third person plural, and the impersonal/passive plural. In all other instances, the relative relation is typically marked within the verbal complex by the mutation of the initial consonant of the stressed syllable. Old Irish does not use relative pronouns or relative particles, when the antecedent functions as subject or object in the relative clause, but has a typologically distinct set of relative marking.<sup>1</sup>

For argument’s sake let me play the devil’s advocate for a moment and try to rescue Preusler’s proposal concerning the importance of the absence of relative particles in the language of English-speaking/learning Britons by reference to the attested loss of relative markers *a* and *y(r)* in sub-literary varieties of Welsh, probably already in the medieval period. Morris-Jones has summarised the relevant facts:

The elision of the relative *a*, except before the verb ‘to be’ is comparatively rare in standard Welsh. It occurs before vowels ...; more rarely it occurs between two consonants ... . [T]he effect of the lost *a* remains in the *softened* [= lenited] *initial* of the verb. In the dialects the relative is generally lost ... . Before a consonant, *y* [not *yr*] must always be used [but *y* may be elided after a vowel], and if this is elided after a vowel there remains nothing to represent the relative, except the *radical initial* of the verb. (Morris-Jones 1931: 92f.)<sup>2</sup>

If the relative marker *a* is elided and the verb begins with a consonant susceptible to lenition, subordination is still formally marked, as in (2.1). Contexts in which relative clauses without formal subordination can occur in Middle Welsh,

<sup>1</sup> For further details compare Thurneysen (1946: 313-320). The history of the Goidelic system of relative marking and the question of its possible influence on (regional varieties of) English relative clauses are separate issues, which require separate treatment and will not be explored here. On Irish prepositional relative clauses see below § 4.2. Kurzová (1981: 92) notes that “[d]er uneingeleitete Relativsatz ... stellt eine grammatikalisierte und normalisierte Form des Relativsatzes im Englischen und den skandinavischen Sprachen einerseits und im Altirischen andererseits dar.”

<sup>2</sup> Many of his examples are so-called ‘abnormal sentences’ in which one sentence constituent precedes the verb in an unmarked construction, which shows formal similarities to relative clauses rather than straightforward relative clauses. For the term and a standard account, see Evans (1964: 179f.).

the relevant period for linguistic contact, according to Preusler, are therefore rather restricted and comprise instances in which (i) *a* is elided before a vowel or before a consonant not susceptible to lenition (2.2) or (ii) *y* is elided between a vowel and a consonant.<sup>3</sup>

(2.1) *val kyt bei brenhin Ø vei bob un onadunt* (YdCM 186: 21f.)  
 as if were king (which) were each one from(-them)  
 ‘as if it were a king which each one of them was’

(2.2) *ar benn gorssed uch penn llyn Ø oed yn Iwerdon* (PKM 35.12f.)  
 on top hill over top lake (which) was in Ireland  
 ‘on top of a hill above a lake which was in Ireland’

This hypothetical scenario, that tries to relate the elision of relative markers in spoken varieties of (medieval and modern) Welsh with the rise of contact clauses in English, does not contradict Preusler’s thirteenth century date for the rise of the English contact clause due to Celtic/Welsh influence. Note that Keller (1925) suggested a fourteenth century date for the influence of the Celtic Englishes, i.e., the regional varieties of English directly or indirectly influenced by the speech habits of speakers of Celtic languages (and learners of English), on the emergence of the progressive in English. In both scenarios, the decisive phase of interference would postdate probably at least 1200.

At this point of the discussion, it will be necessary to turn to some other comparanda of Modern English contact clauses. The history as well as the question of the existence of asyndetic relative clauses in earlier phases of English, and in other early Germanic languages, appears to be a contested area:

Asyndetische Relativsätze, wie *in droume sie in zelitun then weg sie faren scoltun* ‘... den Weg, [den] sie fahren sollten’ (Otfrid), begegnen im Nordischen, Englischen und Deutschen. Vielleicht sind sie als ältester Typ anzusehen [<sup>4</sup>] ... Die entgegengesetzte Auffassung, daß sie ein durch Wegfall eines Relativpronomens erst sekundär entstandenes Gebilde darstellen [<sup>5</sup>] ..., wird durch die historische Verteilung der Belege unterstützt: die asyndetische Konstruktion ist im ältesten Englischen und Nordischen selten belegt, dagegen in jüngeren Stufen dieser Sprachen häufig. Asyndetische Relativsätze kommen nach der ahd. Zeit nur selten vor. (Ebert 1978: 22)

<sup>3</sup> I have not found a convincing example for this type, the example given by Morris-Jones (1931: 93), *Ac yno 'tríc enaid R(h)ys* ‘there Rhýs’s soul rests,’ is again an abnormal rather than a relative clause.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Johansen (1935: 174) for a summary of this position: “primäre Gebilde, die unmittelbar aus asyndetisch angeschlossenen Hauptsätzen ohne pronominale und konjunktionale Einleitung entstanden sind.”

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Johansen (1935: 176) for a summary of this position, which he shares: “Die uneingeleiteten Relativsätze kommen nämlich nur in Texten vor, die einen jüngeren Sprachzustand vertreten; auf nordischem Gebiet kommen uneingeleitete Relativsätze häufig im Alt- und im jüngeren Norw. vor, fehlen aber im ältesten Wn. fast gänzlich. Auf wgm. Gebiet kommen sie vereinzelt in ahd., mhd. und mnd. Quellen vor und sind in jüngeren englischen Texten ausserordentlich häufig belegt, fehlen aber im Aws. ... sowie in der Sprache des Heliand.”

