RELATIVE CLAUSES WITH OVERT MARKING IN EARLY MODERN WELSH*

ELENA PARINA
PHILIPPS-UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG AND
INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS RAS, MOSCOW

ABSTRACT This study investigates the function of overt relative markers (*yr hwn* etc.) in a sample of the 16th-century Welsh translation of *Gesta Romanorum*. Using previous findings from a collection of 14th-century texts, the following results were obtained: (1) The relative frequency of the construction significantly increases in this text compared to the earlier period, which points to the expansion of this construction. (2) The data both from the 14th-century sample, as well as from the *Gesta Romanorum*, demonstrate that this construction is used to mark non-restrictive relative clauses. (3) Moreover, in *Gesta Romanorum*, another usage of this construction is found frequently, where overt marking is used in presentative relative clauses. This testifies that the category proposed by Lambrecht (2000) for French is valid for other languages.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the 16th-century Welsh translation of the highly popular late-medieval collection of stories titled *Gesta Romanorum*, each story begins in a similar way:

(1)　SOmtyme there reygned in ye cyte of Rome a myghty Emperoure and a wyse named Frederyk whiche had onely but one sone whome he loued moche. (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 7])

Ÿdd	*oedd*		*gynt*	*yn*	*Rüvain*	*amherawdr*	*kadarn*	*synwyrvs,*
PCL[1]	be.IMPF.3SG		before	in	Rome	Emperor	strong	wise

yr	*hwnn*	*a*	*elwid*		*Ffredric.*	*Ag*	*vn*	*mab*
the	DEM	PCL	name.PRET.IMPERS[2]		F.	and	one	son

oedd		*yddo*	*ef,*	*yr*	*hwnn*	*a*	*garai*		*ef*	*yn vawr.*
be.IMPF.3SG		to.3SG	he	the	DEM	PCL	love.IMPF.3SG		he	much

(Williams 2000: lines 46–48)[3]

The structure of this beginning sentence is radically different from the beginnings of most Middle Welsh native narrative tales.[4] One of the most unusual features in the example from the point of view of Middle Welsh grammar is the use of demonstrative pronouns in two relative clauses (for a default construction, see example (2) and Section 3 generally). Attitudes to these markers have varied considerably among Welsh grammarians, and in modern studies of Middle Welsh texts they have mostly been considered to be 'traces of translation' (see Section 4).

This study aims to investigate the function of demonstrative pronouns or rather overt relative markers (the terms are discussed in Section 3) in a fragment of the Welsh *Gesta Romanorum.* This text was translated in the 16th cen-

---

1 Abbreviations used in this paper are: ADV = adverbial marker; COMP = comparative; DEM = demonstrative; F = feminine; FUT = future; IMPERS = impersonal form; IMPF = imperfect; M = masculine; NEG = negative; PCL = verbal particle; PL = plural; PRED = predicate marker; PRET = preterite; PROG = progressive marker; PRS = present; SG = singular; SUBJ = subjunctive; VN = verbal noun. The manuscript Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119, discussed in Section 6, is referred to as LlA.

2 According to Evans (1964: 114) the suffix *-it* (*-id* in newer spelling) codes the impersonal form of the imperfective indicative, but in the case of some verbs, including *galw* 'to call' it is also used in the preterite (as Evans 1964: 126 notes, '[i]t is not always easy to distinguish between the impers. pret. in *-it* and the impers. imperf.').

3 In all examples from *Gesta Romanorum*, first the English original is given from the ProQuest full text version of the 1510 edition (the pages of the edition are unnumbered, so the reference is to the scanned images numbered in the database), followed by the Welsh translation from the Williams (2000) edition.

4 By 'native narrative tales' texts originally composed in Welsh are understood, as opposed to translations into Welsh. In eight out of the eleven native tales referred to as the *Mabinogion* (as in the corpus Luft, Thomas & Smith 2013), the story starts with a proper name, as in *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet a oed yn arglwyd ar seith cantref Dyuet.* 'Pwyll, prince of Dyfed, was lord over the seven cantrefs of Dyfed' (Williams 1930: 1.1, translation Davies 2007: 3). Certainly, texts within this group vary considerably in the degree of their 'nativeness', but still many of them share the common opening structure, on which see Meelen (2016: 122) and also (Davies 1995: 129–131).

tury and the language therefore should be classified as Early Modern Welsh (see Borsley, Tallerman & Willis 2007: 286). The annotated text underlying this study[5] will become part of the Parsed Historical Corpus of the Welsh Language (PARSHCWL).[6] Building on the findings from a similar study of the same construction in translated texts from the 14th century (i.e. Middle Welsh), I hope to demonstrate that overt relative markers have consistent functions in this text. Another aim is to compare the data from the 14th century to those of the 16th-century *Gesta Romanorum* and address the changes attested. This study also has a methodological aim – since the new, 16th-century dataset for PARSHWL is in the making, I wanted to test the possibilities of information-state annotation.

A combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches was used in the data analysis. By changing the perspective from the prescriptive (which is seen in many earlier discussions; see Section 4) to the descriptive one, measuring this construction's relative frequency and studying its functions, I hope to contribute to a deeper understanding of relative-clause marking in Middle and Early Modern Welsh. The analysis is new to Celtic historical linguistics in two ways. First, the dichotomy restrictive/non-restrictive has never been applied systematically to the Welsh data. Furthermore, I propose to introduce into the analysis a third category, presentative relative clauses, postulated for French by Lambrecht (2000) – which is not only new for Celtic historical linguistics, but also mostly unnoticed in language typology.

This article is organised in the following way. In Section 2, the texts to be analysed are introduced. Section 3 briefly presents the structure of the Welsh relative clause. In Section 4, previous discussions of overt relative markers are summarised, followed by the explanation of methods used in this study in Section 5. The next two sections (6 and 7 respectively) analyse the use of overt relative markers in Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119 (dated 1346), and in the *Gesta Romanorum* fragment. Section 8 presents the conclusions.

2 TEXTS

This study continues the analysis of overt relative markers undertaken first on data from Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119, also known as the Book of the Anchorite of Llanddewibrefi or Llyfr Ancr Llanddewibrefi (LlA).[7] This collection is dated 1346 and consists of heterogenous religious texts, with one

---

5 Stories 5 to 15, 11,238 words in total.

6 https://www.celticstudies.net/parshcwl/; on the annotation see Meelen & Willis (2021).

