

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

Carlos García-Castillero

CLAUSE TYPING IN THE OLD IRISH VERBAL COMPLEX

TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 2/9/2023 9:44 PM
via
AN: 135190 ; Carlos Garca-Castillero.; Clause Typing in the Old Irish Verbal
Comp
Account: s335141

DE
GRUYTER
MOUTON

Carlos García-Castillero
Clause Typing in the Old Irish Verbal Complex

Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

Editor

Chiara Gianollo

Daniël Van Olmen

Editorial Board

Walter Bisang

Tine Breban

Volker Gast

Hans Henrich Hock

Karen Lahousse

Natalia Levshina

Caterina Mauri

Heiko Narrog

Salvador Pons

Niina Ning Zhang

Amir Zeldes

Editor responsible for this volume

Chiara Gianollo

Volume 339

Carlos García-Castillero

Clause Typing in the Old Irish Verbal Complex



Morphological Expression, Paradigmatic
Organization, and Syntactic Implications

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-068030-0
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-068032-4
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-068040-9
ISSN 1861-4302

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020936389

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Foreword

This study on the clause types morphologically distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex was initially an investigation aimed at explaining the origin of the difference between absolute and conjunct in Old Irish verbal morphology, a fairly recurrent research topic in Celtological studies. The development of the descriptive implications associated with that basically diachronic issue has led to a thorough investigation of the so-called ‘absolute / conjunct’ opposition, as well as other morphological elements and syntactic structures related in one or another way to clause typing.

The present study is mainly concerned with the systematic description of clause typing in Old Irish and it refrains from proposing a diachronic explanation for all the formal features considered. Such a diachronic investigation would probably need a text at least as long as the present one, but this limitation is advisable not only for practical reasons. Instead, only a limited set of phenomena related to clause typing will be discussed from the diachronic perspective, i.e. relative nasalization, suppletion in the paradigms of the present indicative of the copula and substantive verbs, and some specific uses of pronominal forms which are related to clause typing.

The descriptive discussion of the morphological expression of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex represents a topic in itself that may be of interest to those scholars interested in the morphosyntax of the Insular Celtic languages, especially of Old Irish, but also to those linguists who are interested in clause typing, in particular in its morphological expression and in the various ways in which this category interacts with other linguistic domains. The main ideas proposed in this work are, first, that Old Irish has a morphological paradigm of six clause types, declarative, relative, *wh*-interrogative and polar (or yes/no) interrogative, responsive and imperative clause types, and, second, that the morpho-syntactic expression of these clause types must be analyzed in its relation to pragmatically marked syntactic structures, the domain of syntactic subordination, as well as distinctions in predicate types (i.e. transitive and intransitive predicates).

Needless to say, the Old Irish forms and structures dealt with in this study have already been discussed by other scholars. However, in my opinion one of the important contributions of this monograph is the systematic consideration of the theoretical and structural implications of the existence of a paradigm of clause types in Old Irish, a point that has been overlooked in studies on Old Irish verbal morphology and, especially, in those dealing with the absolute / conjunct problem. The general statement of Austin (1962: 1) in the introductory part of his pathbreaking study on speech acts may be applied to this specific aspect of Old

Irish morphosyntax: “The phenomenon to be discussed is very widespread and obvious, and it cannot fail to have been already noticed, at least here and there, by others. Yet I have not found attention paid to it specifically.”

The systematic consideration of clause types in Old Irish verbal morphology raises important issues about the distribution and use of the declarative clause type forms in some specific subordinate clauses, and on the special place of relative nasalization with respect to other clause type markers, but the very assumption of a paradigm of clause types leads to a systematic analysis of the formal procedures used in the expression of clause types, as well as other morphological and syntactic elements that are related to that grammatical category. To the extent that this study may be compared to Thurneysen’s *A Grammar of Old Irish*, the most direct consequence of the study on Old Irish clause types in the verbal complex is the theoretically coherent and comprehensive analysis of a number of points that in Thurneysen’s master piece are dealt with here and there in (sometimes quite) separate chapters.