Mustanoja (1960: 203-205) suggests that there are no asyndetic relative clauses in Old English<sup>6</sup> and Early Middle English, and he dates clear examples to around the end of the fourteenth century, for both subject and object function of the antecedent. Dekeyser (1986) argues that it is necessary to keep the histories separate of contact clauses without an overt subject and without an overt object or prepositional phrase respectively, and states that “(a)ll scholars who have dealt with this matter are agreed that SCC’s (subject contact clauses) were rare in OE,” but that “sparse examples of SCC, mainly with the verb *hatan* ‘to be called’ or a copula” are attested (Dekeyser 1986: 108). Non-subject contact clauses are “extremely rare” in Old English (Dekeyser 1986: 109). In the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, non-subject contact clauses begin to outnumber subject contact clauses; subject contact clauses with cleft and existential constructions emerge in Late Middle English (Dekeyser 1986: 110).<sup>7</sup> Dekeyser (1986: 109) observes that “some (Middle English) manuscripts contain hardly any examples of CC’s (contact clauses) at all (e.g. *Trevisa*),” and this should be contrasted with Keller’s views on the emergence of the English progressive under the “Einfluß von englisch sprechenden Briten” (Keller 1925: 66), such as John Trevisa (1326-1412), who, according to Keller (1925: 61), is one of the first authors in whose works the progressive is used in the fourteenth century. In Dekeyser’s view, subject contact clauses originally arose in Old English from the

non-expression of the shared NP in the modifier clause, either as a full NP or a relative pronoun, [which] should be seen as an offshoot of a much wider phenomenon inherent to all the “primitive” Germanic dialects, viz. the optionality of an overt subject if this is identical with an NP in a preceding clause or even sentence. (Dekeyser 1986: 112f.)

He suggests that the asyndetic type was gradually lost in German and Dutch, but grammaticalised in English as well as in the Scandinavian languages. He does not discuss the development of the Scandinavian contact clauses, but relates the emergence of the two English types to “the Old Germanic asyndetic parataxis without an overt subject,” for the original subject contact clause, and to “the introduction of a new relativization strategy with a deletable *that* and fixed word-order,” for the non-subject contact clause (Dekeyser 1986: 115).<sup>8</sup> He also insists that for the subject contact clauses “there is a world of difference between the OE stereotyped parataxis with *hatan/beon* on the one hand, and clefts and existential sentences on the other,” the Old and Early Middle English subject

<sup>6</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the Old English situation, see Mitchell (1985 a: 184-196) and Dekeyser (1986).

<sup>7</sup> See also Erdmann (1980). For the distribution of subject contact clauses in modern regional varieties of English, cf. Erdmann (1980: 142-144) and, specifically for Dorset English, Van den Eynden Morpeth (2002: 187f.). It is perhaps significant that, according to Erdmann’s maps, subject contact clauses are hardly attested in the areas immediately adjacent to Wales and the same holds true for the use of *as/at/what his* instead of *whose*; see Poussa (2002: 5) and below § 4.3.

<sup>8</sup> For the importance of word order in subordination without subordinator, cf. also Lehmann (1984: 160f.).

contact clause therefore being “in no way the ancestor of its MOD[ERN] E[NG-LISH] “equivalent”” (Dekeyser 1986: 115).

For the problem of possible British influences on the English contact clause, it is methodologically important that scholars such as Dekeyser argued for the existence of a pan-Germanic asyndetic parataxis and that Gärtner (1981) adduced evidence for Old High German asyndetic relative clauses, “die ... im heutigen Englisch eine direkte Entsprechung haben in den sogenannten ‘contact-clauses’” (Gärtner 1981: 152):

*Asyndetische RS mit nominalem Bezugswort im übergeordneten Satz, an das der RS ohne einleitendes Pronomen angeschlossen ist.* Als Beispiel für diesen nur im Ahd. belegten Typ gebe ich einen Satz aus Otfrieds ‘Evangelienbuch’ (ed. Erdmann/Wolff); er stammt aus der Partie, in der Otfried nach Mt. 2,12 berichtet, daß den drei Weisen aus dem Morgenland die Engel im Traum erschienen und sie ermahnten, nicht zu Herodes zurückzu-kehren; sie wiesen ihnen einen anderen Weg, heißt es, auf dem sie in ihre Heimat zu-rückkehren sollten. Im ahd. Text nach Otfried I.17,74 lautet das:

*in dróume sie in zélitun t h e n w e g sie f á r a n s c o l t u m;*

Der RS ist in diesem Beispiel ohne verbindendes Pronomen, d.h. asyndetisch, mit dem Bezugswort im übergeordneten Satz verknüpft. Das Bezugswort *then weg* und der RS *sie faran scoltum* gehören aber eng zusammen, denn sie stehen in einem Kurzvers beieinander und sind durch keine metrische Pause getrennt, vielmehr liegt eine metrische Pause vor dem Bezugswort ... Asyndetische RS vom Typus des ersten Otfried-Beispiels (I.17,74) sind im heutigen Englisch und in den skandinavischen Sprachen ganz geläufig. Die Übersetzung des Otfriedschen Satzes ins Englische wäre ...:

*In a dream they told them t h e w a y they should go.*

Wie bei Otfried wird auch in dem äquivalenten englischen Satz beim Sprechen keine Pause gemacht zwischen Bezugswort und asyndetisch angefügtem RS, dem sogenannten ‘contact-clause’ nach Jespersens treffender Terminologie. ... Dieser RS-Typ ist im Ahd. mit sicheren Beispielen belegt; im Mhd. dagegen gibt es kaum noch Vergleichbares. (Gärtner 1981: 154f.)

The three other types of asyndetic relative clauses Gärtner accepts for Old High German are:<sup>9</sup>

... durch ein Relativum eingeleitete RS, das aber keine Stütze (Bezugswort) im übergeordneten Satz hat und deshalb gewissermaßen in Doppelfunktion steht, als Demonstrativum und Relativum zugleich zu funktionieren scheint. Solche Sätze sind vom Ahd. bis zum Frühnhd. ganz geläufig. (Gärtner 1981: 153; (3.1), (3.2)).<sup>10</sup>

Dem Typus mit Pronomen in Doppelfunktion verwandt sind die komplizierteren Fälle, wo das zwischen HS und RS stehende Pronomen sachlich zu beiden Sätzen gehören kann, aber wegen der unterschiedlichen Kasus, die HS und RS verlangen, nur zu einem Satz – und zwar meist dem übergeordneten – konstruiert wird. Auch dafür sind die Beispiele vom Ahd. bis zum Frühnhd. zahlreich. (Gärtner 1981: 153; (3.3))

<sup>9</sup> For a useful English summary of Gärtner’s position see Davis and Bernhardt. (2002: 106-108)

<sup>10</sup> Cf. also Paul, et al. (1969: 424) for Middle High German, “(d)as Pronomen *der diu daz*, substantivisch und ohne Wiederholung gebraucht, kann Bezugswort und Relativum zugleich bezeichnen,” as in *er gienc als der buchszen treit* ‘he went as one who carries boxes’ or *du zihst in daz doch nie geschach* ‘you blamed him for that that never happened.’