7 These texts were studied within the project 'Translations as language contact phenomena: studies in lexical, grammatical and stylistic interference in Middle Welsh religious texts' (led by Prof. Erich Poppe, research fellow Elena Parina, Philipps-Universität Marburg) 1.10.2015–

exception, all translations. The results of this previous study are presented in section 6.

The new data set comes from a part of the text *Gesta Romanorum*, found in Welsh in one manuscript, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. 13076 B (Llanover B 18), dated to the end of the 16th or beginning of the 17th century. This collection of narratives of ultimately Latin origin was translated into Welsh from English. Pinpointing the exact source is problematic; the translation must be based on an edition by Wynkyn de Worde (multiple editions from 1510 or earlier to 1557), but also shows traces of revision according to the new, Protestant version published by Richard Robinson in *Gesta Romanorum* (1595) (see Williams 2000: xviii–xix; Williams in prep.; for elaboration of the dates, see Parina in prep.). The precise date of the translation into Welsh is therefore impossible to state, although its revision must postdate the edition of Robinson in 1595, and be earlier than 1600, a latest possible date for the manuscript. For this study, I analysed a sample (stories 5 to 15) taken from the edition by Williams (2000),[8] comparing the passages to both English print editions (1510 and 1577). The structure of the book is important for our study: it is a collection of stories, most of them dedicated to the events that happened during the reign of some Roman emperor, whose name is given at the beginning of the story, concluded by a passage of moralisation in which the events are interpreted. This text is transmitted in the hand of Llywelyn Siôn, one of the most prominent scribes of the late-16th century and beginning of the 17th century, and belongs to the textual community in Glamorgan, where at this time earlier texts were copied, and religious and moralistic texts popular in England and on the Continent in the 15th and 16th centuries were translated (see Thomas 1997: 255). It has been suggested that the works of this 'school' are unaffected by the influence of both William Salesbury (the main translator of the New Testament published in 1567) and other later Welsh Bible translators, such as William Morgan, who was responsible for the edition of the whole Welsh Bible in 1588 (see Williams 1948: 176), which provides us with an opportunity to look at an understudied strand of the Welsh prose language.

On the basis of a small sample from the *Gesta Romanorum*, a first test study will be undertaken here of the functions of overt relative markers in Early Modern Welsh. This forms the starting point for further research building on a larger corpus, which should incorporate texts from the Protestant tradition

8 This sample will become part of the PARSHCWL.

influenced by the Bible translations, since they form the foundation of the modern literary language.

3 WELSH RELATIVE CLAUSES

Before proceeding to examine the functions of the construction with overt marking in the next section, it will be helpful to present general information on Welsh relative constructions. In Welsh, the construction depends on the function of the common argument (following the terminology used by Dixon 2009) in the relative clause, i.e. to its position on the Accessibility Hierarchy (see Keenan & Comrie 1977: 70, also Comrie & Keenan 1979; for a detailed analysis of the Modern Welsh data, see Tallerman 1990). If the syntactic function of the common argument in the relative clause is either subject or object, it has no overt manifestation in the relative clause.[9] Unless the special relative form of *bod* 'to be' is used, the verb is preceded in Middle and literary Modern Welsh by the particle *a*, triggering soft mutation:

(2) *y   dyn   a   gafodd   y   wobr*
    the man PCL get.PRET.3SG the prize
    'the man who got the prize' (slightly modified example from Borsley et al. 2007: 118)

If the common argument has a role lower on the Accessibility Hierarchy described by Keenan & Comrie (1977), and Comrie & Keenan (1979), a different, resumptive strategy is employed (see Borsley et al. 2007: 120–122); for instance, in the case of prepositional relative clause, the verb is preceded by the particle *y* and an inflected preposition, whose pronominal element resumes the common argument, is in clause-final position:

(3) *y   wraig   y   gwerthodd   Ieuan y   ceffyl iddi*
    the woman PCL sell.PRET.3SG Ieuan the horse to.3FSG
    'the woman that Ieuan sold the horse to' (slightly modified example from Borsley et al. 2007: 121)

These are the default constructions for literary Modern Welsh, and the most frequent realisations of the relative clause in Middle Welsh. However, in some Medieval and Early Modern texts, an additional use of overt relative markers was possible – i.e. some phrases were used in apposition to the common argument in the main clause (see Evans 1964: 69, 92). The most frequent of these phrases are the article + a demonstrative pronoun *yr hwn* (m.),

---

9 For an analysis of this construction, see Borsley et al. (2007: 118–120).

yr hon (f.), *yr hyn* (n.), and, in the plural, *y rhai* meaning 'some, those'.[10] The resulting construction is illustrated by modified examples (2′) and (3′):

(2′)   y   dyn   yr   hwn   a   gafodd   y   wobr
      the   man   the   DEM.M   PCL   get.PRET.3SG   the   prize
      'the man who got the prize' (slightly modified example from Borsley et al. 2007: 119)

(3′)   y   fenyw   yr   hon   y   gwerthodd   Ieuan   y   ceffyl
      the   woman   the   DEM.F   PCL   sell.PRET.3SG   Ieuan   the   horse
      iddi
      to.3FSG
      'the woman that Ieuan sold the horse to'

In the next section, we will look at previous evaluations of these constructions.

4   Summary of previous research

The analysis of overt relative markers or demonstrative pronouns in relative clauses is controversial in Welsh grammars, as will be seen in the following short chronological survey. Earlier Welsh grammarians, like John Davies (1621: 72) or Thomas Jones Hughes (1849: 173), regard *yr hwnn* as a relative pronoun, but also note the frequent absence of this element, which they describe as ellipsis.