This is partly due to the fact that clause typing cannot properly be accounted for without considering decidedly syntactic and pragmatic issues. This is particularly clear in Old Irish, in which the regular clause initial position of the verbal complex entails a pragmatically marked character for every sentential ordering in which an NP or any other syntactic constituent precedes the finite verb. Thus, for reasons that will become clear in the development of the book, it is necessary to pay special attention to the two main pragmatically marked word orders of Old Irish sentential syntax, i.e. cleft-sentences and left-dislocation, and as a further element intrinsically related to all those morphosyntactic elements, to the Old Irish personal pronouns, in both their tonic and affixal variants. This monograph therefore constitutes a contribution to the study of the Old Irish syntax, one of the neglected areas in the study of this language, as McCone (1996b: 18) noted some twenty five years ago.

Certainly, one could argue that the elements analyzed in this study have been selected due to the fact that they are precisely the basic protagonists of the diachronic explanation put forward by the author for some specific clause types. No doubt, a certain selection of topics to be included in this study has been necessary, and in fact some partial studies originally developed as separate chapters or sections have been taken out and reformulated as independent papers. Apart from that, not all the Old Irish verbal grammatical categories other than clause typing have been explored in this study: categories such as person, number, diathesis, mood and polarity have been taken into account at different stages and more or less systematically, and I think that their bearing for the descriptive and diachronic analysis is beyond doubt. However, other verbal categories such as

tense and aspect have not been dealt with and, though it seems clear to me that they are less relevant for the point at issue, this absence must be acknowledged.

This study has received financial support from the Research Project FFI2011–27056 granted by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Education, and from the Research Group IT 1344-19 granted by the Basque Government. I would like also to express my gratitude to Joaquín Gorrochategui, José María Vallejo (Vitoria-Gasteiz), Kees Hengeveld (Amsterdam), and Lachlan Mackenzie (Lisbon), who have all discussed with me some points of the study at different stages of its development. Dagmar Wodtko has kindly read a previous version of some parts of this study and has proposed some valuable observations. An anonymous De Gruyter reviewer made very important observations and corrections. Needless to say, any shortcomings and errors are my sole responsibility.

Contents

Foreword — v

Aims and structure of the study — xvii

List of tables — xxi

List of abbreviations — xxv

Part I: Preliminary chapters

- 1 Old Irish and the notion of clause typing — 3**
 - 1.1 Aims of the chapter — 3
 - 1.2 Old Irish as a Medieval West European Celtic language — 3
 - 1.3 Old Irish sources — 6
 - 1.3.1 Old Irish contemporaneous texts — 6
 - 1.3.2 Texts attested in later manuscripts — 8
 - 1.4 The Old Irish Glosses as a linguistic document — 10
 - 1.4.1 Some Old Irish glosses — 11
 - 1.4.2 Linguistic variation in the Old Irish Glosses — 13
 - 1.5 On the sounds and spelling in the Old Irish contemporaneous texts — 15
 - 1.5.1 The Old Irish phonological system — 15
 - 1.5.2 The spelling of the Old Irish sounds in the contemporaneous manuscripts — 17
 - 1.6 The representation of the Old Irish verbal complex in this study — 19
 - 1.7 The notion of clause typing — 21
 - 1.7.1 Illocutionary force, clause typing, and clause types — 21
 - 1.7.2 Other notions directly related to clause typing — 23
 - 1.7.3 The clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex — 25
 - 1.8 Concluding remarks — 26
- 2 The Old Irish verbal complex: Morphological structure and components — 28**
 - 2.1 Introduction — 28
 - 2.2 The Old Irish verbal complex: Preliminary notions — 29
 - 2.2.1 The obligatory character of the affixal pronominal references — 29