Schließlich gehören zu den asyndetischen RS auch noch die sogenannten *hiez*-Konstruktionen, eine im Mhd. und Frühnhd. zahlreich belegte Form der asyndetischen Verbindung eines RS mit seinem Bezugswort. Seinen Namen verdankt dieser RS-Typ dem Umstand, daß sein Prädikat meist mit *hiez* oder einer anderen finiten Form von passivischem *heizen* gebildet ist. (Gärtner 1981: 153; (3.4))

Some of Gärtner's examples for these types are:

- (3.1) *Maria uias t h i u da salbota trohtin.* (Old High German)  
'it was Mary who rubbed the Lord with ointment'
- (3.2) *Maria aber war, d i e den Herrn gesalbt hat.* (Early Modern High German)  
'but it was Mary who rubbed the Lord with ointment'
- (3.3) *enti quad z u d e m dar uuarun.* (Old High German)  
'and said to those who were there'
- (3.4) *e i n k ü n e c hiez Anfortas.* (Middle High German)  
'a king who was called Anfortas'

Gärtner's views were shared by Hermann Paul, et al. (1969: 423) who suggest that asyndetic relative clauses are not attested as a distinct type in Middle High German, "(v)ereinzelte Fälle, die sich so auffassen lassen, können als leicht anakoluthisch empfunden werden."<sup>11</sup> Asyndetic relative clauses occur only rarely in Early Modern High German:

Der asyndetische Relativsatz ist ohne einleitendes Element an einen das Bezugswort enthaltenden übergeordneten Satz angeschlossen; die syntaktisch-semantische Rolle des Bezugsworts im Relativsatz muß aus der syntaktisch-semantischen Lehrstelle im Relativsatz erschlossen werden. Dieser Typus begegnet nur vereinzelt im 14.-16. Jh. und ist danach untergegangen: *den ersten fisch du fehst, den nym*, Luther, Freiheit 36, *danck im auch von meinet wegen seines manchfeltigin grues, er mir hat durch dich entpietten lassen* Michel Behaim 122. Häufiger als der asyndetische Relativsatz mit Späterstellung des Verbs ist der parataktische Typus mit Anfangsstellung des Verbum finitum, besonders *heißen: Ez waz ein swester, hiez Alheit von Trochaw.* (Reichmann and Wegera 1993: 444)

In Fleischer's sample of relative constructions in modern German dialects the asyndetic type is only found in some North Saxon dialects of Schleswig (Fleischer 2004: 226).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Cf. their example, Paul, et al. (1969: 423) *der grôzen sûl [v.l. die da] dâ zwischen stuont* 'of the strong pillar which stood inbetween.' For a brief summary of relevant research, see Haugann (1974: 236-238).

<sup>12</sup> Fleischer (2004: 234f.) comments on the possible areal implications of this situation: "Regardless of whether the zero relatives in this dialect [of Husby] are due to contact with Danish, in an areal perspective this dialect turns out to be in the south-west of a larger area that has zero relatives. The fact that this dialect has zero relatives, which makes it quite exotic within the German varieties, is thus nothing very remarkable in a broader areal perspective."

Typologically in a pan-Germanic perspective, it is interesting to note that the so-called *hie�*-construction is also attested in Old English, as pointed out by Mitchell (1985 a: 186), who says that the “(a)pparent absence of a relative pronoun in a definite adjective clause referring to an expressed antecedent,” in which the adjective clause requires the nominative case, “manifests itself most frequently in OE with forms of the verb *hatan* ‘to be named,’ namely *hatte*, *hatton*,” as in (3.5) from the Old English *Orosius*. Dekeyser (1986: 108) mentions that “typicalization of the proper name” is a characteristic feature of this type in Old English.

- (3.5) *betux þære ie Indus 7 þære þe be westan hiere is, Tigris hatte.* (Old English)  
(Mitchell 1985 a: 186, Or 70.8)

Asyndetic relative clauses are not attested in the Old Norse language of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Heusler 1932: 159), but are found in modern Scandinavian languages (5),<sup>13</sup> as the following examples from Platzack (2002: 82f.) show, in which the complementizers (cpl) *sum/ið* and *som* can be left out:

- (4.1) *Eg kenni tann mann (sum/ið) tu hitti i gjar.* (Faroese)  
I know the man (cpl) you met yesterday.
- (4.2) *Den ny bil (som) vi købte er japansk.* (Danish)  
the new car (cpl) we bought is Japanese.
- (4.3) *Har du sett den lampa (som) eg kjøbte i går?* (Norwegian)  
have you seen the lamp (cpl) I bought yesterday?
- (4.4) *Den kvinnan (som) jag sålde huset till är danska.* (Swedish)  
The woman-the (cpl) I sold house-the to is Danish.
- (Platzack 2002: 82f.)

In the examples under (4.1-4.4), the antecedent has the function of object in the relative clause, just as in Modern English contact clauses. At least in Faroese and Old Swedish, asyndetic relative clauses are also possible with the antecedent as subject in the relative clause, but in these instances a specifically marked word-order in the relative clause is required, probably in order to demarcate clause-boundaries and to eliminate processual difficulties:

<sup>13</sup> For some further information on the distribution of contact clauses in Germanic languages, see Platzack (2002: 77-79, 86). Relative clauses without overt subordinators appear to be rare in European languages: “Postnominale RS (Relativsätze) ohne Subordinator kommen als sekundäre Strategie in europäischen Sprachen vor, und zwar im Englischen und in den festlandskandinavischen Sprachen sowie im umgangssprachlichen Walisischen” (Zifonun 2001: 25). For the restrictions applying in Colloquial Welsh see above. Typologically, literary Modern Welsh is classified by Lehmann (1984: 85) as having a post-nominal relative clause with initial subordinator.