     In his edition of the texts from Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119, John Morris-Jones repeatedly criticises the use of the overt markers; thus, in the Middle Welsh sentence *yn tat ni yr hwnn ysyd yn y nefoed* (LlA 125r) 'our father, (the one) who is in heaven', translating *Pater noster qui es in celis*, 'the *yr hwnn* is unnecessary' in his opinion (Morris-Jones & Rhŷs 1894: xxvi–xxvii). As in the case of other linguistic features, such as verb–subject agreement, his 'prescriptive undertone' (see Sims-Williams 2016: 146) is based on a rather selective

---

10 In Middle Welsh these phrases are often spelled *yr hwnn*, *yr honn*, *yr hynn* and *y rei* respectively. In Early Modern Welsh, the plural form is often *y rhain*, with the spelling variant *yr hain* (see *GPC* s.v. *rhain*[1]). I will use the newer orthography, but preserve the original spelling in quotations and examples. For the sake of brevity, I will hereafter refer to all the forms as overt relative marker *yr hwn*. I choose the term 'overt relative marker' and not 'overt relative pronoun' (as in Borsley et al. 2007: 106), since I want to avoid in this paper the discussion of the syntactic properties of this construction. These phrases are, as will be shown, not grammatically necessary, hence the term 'overt relative marker' seems to me to be more appropriate. For brevity's sake, I am using the term 'overt (relative) marking' specifically for the use of the phrases defined above in the relative clause, although the Welsh default relative clause (as in examples (2) and (3)) also has other overt marking, such as particle and mutation and/or resumptive pronoun.

understanding of the corpus of idiomatic Welsh – on the one hand, the spoken language contemporary to him, on the other hand, 'the poets and […] the more idiomatic prose writings, such as the Mabinogion and the Bardd Cwsc' (Morris-Jones 1931: 104).

Melville Richards (1938: 72–78, 82–84, 87, 93–95) discusses at some length the construction of (positive) relative clauses with a 'special antecedent' (in his terminology, 'rhagflaenydd arbennig'), in which the 'relative pronoun' (the 'relative particle' in modern terminology) is preceded by phrases such as *yr hwn*. He describes two contexts in which this construction is 'legitimate', under the condition that the common argument is a noun in the matrix clause: (1) to avoid ambiguity especially when the relative clause is not adjacent to the antecedent in the main clause; and (2) 'when the relative clause introduces a new idea rather than simply describing the antecedent. In such sentences the main clause and the relative clause are equivalent to two coordinate clauses' (Richards 1938: 74, my translation).[11]

One of the examples Richards gives for the second environment is:

(4) *a   rhai   o' r   Sadwceaid   (y   rhai   sydd   yn*
     and some of the Sadduccees the DEM.PL be.REL.3SG PROG

     gwadu   nad   oes   atgyfodiad) a   ddaethant   ato
     deny.VN NEG be.PRS.3SG resurrection PCL come.PRET.3PL to.3MSG

     ef.
     he

     'Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection.' (Richards 1938: 74 [Luke 20.27 after 1620 edition])

These descriptive paragraphs are followed by a highly prescriptive and evaluative one, in which Richards speaks about the misuse of these constructions and their completely unnecessary employment (Richards 1938: 75) when none of the two conditions outlined above obtain. This, he says, is an all too common feature of the Bible translations and of the literature written later.

In *The syntax of Welsh*, Borsley, Tallerman and Willis discuss only restrictive relative clauses and briefly mention within this section that '[i]n archaic literary style, an overt demonstrative pronoun, such as *yr hwn* 'that one (masc.)', may be used as a relative pronoun' illustrating it with the example quoted above in (2′). They claim, following Richards (1938: 75), that '[t]his

---

11 It should be noted that Morris-Jones, despite his many negative comments on the construction throughout the edition of LlA, notes in his *Welsh syntax* that overt markers (in our terminology) 'are also employed even when the antecedent is expressed, if the relative clause is coordinate, that is, introduces a new idea instead of merely qualifying a noun in the principal sentence' (Morris-Jones 1931: 98), which is a description of a non-restrictive clause.

usage was largely modelled on foreign languages, and has mostly fallen out of use', and later '[t]heir use seems to reflect imitation of the syntax of Latin or of the dominant neighbouring languages, rather than natural developments in speech' (Borsley et al. 2007: 118 and 335 resp.).

Diana Luft (2015: 171–172, 176) mentions that the overt pronominal markers are often negatively evaluated in Middle Welsh text editions as 'traces of translation', although similar examples can be found in the native prose.[12]

In her study of some syntactic properties of *Gesta Romanorum,* Jana Kunze (2018: 77) reports that 'many relative clauses are preceded by something like an overt relative pronoun', but that they are 'used not consistently' (Kunze 2018: 88). She analyses in detail the wording of the examples, but focuses on the correspondences with the English source text and the structure of the construction, leaving the semantics of the construction undiscussed.

The semantics, analysed along the lines hinted at by Morris-Jones and Richards, is the focus of this study. The next section will be dedicated to the methodology of the study.

5   Method

In this section, I describe the selection of examples for the study, their annotation and the perspective on the semantics of the relative clauses.

Since the construction under investigation includes specific lexical items,[13] the examples were found by searching for these items in PoS-tagged files and then manually selecting those where these elements introduce a relative clause, modifying a nominal or pronominal common argument in the matrix clause. For each example in the Welsh *Gesta Romanorum*, its equivalent in the English text was identified. The data was annotated for polarity (in this study only the positive sentences are analysed),[14] adjacency to the modified nominal phrase and distance to its head (measured as number of words from the head), referential state of the common argument (see below), type of relative clause (restrictive, non-restrictive and presentative, see below), equivalent

---

12 It should be noted though that the number of such examples in native prose is very limited. In the four texts of the so-called *Four Branches of the Mabinogi*, our search for these constructions resulted in only one instance which meets our criterion, demonstrative pronoun used appositively to the common argument: *Mae ymma mab it* [...] *yr hwnn ny bu yt eiroet* (Williams 1930: 23.5-6, 'Here is a son for you, [...] that which you have never had'), cited by Evans (1964: 69) and mentioned by Luft (2015: 176). It is therefore understandable that the grammarians saw this construction as a feature of non-native prose texts.

13 In LlA *yr h6nn, yr honn, yr hynn* and *y rei*; in *Gesta Romanorum yr hwnn, yr honn, yr hynn* and *yr hain*.

14 Negative relative sentences have a different structure in Welsh; see Borsley et al. (2007: 335); Plein (2018: 212–213); and Sackmann (2017).

English marker in the source and type of common argument (proper name, personal pronoun, and, in the case of a noun phrase, its determiner).

To annotate the information status of the common argument, Pentaset referential state primitives were used (identity, inferred, assumed, inert and new; see Komen 2013: 143–151, and Meelen 2016: 70–75). The narrative structure of *Gesta Romanorum* with its moralisation at the end of each story made the task of annotation rather easy. A referent at the beginning of the story was annotated as NEW; in the moralisation that gives a Christian interpretation to the story, the same referent was annotated as IDENTITY, a category 'where a noun phrase refers to something that is already available in a reader's mental model' (Komen 2013: 144). A somewhat difficult category was the primitive ASSUMED. According to Komen (2013: 147), in this case, '[a]n author (or speaker) may assume that the addressee is able to link a particular concept with an entity that is already available in the addressee's long term memory (that is, in the location of the mind where the brain stores "general knowledge", or in the location where it stores knowledge related to the discourse situation)'. This is rather difficult to evaluate, so for the texts analysed in this study the direct instructions from the PROIEL (2011: 5–6) project proved very helpful. The tag ACC-gen (standing for 'accessible from general world knowledge') 'is used on elements which are not present in the preceding discourse but which are known and identifiable to the addressee, e.g. 'the Pope'. [...S]uch referents must be unique in order to be identifiable'. Especially useful for our texts is the reference to the Christian belief system in the guidelines for annotation: 'What we consider generally known referents for the original public of the New Testament is of course dependent on our interpretation of their beliefs and knowledge. In particular, we consider that many religious concepts were known, so διαβολος [Greek *diabolos* 'the devil'] is ACC-gen. "An angel" is not, however, since there are many angels' (PROIEL 2011: 5). A list of concepts taken to be generally known was also helpful: 'God, (the) eternal life, the devil, the Evil, Easter' (PROIEL 2011: 6).[15] All information-status annotation was done manually.

The central part of this study involved defining the semantic type of the relative clause. The dichotomy that is found in many languages is restrictive vs. nonrestrictive (for other terms, see Loock 2010: 7). In the definitions of

---

15 For the texts analysed, the Pentaset was sufficient and the referents denoted as ACC-gen in the PROIEL project were tagged as ASSUMED (on the differences see Komen 2013: 151–154). It should be noted that texts with another structure are much more difficult to annotate – in an attempt to analyse in the same way the data from *Perl mewn Adfyd* (see Sackmann 2022 and Parina 2015), I found that it was almost impossible to assess the informational status of entities in it, since it is not narrative and uses extensive quotations from the Bible which are taken out of their original context.

Dixon (2009: 314), a restrictive relative clause provides 'information about the C[ommon] A[rgument] which assists in focusing – or restricting – the reference of the CA', while a nonrestrictive relative clause 'may provide further, background, information about a C[ommon] A[rgument] which is already uniquely identified (say, if it is *a pronoun* or *a proper name*)' [italics mine].

I am not aware of any works applying the term 'nonrestrictive' to Welsh data, but the 'legitimate context' noticed by Richards, already quoted above, when 'the relative clause introduces a new idea [...]' and 'the main clause and the relative clause are equivalent to two coordinate clauses' (Richards 1938: 74, my translation) mentions two criteria (explanation vs. determination and the independence of the speech act) typical for nonrestrictive relative clauses (see Loock 2010: 8–12). This observation and the reference of Morris-Jones to the kind of relative clause which 'is coordinate, that is, introduces a new idea instead of merely qualifying a noun in the principal sentence' (Morris-Jones 1931: 98, see fn. 12) gave an impetus to a systematic study of the semantics of the relative clauses in Middle and Early Modern Welsh. Although the definitions of Dixon proved to be practically useful, in many cases the decision was problematic. This is not surprising, since studying restrictiveness in a written text without a settled punctuation,[16] a developing system of relative marking, and no possibility of testing the suppressibility of the relative clause is bound to be difficult.[17] As shown for modern languages, such as English and French, in many cases both interpretations are possible (Bache & Jakobsen 1980, Loock 2010: 36).

It should also be noted that the very dichotomy between restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses has often been questioned (see Loock 2010: 7 for further literature). One of the solutions to the problem of classification is the introduction of further categories. In the case of this study, the category of presentative relative clause, introduced by Lambrecht for French material, proved to be instructive. In such clauses, a new discourse entity is introduced and simultaneously something is predicated of it (Lambrecht 2000: 50). His examples (with glossing and translations from Loock 2010: 36–37) are:

(5) *Il était une fois une belle princesse qui vivait dans un vieux*
     It   was   once   a   pretty princess who lived   in   an   old
     château.
     castle

---

16 Though even for English this criterion has been shown to be not totally reliable (see Loock 2010: 12–14).

17 And the main framework for studying restrictiveness, formal semantics, is beyond the scope of this project.

'Once upon a time there was a pretty princess who lived in an old castle.'

(6) *Y'a   le   téléphone qui   sonne.*
there's the phone   that is ringing

'Phone's ringing.'

(7) *Je vois le   facteur   qui   arrive.*
I   see the postman that is coming

'I can see the postman coming.'

(8) *Voilà   le   facteur   qui   arrive.*
Here is the postman who comes

'Here's the postman coming.'

This study is focused on qualitative analysis and methodological issues, but quantitative results on the relative frequency of the construction were also obtained and statistically evaluated.

In the next sections I will present the Welsh data. First I will summarise our findings on the usage of overt relative markers in the Middle Welsh texts of the 14th-century manuscript Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119, and then I will proceed to the 16th-century Early Modern Welsh data.

6   Data from *Llyfr Ancr Llanddewibrefi*

In our study of the lexical, syntactic and stylistic interference in Middle Welsh translated religious texts, relative constructions with overt pronouns were one of the features we explored.[18] As noted above, John Morris-Jones regarded this construction critically, and, in many cases, blamed translators for employing it under the influence of Latin. Using our annotated data,[19] we analysed all the instances of relative clauses with a nominal antecedent containing *yr hwn* and its forms.

We came to the following results:

---

18 Some of the other grammatical phenomena analysed were agreement patterns (verb–subject, antecedent and verb in relative clauses, noun–adjective) and the use of derivatives in *-edic*. A much more detailed account of the relative clause marking in LlA is presented in the chapter 'Relative clauses with overt markers: mere "traces of translation" or viable functional alternatives?' of the book Parina & Poppe (in prep.).

19 Now presented in PARSHCWL [link to the repository to be provided by MM and DW]#

   i. The frequency of this construction as measured against text length or the total number of relative clauses is significantly different between the texts.[20]

  ii. The semantic analysis of the examples showed that most of the examples were nonrestrictive and clear contradictions to this preference were rare. The following table summarises the trends we observed with regard to canonical versus overt marking of relative clauses in the texts in *Llyfr yr Ancr*.

	Canonical marking	Overt marking
Restrictive relative clause	Default case in LlA	Some examples
Nonrestrictive relative clause	Some examples	tendency observed in LlA

Table 1   Tendencies in marking of relative clauses in LlA

No systematic search was conducted for presentative relative clauses, although, of those that we know of, most had canonical marking, but isolated examples of overt marking were also identified (see below).