It is interesting to notice that Faroese differs from all the modern Germanic languages in having relative clauses without a relative marker also when the subject is relativized. In this case, there must be a stylistically fronted element at the left periphery of the embedded clause. (Platzack 2002: 82f.)<sup>14</sup>

- (4.5) *Tær komurnar (sum) heima skuldu vera, eru burturstaddar.* (Faroese)  
the woman (cpl) home should be are away.

‘The women who should be at home, are away.’

In conclusion then I think that the Welsh trigger suggested by Preusler for English contact clauses, namely special relative forms of Welsh verbs, is probably numerically not sufficient, since there is only one such form, the third person singular present indicative *sydd* of the verb ‘to be.’ A somewhat extended version tentatively advanced here, based on the loss of relative markers in special contexts in the spoken language, also comes up against serious objections, since in many instances these non-introduced relative clauses would be marked by an initial mutation on the verbal form. Even more important are the pan-Germanic parallels for asyndetic relative clauses, especially the German examples adduced by Gärtner (1981), which suggest that the origin and development of such clauses should be explained internally within Germanic, as resulting from asyndetic parataxis. Many scholars, from Curme (1912)<sup>15</sup> to Dekeyser (1986), seem to agree that at least the subject contact clause is of Common Germanic origin. As Dekeyser (1986) has shown, it is probably best to treat separately the rise in English of subject and non-subject contact clauses respectively, and he also suggests that the latter can be adequately explained as having arisen within English.

#### 4.2. Preusler on Prepositional Relatives

Preusler’s hypothesis of the existence in Welsh and English of a parallel formal and systematic contrast of pied-piped and preposition stranding – i.e., Welsh *ar yr hwn* = English *on which* versus Welsh *y ... ohoni* = English *that ... from* – rests on slim grounds, even if one disregards for the time being the formal and typological differences between the English stranded preposition *from* and the Welsh preposition with an anaphoric personal pronoun *ohoni*. Preusler accepted

<sup>14</sup> This element is *heima* in (4.5); cf. Platzack (2002: 85) for a discussion of Old Swedish example. The subject contact clauses of Modern English are also restricted to specific syntactic contexts, typically existential *there is/are* and cleft sentences (cf. Dekeyser 1986: 111; Erdmann 1980: 140-142). For the processual difficulties, cf. Zifonun’s remark that in constructions such as *\*The man [ \_ ] came yesterday was my friend* “wäre die Satzgrenze zum RS nicht erkennbar, die Setzung eines Subordinators ist also functional” (Zifonun 2001: 25). See also Lehmann (1984: 160f.) and Kurzová (1981: 93f.) for the impact of word order in subordination without subordinators/contact clauses.

<sup>15</sup> In view of Dekeyser’s analysis, it is probably not necessary to argue that subject contact clauses were colloquial even in Common Germanic, as suggested, for example, by Curme (1912).

(5), with a preposition followed by definite article and demonstrative, as a genuine Welsh mode of relative construction, parallel to English *on which*:<sup>16</sup>

- (5) *gwely y teulu, ar yr hwn yr eistedd id y dydd*  
 ‘the bed of the family on which one sat during the day’

However, as Morris-Jones (1931: 103) has shown, this mode of expression in which “the definite pronoun (*yr hwn* etc.) is the object of the preposition which should govern the relative” is “un-idiomatic” in Welsh and derived from foreign (Latin, perhaps also English) models. Morris-Jones contrasts it with the idiomatic mode, in which the demonstrative is not part of the relative clause, but stands in apposition to the antecedent:

When the antecedent is expressed, the definite pronouns *yr hwn*, *yr hon*, etc., properly stand in apposition to it, even when the relative ... is the object of a preposition [(6.1) ...]. But the translators, like the grammarians, regarded *yr hwn*, etc., as relatives, and considered the true relatives to be meaningless particles; hence ... they often make the definite pronoun the object of the preposition which should govern the relative [(6.2) ...]. (Morris-Jones 1931: 102f.)<sup>17</sup>

- (6.1) *Y llety eu estavell e brenyn, er hon e bo en kescu endy.*  
 ‘his accomodation is the chamber of the king, the one that he sleeps in.’
- (6.2) *Y lle teckaf yw yn y dwyrein, yn yr hwnn y gossodet amravaelyon genedyloed o’r gwyd.*  
 ‘the most beautiful place is in the east, in which trees of different kinds were planted.’

Example (6.2) is taken from a manuscript of 1346, called *Llyvyr Agkyr Llandewivrevi* (‘Book of the Anchorite of Llanddewibrefi’), a Welsh translation of the Latin *Elucidarium*, in which the relevant sentence has a pied-piped prepositional relative *in quo*, on which *yn yr hwnn (y)* is modelled:

- (6.3) *Locus amoenissium in oriente, in quo arbores diversi generis erant consitae.*  
 (Morris-Jones 1931: 103)  
 ‘the most beautiful place in the east, in which trees of different kinds were planted’

Preusler’s suggestion that the pied-piped construction as in *yn yr hwnn (y)* is genuine and idiomatic in Welsh lacks support in the linguistic facts of Welsh relatives, as does the correlation he perceives to exist between the distribution of variants such as Welsh *e ... endy* versus *yn yr hwnn ...* and English  $\emptyset$  ... *in* versus *in which*.

Prepositional relatives with pied-piping exist in the history of Insular Celtic relative clauses (cf. Isaac 2003 b). It was the dominant mode in Old Irish (7.1) and a marginal one in Middle Welsh (7.2), whereas the type with preposition and suffixed anaphoric pronoun is marginal in Old Irish (7.3) and dominant in Middle Welsh (7.4). In Modern Irish the pied-piped type is marginally retained, but generally supplanted by the anaphoric one (7.5).

<sup>16</sup> Preusler gives no source reference for this seemingly Early Modern Welsh example (Tr).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Evans (1964: 66).