In relative clauses that we expect to be nonrestrictive, such as those modifying proper names or 'God' in a Christian text, a strong tendency to use overt markers was found:[21]

(9)   *vrth hynny y   byd   kyyrff y   seint ygorff   eglurder*
      therefore   PCL be.FUT.3SG bodies the saints in body splendour
      crist   yr   h6nn yssyd   loy6ach   no   'r   heul.
      Christ the DEM be.REL.3SG bright.COMP than the sun

      'Therefore, the bodies of the Saints will be in the body of the splendour of Christ, Who is brighter than the sun' (*Lucidar*; LlA 62v)

      Si ergo corpora sanctorum corpori claritatis Christi, qui splendidior quam sol est, configurantur (Lefèvre 1954: 468)

---

20 In the whole manuscript, the construction occurs with a frequency of 1.1 per 1000 words; in two texts out of sixteen (*Pwyll y Pader* and the fragment of Luke 1), the relative frequency is higher than 6; in four texts the construction is not found; and in the longest text (28,611 words), *Ystoria Lucidar*, it is found only 16 times, with a frequency of 0.56 per 1000 words.

21 An important feature of some LlA texts is the use of another marker, *y gwr*, literally 'the man' in the same contexts (for details see Parina & Poppe in prep..)

(10) *Ef   a   wydat   pob peth. megys du6. yn yr   h6nn yd*
     he   PCL know.IMPF.3SG all   thing like   God   in   the DEM   PCL
     oeddynt   holl   dryzor   gwybot   a   doethineb kuydyedic.
     be.IMPF.3PL   all   treasure knowledge and   wisdom   hidden

     'He knew everything, like God, in Whom all the treasures of wisdom
     and learning were hid.' (Lucidar; LlA 17v)

     Omnia plane, ut puta Deus, "in quo fuerunt omnes thesauri
     sapientiae et scientiae absconditi".[22] (Lefèvre 1954: 384)

The examples that we could not interpret as nonrestrictive were few. One
particular example is reminiscent of the sentence quoted at the beginning of
this article:

(11) *EF   annvonet [sic for a annvonet]   Gabriel angel   y gann du6   y*
     it   send.PRET.IMPERS   G.   angel   by   God   to
     dinas o   Alilea yr   h6nn A   oes [sic for oed] y   en6   nazared
     city   of Gal.   the   DEM   PCL   be.IMPF.3SG   his   name   N.
     at   wyry.   bria6t   y   6r   yr   h6nn A   oed   y
     to   virgin married   to   man   the   DEM   PCL   be.IMPF.3SG   his
     en6   Joseph o   l6yth   dauid
     name J.   from lineage David

     'The angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of Galilea whose name
     was Nazareth, to a virgin married to a man whose name was Joseph
     from the house of David' (*Luke 1*, LlA 134r)

     In mense autem sexto missus est angelus Gabrihel a Deo in civitatem
     Galilaeae cui nomen Nazareth ad virginem desponsatam viro cui
     nomen erat Ioseph de domo David [...] (Biblia Sacra Vulgata, Luke 1:
     26–27)[23]

     And in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God into a
     city of Galilee, called Nazareth, To a virgin espoused to a man whose
     name was Joseph, of the house of David: and the virgin's name was
     Mary. (Douay-Rheims Bible)

     And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a
     city of Galilee, named Nazareth, 27 To a virgin espoused to a man
     whose name was Joseph, of the house of David (KJV)

---

22 Note the parallelism of the Latin relative clause with *in quo* and the Welsh with *yn yr h6nn*,
   which is not the default Welsh construction (see example 3 above for the default construction).
23 https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/biblia-sacra-vulgata/lesen-im-bibeltext/
   bibel/text/lesen/stelle/52/10001/19999/ch/f37c5336771a7a0e2619760805248bd0/

Here, two new entities, a city and a man, are introduced and provided with additional information in form of a relative clause. We believe that this example belongs to Lambrecht's presentative relative clause category. It should be noted that examples of this kind are rare in LlA, and relative clauses modifying nouns in mirative constructions,[24] which are parallel to Lambrecht's example (([8]) in this article), show default relative marking:

(12) *llyma yr eneit a tremyga6d gorchymynnev du6.*
here the soul PCL despise.PRET.3SG orders God

'Here (is) the soul that despised God's orders' (*Breuddwyd Pawl*, LlA 131r)

Vide istam animam, quomodo in terris contempsit dei mandata! (C2, V[4], Jiroušková 2006: 790)

We suggested that overt markers in relative clauses were a device developed by Welsh translators in texts with increased syntactic complexity as compared to that of traditional narratives. A question that can only be answered once the annotated Middle Welsh corpus expands is whether the tendencies we were able to observe for a number of religious texts are also valid in texts of other genres.

7   Data from *Gesta Romanorum*

In the 11,238-word sample of the Welsh *Gesta Romanorum*, 78 examples of the construction under investigation were found, the relative frequency per 1000 words being 6.05, which is similar to the two short texts in LlA (see fn. 20) and is much higher than the average relative frequency in the 14th-century manuscript. In a preliminary study of the text *Perl mewn Adfyd* from 1595 (on this text, see Sackmann 2022), 84 examples were found in the 14,290-word fragment, the relative frequency per 1000 words being 5.88. The evidence of these two texts as well as the fact that most of the examples of the construction in traditional grammars come from 16th-century texts, suggests that this construction expands during this period, but further corpus analysis is required to prove this hypothesis.

The 78 examples in the analysed fragment of the *Gesta Romanorum* are classified according to their semantics in Table 2.

---

24 More on miratives in the chapter 'A case for the translators' linguistic sensitivity: miratives and presentatives' in Parina & Poppe in prep..