- (7.1) *is torbe namáa tra ara-tobarr labrad ilbelre*<sup>18</sup> (Old Irish)  
 ‘it is the only profit then for which speaking  
 many languages is given’
- (7.2) *gwelet y bed a uynnei trw yt gaffei wreicca*<sup>19</sup> (Middle Welsh)  
 ‘he wanted to see the grave by which he would  
 be allowed to seek a wife’
- (7.3) *nech suidigther loc daingen dó* (Old Irish)  
 ‘anyone (that) is established a strong place to(-him)’
- (7.4) *y coedyd y foassant vdunt* (Middle Welsh)  
 ‘the woods that they fled to(-them)’
- (7.5) *hon yw’r gadair yr eisteddai ef arni*<sup>20</sup> (Modern Welsh)  
 ‘this is the chair on which he would sit on(-it)’
- (7.6) *áit a dtugann said An Lag air*<sup>21</sup> (Modern Irish)  
 ‘a place they give An Lag on(-it)’  
 (= ‘a place they call An Lag’)

Various forms of preposition stranding are attested in the Germanic languages. For Old English, Mitchell (1985 a: 151-158) has shown that pied-piped and preposition stranding existed side by side, depending on the form of the relative. He also showed that the relative *þæt* prefers preposition stranding. At least one constituent intervenes between the relative marker and the stranded preposition (Pilch 1970: 189) which typically appears to be placed before the verb (Mitchell 1985: 447f.). Middle English shows variation with regard to the position of the stranded preposition within the relative clause:

Prepositions occurring in connection with *that* are placed immediately before the verb [...*the place that I of spake ...*], particularly in early ME. Less frequently in early ME, but commonly in late ME, the preposition is placed at the end of the clause (*precious stanes þat he myght by a kingdom with ...*). (Mustanoja 1960: 197)

As noted by Preusler (1956: 338), preposition stranding into clause-final position is also a feature of the Scandinavian languages.

- (8.1) *land er hann kom frá* (Old Icelandic)  
 ‘the land that he came from’
- (8.2) *den piken som du danset med* (Norwegian)  
 ‘the girl that you danced with’

<sup>18</sup> Isaac (2003 b: 76), from the Würzburg Glosses.

<sup>19</sup> Example from Isaac (2003 b: 81). Instances of preposition plus relative *a* quoted by Morris-Jones (1931: 95) are best taken as relative clauses without an expressed antecedent, as indicated in his translation, e.g., *Aeth yr Unduw a Thrindawd / ag a wnaeth les gwan a thlawd* ‘the One God and Three has taken (lit. gone with) [him] who benefited weak and poor,’ rather than as prepositional relatives proper, i.e. ‘with whom benefited.’

<sup>20</sup> Williams (1980: 167).

<sup>21</sup> Isaac (2003 b: 76).

Heusler (1932: 162f.) remarks on the normal situation in Old Icelandic that the prepositions are placed at the end of the clause as adverbs bearing stress (“sie (die Präpositionen) treten als starktonige Adverbia nach hinten”). However, he also quotes instances of prepositional relative clauses with an anaphoric pronoun (8.3), with a prepositional phrase followed by a relative particle (8.4), and with an inflected interrogative following a preposition (8.5).

- (8.3) *þann konung, er under honom ero skattkonungar.*  
 ‘the king under whom are tributary kings’ (lit. that under him)
- (8.4) *i þorpe nøkkoro er ein kurteis kona, til þeirar er Heinrekr konungr venr sínar ferþer*<sup>22</sup>  
 ‘in a village there is a noble woman to whom king Henry rides’
- (8.5) *þetta sama orþ var ok upphaf, i huerio ok fyrer huat er guþ skapape allan heimenn*  
 ‘this same word was also the origin, in which and through which God created the whole world’

Heusler (1932: 163) considers these to be artificial and learned formations in order to make grammatical relations more transparent and to avoid “(die) Unempfindlichkeit (der starren Relativpartikel) gegen die Rektion der Verba.” The Old Norse example (8.4) is similar to the Welsh examples (5) and (6.2); they share the same motivation and the same model, namely Latin pied-piped prepositional relatives in which a preposition is followed by a relative pronoun, as in, for example, *in quo* (6.3), the Latin model for (6.2) above.

In our context it is again relevant that the earlier English type with the preposition in non-final position is also attested in other West Germanic languages. In Middle High German, relative adverbials (‘relative Adverbien’) may introduce a semantically prepositional relative clause and the required preposition then appears as a stressed adverb within the relative clause, as in (9.1).<sup>23</sup>

- (9.1) *man huop in von der bâre, dâ er ûfe lac* (Middle High German)  
 ‘he was lifted up from the stretcher that he was lying on’

In dialects of Modern German, a similar type is realised, with the relative particle *wo* (‘where’) and either a prepositional adverb, as in (9.2), or the simple preposition, as in (9.3). According to Fleischer (2002: maps 3 and 6), type (9.2) occurs south of a line from Aachen in the west to Berlin in the east, whereas type (9.3) is found north of this line, namely in the Low German dialects – only preposition stranding with *mit* (‘with’) as in (9.3) being attested nearly everywhere

<sup>22</sup> For more idiomatic *sú er Heinrekr konungr venr sínar ferþer til*.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Paul, et al. (1969: 421). Alternatively, a relative adverb may introduce the relative clause on its own, as in *santin si den edelin Cesarem, dannin noch hiude kuninge heizzint keisere* ‘they sent noble Caesar after whom kings are still called today ‘keisere.’ For rare examples parallel to (9.1) from Modern German dialects see Fleischer (2002: 173), who suggests “dass es sich bei dieser Verwendung der Spaltungskonstruktion um ein Relikt handelt” which has been supplanted by the construction with *wo* (‘where’).

in the German speaking area (“fast über das gesamte Sprachgebiet des Deutschen”) (Fleischer 2002: 196).<sup>24</sup>

(9.2) *Drei milioone, wo s drum schritted* (Fleischer 2002: 268)  
‘three millions that they argue about’

(9.3) *de ddern, wo he mit utgaan is* (Fleischer 2002: 194)  
‘the girl that he went out with’

The same types also occur in substandard/colloquial Modern German, (9.4) and (9.5). The constructions of (9.3) and (9.5) are also an option in (standard) Dutch (9.6).<sup>25</sup>

(9.4) *Die deutschen Kicker sind an ein Limit gekommen, wo es im Moment nicht drüber geht.* (colloquial Modern German)  
‘The German football players have attained a standard that cannot be surpassed at the moment.’

(9.5) *Das Mädchen, wo du mit getanzt hast, hat langes Haar.* (colloquial Modern German)  
‘The girl you danced with has long hair.’

(9.6.) *De tafel waar het brood op ligt, is van mij.* (Dutch)  
‘the table which the bread is lying on is mine.’

Preposition stranding appears to be rare in a typological perspective,<sup>26</sup> and is probably connected with an adverbial characterisation of the prepositions as Lehmann und Kurzová suggest:

Nur Englisch, die skandinavischen Sprachen, Ewe, Koyo und Kambodschanisch repräsentieren den Nukleus auch dann nicht im RS, wenn er das Komplement einer Adposition ist. (Lehmann 1984: 230)<sup>27</sup>

Adpositionen kann man in den meisten Sprachen nicht einfach ohne ein Komplement stehen lassen; Englisch, Kambodschanisch und Koyo, wo dies nicht nur in RSen möglich ist, gehören da sicher einer Minderheit an. Wahrscheinlich hängt die Möglichkeit des ‘preposition stranding’ damit zusammen, daß die Adpositionen gleichzeitig als Adverbien fungieren (die ja kein Komplement erfordern). (Lehmann 1984: 232)

<sup>24</sup> For further examples and discussion, including the positions available for the stranded prepositions in the relative clause, see Fleischer (2002: 190-202, with map 3, 255-276, with map 6). On significant differences in relative-clause formation between Standard German and German dialects in a typological perspective, see Fleischer (2004: 236f.).

<sup>25</sup> There is also a pied-piped variant, *De tafel waarop het brood ligt* ‘the table on which the bread is lying,’ see Donaldson (1981: 63-66) and Gm. *der Tisch, worauf das Brot liegt* and its colloquial variant *der Tisch, wo das Brot drauf liegt*. I wish to thank Graham Isaac for pointing out to me the existence of preposition stranding in Dutch. Note Dekeyser’s claim, reported by Van den Eynden Morpeth (2002: 189), that “there is a correlation between particle strategies and preposition stranding.”

<sup>26</sup> I cannot offer a survey of the distribution of the ‘Welsh type’ of prepositional relatives in which an anaphoric personal pronoun is used; this type is found, for example, in Egyptian and Modern Persian (Isaac 2003 b: 79), and also in substandard French, *le patron que je travaille pour lui* ‘the man whom I work for(-him),’ and in Modern Greek, *i kopela pu kathisa konda tis* ‘the girl whom I sat next to(-her).’

<sup>27</sup> See also Tallerman (1990: 307).

Die Endstellung der Präposition ist durch gewisse strukturelle Voraussetzungen der germanischen Sprachen bedingt. Die Trennung der Präposition von der Nominalphrase und ihre enge Verbindung mit dem Verb im Englischen und in den skandinavischen Sprachen beruht auf den strukturellen Eigenschaften der germanischen Sprachen, die sich im Deutschen anders, nämlich in der Trennung des Präverbs vom Verb äußern. Beiden Erscheinungen liegt die Autonomie, der überlebende Adverbialcharakter von Präposition-Präverb zugrunde. (Kurzová 1981: 86)<sup>28</sup>

Following Lehmann and Kurzová and pending further more detailed investigation of the Insular Celtic situation, I am inclined to accept that Insular Celtic and Germanic languages are typologically different with regard to the extent to which they allow an adverbial characterisation of prepositions. This would appear to be reflected in the differences between their idiomatic prepositional relative clauses, namely the ‘Celtic type’ with particle plus preposition and anaphoric personal pronoun versus the ‘Germanic type’ with particle plus clause-internal preposition or prepositional adverb. I would also like to suggest that the clause-final position of the stranded preposition in English and of the prepositional phrase in Welsh respectively is coincidental, rather than diagnostic for contact, and probably related to basic word order rules in the two languages, but this requires further scrutiny, particularly in the light of the Scandinavian examples.

It should be noted, however, that stranded prepositions of the Germanic/English type occur in colloquial Modern Welsh, as in (10).

- (10) *y papur roeddwn i'n edrych ar*  
 the paper COMP-was-ISG I-PROG look at  
 ‘the paper that I was looking at’  
 (Tallerman 1990: 305)

Tallerman (1990: 307) and Isaac (2003 a: 49) agree that the rise of this type in Welsh is due to English influence; and I think it is methodologically interesting to note that contact here straddles typological boundaries in a situation described by Isaac as one of a “minority language being distorted by contact with the majority language of political hegemony” (Isaac 2003 a: 49, fn.).

Isaac, in his contribution to *Celtic Englishes III*, has in my view rightly insisted that Welsh has no stranded prepositions in the strict sense in relative clauses, “(t)he English construction with isolated prepositions could not be more foreign to Celtic syntax” (Isaac 2003 a: 47), and he therefore rules out any possibilities of contact in this area. I have shown above that one central part of

<sup>28</sup> Wagner (1959) and, following him, Veselinović (2004) suggest that verbal composition in Old Irish was gradually supplanted by phrasal verbs in Early Modern Irish. Wagner even posits a geographical relationship (“einen geographischen Zusammenhang”) between this development and similar developments at the transition from Old English to Middle English and from Proto-Norse to Old Norse (“im Übergang vom Altengl. zum Mittelengl. und vom Urnord. zum Altnordischen”) (Wagner 1959: 122). See, however, Veselinović’s rather more sceptical assessment in her contribution to this volume. The situation in Welsh requires further investigation. In spite of the typological change, Modern Irish still uses a prepositional relative clause with a prepositional phrase containing an anaphoric pronoun, see (7.5.) above.