Semantics of the relative clause	Number of cases	%
nonrestrictive	48	61.54
presentative	24	30.77
restrictive and nonrestrictive interpretations possible	6	7.69
Total	78	100.00

Table 2   Relative clauses with overt marking in *Gesta Romanorum*

Among nonrestrictive clauses, there are several that occur in the prototypical context indicated by Dixon (2009: 314). In (13), a proper name is modified by a relative clause; in the same sentence another relative clause with overt marking modifies the phrase *yr Ysbryd Glan* 'the Holy Ghost', which is identifiable and unique for readers of the text:

(13) This Vyrgyll whiche made this ymage is the holy goost whiche is sette vp amonge vs a precher to teche vertues and to repreue vyces and that he sholde not spare the poore ne the ryche. (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 18])

    A   'r   Vyrgil, yr   hwnn   a   wnaeth   y   ddelw   hynny,
    and the V.   the   DEM   PCL do.PRET.3SG the image   that
    yw   yr   Ysbryd   Glan, yr   hwnn   a   sydd   yn
    be.PRS.3SG the ghost   holy the DEM   PCL be.REL.3SG PROG
    annog   prygethwyr i ddangos daeoni   ag   i   geryddy
    urge.VN preachers   to show.VN goodness and to punish.VN
    drygoni,   heb   arbed   na   thylawd na   chyvoethog.
    viciousness without   spare.VN NEG   poor   NEG   wealthy
                                      (Williams 2000: 17)

In the next example, the relative clause modifies a personal pronoun, *tydi* 'you', which is another typical context for a nonrestrictive clause:

(14) I shall take none other but the whiche hast shedde thy blode for me (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 17])

    Nẏ   chymeraf   j   neb   ond tydi, yr   hwnn   a
    NEG   take.PRS.1SG I   anyone   but you   the DEM   PCL
    gollaist   dy   waed   drosof j.
    lose.PRET.2SG your blood   for.1SG I   (Williams 2000: 15)

'Eternal life', one of the concepts supposed to be assumed in the general world knowledge of the readers, is modified by the same relative clause at the end of each story:

(15) And thus shall we wynne euer lastynge lyfe. Vnto the whiche god brynge vs all (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 17])

velly	*ni*	*a*	*enillwn*	*y*	*bywyd*	*tragwddol,*	*i*	*'r*	*hwnn*
so	we	PCL	win.PRS.1PL	the	life	eternal	to	the	DEM

le	*Duw*	*a*	*'n dyko*	*ni*	*oll*	*yddo.*[25]
place	God	PCL	us lead.PRS.SUBJ.3SG	us	all	to.3MSG

(Williams 2000: 15)

The interpretation that the relative clause conveys additional information is also supported by the fact that in some cases, in moralisations, it translates an English clause introduced by *that is to say*:

(16) But that came a fayre yonge knyght & a strō|ge / that is to saye our lorde Ihesu cryst (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 17])

Ond	*ef*	*a*	*ddaüth*	*yno*	*varchog*	*teg*	*grymvs,*	*yr*
but	it	PCL	come.PRET.3SG	there	knight	fair	strong	the

hwnn	*oedd*	*yr*	*Arglwydd*	*Jesü*	*Grist.*
DEM	be.IMPF.3SG	the	Lord	Jesus	Christ

(Williams 2000: 14)

In all these cases the common argument was annotated either as identity (22 cases), known from the previous discourse,[26] or as assumed (31 cases).

---

25 On the details, see Kunze 2018: 79–80.

26 In one case the common argument was classified as 'inert':

(i) wherfore I holde ye for the moost fole yt euer I founde **that** for yt lordshyp of a yere thou woldest so wyl|fully lese thy selfe. (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 8])

Ag	*am*	*hynn,*	*tydi*	*yw*	*y*	*ffol*	*ffola*	*ag*	*a*	*welais*	*i*
and	on	this	you	be.PRS.3SG	the	fool	foolest	than	PCL	see.PRET.1SG	I

erjoed,	**yr**	**hwnn**	*o serch*	*kael*	*riolaeth*	*vlwyddyn,*	*a*	*wyd*
ever	the	DEM	on account of	get.VN	rule	year	PCL	be.PRS.2SG

yn	*bwrw*	*dy*	*hvnan*	*ymaith*	*dros vyth.*
PROG	throw.VN	your	self	outside	forever

'And therefore, you are the foolest fool as I have ever seen, who on account of getting the rule of a year will [let] yourself out forever.' (Williams 2000: 3)

Here the phrase *y ffol ffola* 'the foolest fool' is in the predicate position, which is similar to one of the examples for inert in Komen (2013: 149): *Ann is **a teacher**. ?The teacher caught a bus.* The entity *a teacher* does not introduce a new entity in the mental model and therefore the second

There was, however, a considerable number of examples (24 cases) where the antecedent's state was annotated as 'new'. All these examples fit into Lambrecht's category of presentative relative clauses, cf. example (1) as well as a similar structure from the beginning of another story:

(17) THere regned somtyme in ye cyte of Rome a myghty Emperour & a wyse named Betolve (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 11])

Ẏdd	*oedd*	*amherawdr*	*kadarn*	*yn*	*Rüvain*	*gynt,*	*yr*	*hwnn*
PCL	be.IMPF.3SG	emperor	strong	in	Rome	before	the	DEM

a	*elwid*	*Betold.*
PCL	name.PRET.IMPERS	B.

(Williams 2000: 7)

It is possibly significant that, in these examples, *yr hwn* rarely corresponds to English relative markers such as *which* or *that*, but often occurs in passages that do not follow the original word for word – which could be an indication that at least this usage is not a direct calque on English.

Apart from the beginnings of the stories, this construction also occurs in other contexts specified by Lambrecht, introducing a new object, i.e. modifying the object of a verb of perception (18), or in combination with an adverb like *dyma* 'here' (see (20) below):

(18) And with that he sawe knyfe of golde vpon the borde whiche he toke and wolde haue put it in his bosome. (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 9])

Ag	*yna*	*i*	*gwelai*	*ef*	*gyllell*	*o*	*aür*	*ar*	*y*	*vord,*
And	then	PCL	see.IMPF.3SG	he	knife	of	gold	on	the	table

yr	*honn*	*a*	*gymerth*	*ef,*	*ar vedr*	*i*	*dodi*	*yn*	*y*
the	DEM.F	PCL	take.PRET.3SG	he	intending	to	put.VN	in	his

asgref.
breast

(Williams 2000: 4)

Similar to this is the next example, where a new character appears in the story:

---

sentence with the teacher is ungrammatical. The same could tentatively be said about the phrase *y ffol ffola*. On the other hand, finding the most foolish fool was the quest in this story, and the entity could be coded as 'identity'. Alternatively, one could suggest that the relative clause refers back to *tydi* 'you'.