Preusler's argument – presumed systematic parallels between Welsh and English, variants such as *e ... endy* versus *yn yr hwnn ...*, parallel to English *Ø ... in* versus *in which ...* – lacks support in the linguistic facts of Welsh relatives. Preposition stranding, with admittedly some variation of the position of the stranded preposition within the relative clause, appears to be a pan-Germanic option connected with the adverbial characterisation of prepositions in this group of languages, as suggested by Lehmann and Kurzová.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.3. Preusler on Genitival Relative Clauses

Finally on Preusler, I would like to discuss very briefly his suggestion that genitival relative clauses with anaphoric possessives in earlier and regional varieties of English are related to a formally identical construction of Welsh genitival relative clauses.<sup>30</sup> It would seem, however, that functionally this type is intimately connected with other relative clauses which contain anaphoric personal pronouns:

A not infrequent construction in ME texts is *that* followed by a personal pronoun or a possessive. ((11.1) and (11.2))<sup>31</sup> ... The personal pronoun and the possessive seem to be used partly for emphasis, partly to indicate the case of the indeclinable relative pronoun ... The same desire for clarity of expression seems to account for the use of the personal or possessive pronoun in *which*-clauses. (Mustanoja 1960: 202f.)

(11.1) *þat he ne was robbed*  
'who was not robbed'

(11.2) *þat wrong is his name*  
'whose name is wrong'

<sup>29</sup> Note in this context that in Welsh the syntax of prepositional questions is different from that of prepositional relatives, in that in the former the preposition precedes the interrogative, e.g., *i bwy ...?* 'to whom ...?', whereas in the latter a relative particle and a preposition plus anaphoric pronoun within the relative clause is used, e.g. *y ... iddo* 'who ... to(-him)'. The map for the syntactic variation in the SED frame for TO WHOM, in the embedded question *I wonder to whom I shall give it?* has therefore no bearing on our problem. Poussa (2004: 186) considers *who ... to* to be "the incoming form, spreading from the Northern Midlands" – and in her oral response to this paper at the Colloquium she suggested a strong association of preposition stranding with the Scandinavian-settled areas of England.

<sup>30</sup> For Preusler's examples from Welsh and English, see above § 2. The construction in which the subordinator *that* or *at* is followed by a possessive pronoun, as in *the man at his weyfe's deid* or *the crew that their boat wis vrackit*, is common in Scots, according to Sepänen (1999: 22f.), but it also occurs in other dialects of English. For a map showing the distribution of *as/at/what his* see Poussa (2002: 5). The largest part of the area immediately adjacent to Wales seems to prefer *whose*.

<sup>31</sup> Mustanoja (1960: 202), from *Piers Plowman*.

Relative clauses with anaphoric personal pronouns are only very marginally attested in Middle Welsh, if at all.<sup>32</sup> Heusler (1932: 163) quotes similar examples from Old Norse for the use of a pronoun in the genitive in relative clauses as a rescue strategy to guarantee clarity. It is therefore perhaps more likely that in spite of the formal parallels between the Welsh and English clauses these have arisen independently in exploitation of available linguistic means to enhance clarity, regularly in Welsh, marginally in English and Old Norse.<sup>33</sup>

#### 4.4. *Molyneux*

Molyneux argues that English contact clauses without an explicit subordinator are equivalent to Welsh relative clauses with the subordinators *a* and *y(r)* – the two types are, however, different with regard to the making of subordination and I can see no reason why they should be collapsed into a single category. Problems relating to the typological differences between stranded prepositions with adverbial characterisation in English and other Germanic languages and prepositions plus anaphoric pronouns in the Insular Celtic languages have already been addressed above (§ 4.2).

#### 5. *Conclusions*

In conclusion, I need to stress that my aim here was to review and assess Preusler's and Molyneux's arguments for possible Celtic/British/Welsh influences on English relative clauses. I am currently inclined to remain sceptical with regard to the arguments for Insular Celtic influences on the formation of English relative clauses they put forward. There are robust parallels for contact clauses and various forms of preposition stranding in other Germanic languages, including West Germanic ones, which point towards the likelihood of language-internal motivations. Patricia Poussa stressed the possibility of linguistic influence from the Scandinavian settlements in her oral response to this paper at the Col-

<sup>32</sup> For some contexts in which such anaphoric pronouns may be used in Middle Welsh, cf. Evans (1964: 63, 64), namely the form *ae* of the relative marker which sometimes occurs in early Middle Welsh, as in *E Betew ae gulich y glav*, lit. 'the graves which the rains wets (them)' (*Black Book of Carmarthen*), and which "may be explained as consisting of *a* and 'e', 'y', the infixed pronoun," as well as negative relative clauses in which the antecedent functions as object, as in *llyna beth nys gwrthodaf i*, lit. 'that is a thing which I will not refuse (it)' (*Ystoria de Carolo Magno*).

<sup>33</sup> See Fleischer (2004: 223f.) for rare examples from German dialects and Lehmann (1984: 88f.) for the attestation of relative clauses with anaphoric pronouns in modern Indo-European languages: "In allen slavischen und romanischen Sprachen außer dem Rumänischen existiert diese Konstruktion; Unterschiede bestehen nur in dem Grad der Verbreitung und in der Höhe des stilistischen oder soziolektalen Niveaus, auf dem die Konstruktion zulässig ist (meist kein sehr hohes Niveau). ... Dieselbe Strategie ist ferner die übliche im Neugriechischen." The use of the so-called 'pronomen coniunctum' in Modern Greek is typologically instructive: "It is the personal pronoun by which the meaning of the rather vague relative pronoun *του* is rendered clearer" (Bakker 1974: 9).

loquium; and I would not want to rule out the possibility that some developments within English could perhaps be reinforced by British influences through imperfect acquisition of English by speakers of Welsh and/or Goidelic languages, but this is methodologically difficult to demonstrate.

### References

- HS* Hauptsatz ('main clause')  
*PKM* *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*, ed. by Ifor Williams, Caerdydd (Cardiff): Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1930.  
*RS* Relativsatz ('relative clause')  
*YdCM* *Ystoria de Carolo Magno*, ed. by Stephen J. Williams, Caerdydd (Cardiff): Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1930.

**Bakker, W.F.**, 1974, *Pronomen Abundans and Pronomen Coniunctum. A Contribution to the History of the Resumptive Pronoun within the Relative Clause in Greek*, (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 82), Amsterdam & London: North-Holland.

**Curme, G.O.**, 1912, "A History of the English Relative Constructions," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 11: 10-29, 180-204, 355-380.

**Davis, G. & K.A. Bernhardt**, 2002, *Syntax of West Germanic: The Syntax of Old English and Old High German*, Göppingen: Kümmerle.

**Dekeyser, X.**, 1986, "English Contact Clauses Revisited: A Diachronic Approach," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 7: 107-120.

**Donaldson, B.C.**, 1981, *Dutch Reference Grammar*, 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.

**Ebert, R.P.**, 1978, *Historische Syntax des Deutschen*, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

**Erdmann, O. & L. Wolff**, eds., 1973, *Otfrieds Evangelienbuch*, Tübingen: Niemeyer (6<sup>th</sup> ed.).

**Erdmann, P.**, 1980, "On the History of Subject Contact-Clauses in English," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 1: 139-170.

**Evans, D.S.**, 1964, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

**Filppula, M., et al.**, 2002, "Early Contacts between English and the Celtic Languages," in: Filppula, M., et al., eds., *The Celtic Roots of English*, (Studies in Language 37), Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities, 1-26.

**Fleischer, J.**, 2002, *Die Syntax von Pronominaladverbien in den Dialekten des Deutschen. Eine Untersuchung zu Preposition Stranding und verwandten Phänomenen*, (Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik, Beihefte 123), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

**Fleischer, J.**, 2004, "A Typology of Relative Clauses in German Dialects," in: Kortmann, B., ed., *Dialectology Meets Typology. Dialect Grammar from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 211-243.

**Gärtner, K.**, 1981, "Asyndetische Relativsätze in der Geschichte der Deutschen," *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 9: 152-163.

**Haugann, O.M.**, 1974, "Zu den nicht-attributiven und den asyndetischen Relativsätzen im Mittelhochdeutschen," *Norwegian Journal of Linguistics. Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 28: 207-248.

**Heusler, A.**, 1932, *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg: C. Winter (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.).

**Isaac, G.**, 2003 a, "Diagnosing the Symptoms of Contact: Some Celtic-English Case Histories", in: Tristram, H.L.C., ed., *The Celtic Englishes III*, Heidelberg: C. Winter, 46-64.

**Isaac, G.**, 2003 b, "The Structure and Typology of Prepositional Relative Clauses in Early Welsh," in: Russell, P., ed., *Yr Hen Iaith. Studies in Early Welsh*, Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 75-93.

**Johansen, H.**, 1935, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der altgermanischen Relativsatzkonstruktionen*, Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.

**Keller, W.**, 1925, "Keltisches im englischen Verbum," *Anglica. Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie*, Bd. 1: *Sprache und Kulturgeschichte*, (Palaestra 147), Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 55-66.

**Kurzová, H.**, 1981, *Der Relativsatz in den indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

**Lehmann, C.**, 1984, *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

**Mitchell, B.**, 1985 a, *Old English Syntax*, vol. I: *Concord, the Parts of Speech, and the Sentence*, Oxford: Clarendon.

**Mitchell, B.**, 1985 b, *Old English Syntax*, vol. II: *Subordination, Independent Elements, and Element Order*, Oxford: Clarendon.

**Molyneux, C.**, 1987, "Some Ideas on English-British Celtic Language Contact," *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 28: 81-89.

**Morris-Jones, J.**, 1931, *Welsh Syntax. An Unfinished Draft*, Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board.

**Mustanoja, T.F.**, 1960, *A Middle English Syntax*, Part I: *Parts of Speech*, Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

**Paul, H., et al.**, 1969, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, Tübingen: Niemeyer (20<sup>th</sup> ed., rev. by H. Moser & I. Schröbler).

**Pilch, H.**, 1970, *Altenglische Grammatik*, Munich: Max Hueber Verlag.

- Platzack, C.**, 2002, "Relativization in the Germanic Languages, with Particular Emphasis on Scandinavian," in: Poussa, ed., 77-96.
- Poussa, P.**, 2002, "North Sea Relatives: Introduction," in: Poussa, ed., 1-23.
- Poussa, P.**, 2004, "The Motivation of Where and What as Relative Markers in North Norfolk," in: Bergh, G., et al., ed., *An International Master of Syntax and Semantics. Papers Presented to Aimo Seppänen on the Occasion of the 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, (Gothenburg Studies in English 88), Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 181-188.
- Poussa, P.**, ed., 2002, *Relativisation on the North Sea Littoral*, Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Preusler, W.**, 1956, "Keltischer Einfluss im Englischen," *Revue des Langues Vivantes* 22: 322-350.
- Reichmann, O. & K.-P. Wegera**, eds., 1993, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Seppänen, A.**, 1999, "Dialectal Variation in English Relativization," *Lingua* 109: 15-34.
- Tallerman, M.**, 1990, "Relativization Strategies: NP Accessibility in Welsh," *Journal of Linguistics* 26: 291-314.
- Thorne, D.A.**, 1993, *A Comprehensive Welsh Grammar*, Oxford & Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Thurneysen, R.**, 1946, *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Tristram, H.L.C.**, 1999, *How Celtic is Standard English?*, St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- Van den Eynden Morpeth, N.**, 2002, "Relativisers in the Southwest of England," in: Poussa, ed., 181-194.
- Veselinović, E.**, 2004, "Der Übergang von der Verbalkomposition zum Phrasal Verb im Irischen," in: Poppe, E., ed., *Keltologie heute. Themen und Fragestellungen*, (Texte und Studien zur Keltologie 6), Münster: Nodus, 95-110.
- Wagner, H.**, 1959, *Das Verbum in den Sprachen der britischen Inseln*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- White, D.**, 2002, "Explaining the Innovations of Middle English: What, Where, and Why," in: Filppula, M., et al., eds., *The Celtic Roots of English*, (Studies in Language 37), Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities, 153-174.
- Williams, J.W.**, 1980, *A Welsh Grammar*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Zifonun, G.**, 2001, *Grammatik des Deutschen im europäischen Vergleich: Der Relativsatz*, (amades 3/01), Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.