(19) There came a knyght to me & reuerently salued me (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 22])

> *Mi   a   gyhwrddais   a   marchog, yr   hwnn a*
> I   PCL meet.PRET.1SG with knight   the DEM   PCL
> *gyvarchawdd   yn   ostyngedig i   mi.*
> greet.PRET.3SG ADV respectful to me   (Williams 2000: 22)

In the next example, the entity new in the dialogue is introduced by *dyma*:

(20) My lorde lo I gyue to ye this balle of golde on my faders behalfe. (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 8])

> *Arglwydd, dyma bel   o   aür,   yr   honn a   wyf   j yn*
> Lord   here ball of gold the DEM.F PCL be.PRS.1SG I PROG
> *ẏ   roddi   y   ti   wrth wllys vy   nhad.*
> its give.VN to you by   will   my   father   (Williams 2000: 3)

It should be remembered that such examples were not found in similar contexts in LlA (see above).

Six examples could be interpreted as restrictive, although a nonrestrictive interpretation is also possible:

(21) These men that came to the tauerne and drynkyn the wyne be synners whiche oftentymes comen vnto the tauerne of our aduersarye the deuyll and drynken / that is for to saye / they do consume and there wast a waye all goostly vertues whi|che they receyued whan they toke crystendome (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 19])

> *A   'r   gwyr hynn a   ddaüth   i   'r   tavarn i*
> and the men these PCL come.PRET.3SG To the tavern to
> *yved   gwin yw   pechadüriaid, yr   hain   a*
> drink.VN wine be.PRS.3SG sinners   the DEM.PL PCL
> *sydd   yn   dyvod   yn   vynych i   davarn yn*
> be.REL.3SG PROG come.VN PRED frequent to tavern our
> *gwrthnebwr, y   diawl, gan yved   I   pechodav; hynny*
> opponent   the devil by   drink.VN to Sins   that
> *yw,   yno   i   maent   hwy yn   Troelo   i   holl*
> be.PRS.3SG there PCL be.PRS.3PL they PROG waste.VN their all
> *rinwedav da,   yr   hain   a   gawsant   yn y   bedydd.*
> virtues   good the DEM.PL PCL get.PRET.3PL in the baptism
>   (Williams 2000: 19)

In this example with an indefinite noun head, the relative clause could be seen as restricting a certain type of sinner, but it also could be seen as additional information on sinners.[27] The same is true for the mighty men of this world in the next example:

(22) By this kynge that cometh wt|oute cloke in the rayne is to vndestande the myghty men of this worlde / as Iustyces Mayres & balyes whiche had no|clokes to couer al their other clothe (*Gesta Romanorum* 1510, [image 22])

Wrth	*y*	*brenin*	*a*	*oedd*	*yn*	*dyvod*	*heb*	*glog*
by	the	king	PCL	be.IMPF.3SG	PROG	come.VN	without	cloak

ar	*y*	*glaw, idd*	*ym*	*ni*	*yn*	*deall*	*y*	*gwyr*
in	the	rain PCL	be.PRS.1PL	we	PROG	understand.VN	the	men

kedyrn	*o*	*'r*	*byd*	*yma,*	*yr*	*hain*	*a*	*sydd*
strong.PL	from	the	world	here	the	DEM.PL	PCL	be.REL.3SG

a	*chlogav*	*i*	*giddio*	*pob dillad.*[28]	
with	cloaks	to	hide.VN	all clothes	(Williams 2000: 23)

In all of these cases the common argument was annotated either as identity or as assumed; in most of the cases the nominal phrase is generic.

8   CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to investigate the function of overt relative markers in a sample of the 16th-century Welsh translation of *Gesta Romanorum*. Before coming to the linguistically interesting results, a methodological outcome needs to be mentioned. In the course of this study, annotation issues were tested. For a narrative text, the Pentaset annotation proved easily implementable, but a text with a different structure, *Perl mewn Adfyd*, showed the possible limits of annotation.

---

27 On the specific problem of distinguishing between restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses with an indefinite common argument, see Loock (2010: 37–39). As suggested by one of the reviewers, the antecedent could also be 'the men' rather than 'sinners', and this could be a further instance of a presentative relative clause; although the men have already been introduced, they are described in the relative clause in order for them to become discourse topics, exactly as in the presentative constructions at the beginning of narrative texts. I find that this is another possible interpretation for this example, and would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for this idea.

28 Examples (21) and (22) also show an interesting equivalence between English and Welsh: English relative clauses introduced by *that* are translated by default relative clauses in Welsh, while English relative clauses introduced by *which* are translated by Welsh relative clauses with overt markers. Nevertheless, one also finds in this text English relative clauses with *that* translated with Welsh *yr hwn*-clauses.

Turning to the linguistic issues in this research: using the previous findings from the collection of religious texts in the 14th-century manuscript Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119 (LlA), the following results were obtained:

(i) The relative frequency of the construction in the fragment of the Welsh *Gesta Romanorum* that was analysed is significantly higher than that in the texts of the 14th-century manuscript. The same tendency found in a preliminary study of another text of this period, *Perl mewn Adfyd,* appears to point to an expansion of this construction in the 16th century. A broader corpus study is needed to evaluate this hypothesis.

(ii) The use of the construction under investigation is defined by a semantic rule. As in the earlier data, the majority of relative clauses with overt marking consisted of nonrestrictive clauses. This has two implications. First, it testifies that, at least in some registers in some periods of its development, a distinction was made in Welsh between restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses. Secondly, the data suggests that this construction is more than 'imitation of the syntax of Latin or of the dominant neighbouring languages', as stated in previous research (Borsley et al. 2007: 335), because Latin has no formal distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses and the semantic rule developed within Welsh itself.

(iii) In addition to the restrictive–nonrestrictive distinction found systematically in some earlier texts, in *Gesta Romanorum* another usage of this construction is found frequently, where overt marking is used in presentative relative clauses. This is an interesting result for Welsh historical linguistics, especially since specific features of presentational structures have already been demonstrated for (Middle) Welsh in other domains of syntax (see Meelen 2016: 172, 188; Plein 2018: 117–136). Moreover, in terms of typology, it testifies that the category proposed by Lambrecht for French is also coded specifically in other languages.

This study cannot encompass the whole system of relative marking even in a single text. To adequately do so, the semantics of relative clauses of other types, most importantly of the default type, should also be analysed. In this way, a better understanding of the usage of the special constructions with overt marking could be achieved. What is more, only by analysing further texts can tantalising questions, such as whether variation and change in the frequency of the construction represent change in writing conventions or in speech, be approached. In the future, on the basis of the emerging parsed historical Welsh corpus, a fine-grained study of Welsh relative clause system

similar to that undertaken by Romaine (1980, 1982: 139–175) for Middle Scots could be attempted. In this way we could learn more about specific register features in Welsh as well as possibly about influence from English.

REFERENCES

Bache, Carl & Leif K. Jakobsen. 1980. On the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in modern English. *Lingua* 52(3–4). 243–267.

Borsley, Robert, Maggie Tallerman & David Willis. 2007. *The syntax of Welsh* Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard & Edward L. Keenan. 1979. Noun phrase accessibility revisited. *Language* 55. 649–664.

Davies, John. 1621. *Antiquae linguae Britannicae nunc communiter dictae Cambro-Britannicae, a suis Cymraecae vel Cambricae ab aliis Wallicae rudimenta*. Londini: Billium.

Davies, Sioned. 1995. *Crefft y cyfarwydd: Astudiaeth o dechnegau naratif yn Y Mabinogion*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Davies, Sioned. 2007. *The Mabinogion* (Oxford World's Classics). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 2009. *Basic linguistic theory: Volume 2. Grammatical topics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, D. S. 1964. *A grammar of Middle Welsh* (Mediaeval and Modern Welsh Series. Supplementary volume). [Dublin]: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Gesta Romanorum. 1510. *Gesta romanorum*. London: Enprynted at London in Flete streete, by me Wynkyn de Worde. ProQuest.

Gesta Romanorum. 1595. *A record of auncient histories, entituled in latin: Gesta romanorum discoursing vpon sundry examples for the aduancement of vertue, and the abandoning of vice. no lesse pleasant in reading, then profitable in practise.* London: By Thomas Est. ProQuest.

Hughes, Thomas J. 1849. Essay on the principles and laws of Welsh and English syntax. In *Transactions of the Aberffraw Royal Eisteddfod*, 138–206. London, Oxford: J. H. Parker / Bangor: W. Shone.

Jiroušková, Lenka. 2006. *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter unter Einschluss der alttschechischen und deutschsprachigen Textzeugen* (Mittellateinische Studien und TexteBd. 34). Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1). 63–99.

Komen, Erwin R. 2013. *Finding focus: A study of the historical development of focus in English*. Utrecht: LOT.

Kunze, Jana. 2018. Some observations on the syntax of the Welsh Gesta Romanorum. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19(1). 69–85.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2000. Prédication seconde et structure informationnelle: La relative de perception comme construction présentative. *Langue française* 127. 49–66.

Lefèvre, Yves. 1954. *L' Elucidarium et les lucidaires: Contribution, par l'histoire d'un texte, à l'histoire des croyances religieuses en France au moyen âge* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 180). Paris: De Boccard.

Loock, Rudy. 2010. *Appositive relative clauses in English: Discourse functions and competing structures* (Studies in Discourse and Grammar (SIDAG) 22). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Luft, Diana. 2015. Tracking *ôl cyfieithu*: Medieval Welsh translation in criticism and scholarship. *Translation Studies* 9(2). 168–182.

Luft, Diana, Peter W. Thomas & D. M. Smith. 2013. *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300–1425*. http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk.

Meelen, Marieke. 2016. *Why Jesus and Job spoke bad Welsh: The origin and distribution of V2 orders in Middle Welsh*. Utrecht: LOT.

Meelen, Marieke & David Willis. 2021. Towards a historical treebank of Middle and Early Modern Welsh. Part I: Workflow and POS tagging. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 22. 125–154. doi:doi.org/10.16922/jcl.22.6.

Morris-Jones, John. 1931. *Welsh syntax: An unfinished draft*. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board.

Morris-Jones, John & John Rhŷs. 1894. *The Elucidarium and other tracts in Welsh from Llyvyr Agkyr Llandewivrevi A.D. 1346* (*Jesus College ms. 119*). Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Parina, Elena. 2015. *Welsh translations from English* (*16th to 19th century*)*: A digital parallel edition*. http://www.online.uni-marburg.de/welshtranslations/.

Parina, Elena. in prep. The 'Glamorgan school of translation': A no politics phenomenon? In A. Flüchter, A. Gipper, S. Greilich & H.-P. Lüsebrink (eds.), *Politiken des Übersetzens*, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.

Parina, Elena & Erich Poppe. in prep. Translating devotion in medieval Wales. Studies in the texts and language of *Llyfr Ancr Llanddewibrefi*.

Plein, Kerstin. 2018. *Verbalkongruenz im Mittelkymrischen*. Hagen/Westf.: Curach Bhán.

PROIEL. 2011. *Guidelines for annotation of givenness*. http://folk.uio.no/daghaug/info_guidelines.pdf.

Richards, Melville. 1938. *Cystrawen y frawddeg Gymraeg*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1980. The relative clause marker in Scots English: Diffusion, complexity, and style as dimensions of syntactic change. *Language in Society* 9. 221–247.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1982. *Socio-historical linguistics: Its status and methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sackmann, Raphael. 2017. *Verbale Negation in deklarativen Haupt- und Relativsätzen in mittelkymrischen religiösen Texten*. Marburg: Philipps-Universität Marburg unpublished MA thesis.

Sackmann, Raphael. 2022. Agents of verbal nouns in Early Modern Welsh: Evidence from *Perl mewn Adfyd* (1595). *Journal of Historical Syntax* 1–46.

Sims-Williams, Patrick. 2016. John Morris-Jones and his *Welsh Grammar*. *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* 22. 134–153.

Tallerman, Maggie. 1990. Relativization strategies: NP accessibility in Welsh. *Journal of Linguistics* 26(2). 291–314.

Thomas, Graham C.G. 1997. From manuscript to print: I. Manuscript. In R. G. Gruffydd (ed.), *A guide to Welsh literature c. 1530–1700*, 241–262. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Williams, Griffith J. 1948. *Traddodiad llenyddol Morgannwg* [The literary tradition of Glamorgan]. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Williams, Ifor. 1930. *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi allan o Lyfr Gwyn Rhydderch*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Williams, Patricia. 2000. *Gesta Romanorum*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Williams, Patricia. in prep. The Welsh version of the *Gesta Romanorum*.

Elena Parina
Philipps-Universität Marburg
FB 10, Keltologie
W.-Röpke-Str. 6E
D-35032 Marburg
Germany
elena.parina@uni-marburg.de