2.2.2	The template of the Old Irish verbal complex —	31
2.2.3	The spelling of the verbal complex in the contemporaneous texts —	33
2.3	Preverbal elements —	35
2.3.1	Conjunct particles —	35
2.3.2	Lexical preverbs —	37
2.3.3	Deadjectival preverbs —	39
2.4	Deuterotonic and prototonic forms —	40
2.4.1	The position of the three types of preverbal elements —	40
2.4.2	The deuterotonic and prototonic forms of a lexical compound —	42
2.4.3	The deuterotonic boundary —	44
2.4.4	Distribution of prototonic vs deuterotonic and the notion of dependency —	45
2.5	Phonological effects and spelling of the Old Irish mutations in the verbal complex —	47
2.5.1	Phonological effects of lenition and nasalization —	48
2.5.2	The graphical notation of the Old Irish mutations in the Glosses —	48
2.5.3	The mutation effects in the Old Irish verbal complex —	50
2.6	Pronominal affixes —	52
2.7	On the affixal character of the elements in slots 1 to 3 and 6 —	55
2.8	Minimal and maximal constituency of the verbal complex —	60
2.9	Concluding remarks —	62
3	The syntax of the Old Irish verbal complex: Unmarked and marked word orders —	65
3.1	Introduction: Unmarked and marked V positions in Old Irish —	65
3.2	The Old Irish cleft-sentence —	66
3.2.1	Focused constituent —	67
3.2.2	Introductory copula —	70
3.2.3	The clause type marking of the post-focus verb —	73
3.2.4	Summary —	76
3.3	Left-dislocation in Old Irish —	77
3.3.1	Introductory notes —	77
3.3.2	Subject and object left-dislocation —	78
3.3.3	The interplay of left-dislocating structure and normal order —	81
3.3.4	Summary —	82
3.4	Tmesis and Bergin's Law (and other irregular phenomena) —	83

- 3.4.1 A unified description of Bergin's Law and tmesis — **83**
- 3.4.2 Other irregular structures different to Bergin's Law and tmesis — **87**
- 3.4.3 Bergin's Law and tmesis in the Old Irish literary texts — **90**
- 3.5 An overview of the alternative V orders in Old Irish — **92**
- 3.6 Concluding remarks — **94**

Part II: The Old Irish clause types

- 4 Declarative and relative clause types — 99**
- 4.1 Scope of the chapter — **99**
- 4.2 The oppositions declarative vs relative clause type and absolute vs conjunct — **100**
- 4.3 Declarative and relative clause type morphology of simple active verbs — **103**
- 4.3.1 Paradigmatic extension of the absolute positive declarative and relative active forms — **103**
- 4.3.2 Some examples of absolute positive declarative and relative clause type active forms — **105**
- 4.4 Pronominal affixes and the opposition absolute vs conjunct — **107**
- 4.4.1 Suffixed vs infixes pronouns, absolute vs conjunct forms and clause types — **108**
- 4.4.2 Some examples of suffixed forms — **112**
- 4.4.3 Economy and iconicity of the suffixing strategy in the Old Irish verbal complex — **113**
- 4.5 Declarative and relative clause type in simple passive and deponent verbs — **115**
- 4.5.1 The passive paradigm — **115**
- 4.5.2 The 'ex-deponent' character of the Old Irish deponent verbs — **119**
- 4.6 Formal features of the Old Irish absolute inflection — **120**
- 4.6.1 Absolute declarative inflection — **121**
- 4.6.2 Absolute relative inflection — **122**
- 4.7 Declarative and relative clause type morphology in lexical compounds — **123**
- 4.7.1 Some examples of relative clause type verb forms from lexical compounds — **124**
- 4.7.2 Functional domains of the Old Irish relative mutations — **127**
- 4.7.3 Relative mutations after m./f. sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function — **129**

- 4.7.4 Relative mutations in simple verbs — **133**
- 4.8 Declarative and relative clause type infixed pronouns — **134**
- 4.8.1 The distinction between Classes A/B and C in 3rd person infixed pronouns — **134**
- 4.8.2 The distinction between Classes A/B and C in 1st and 2nd person infixed pronouns — **136**
- 4.8.3 The use of the infixed pronouns after negative conjunct particles — **138**
- 4.9 Declarative and relative clause types and pronominal markers — **140**
- 4.9.1 Pronominal markers and clause types — **141**
- 4.9.2 A preferred pronominal argument structure — **145**
- 4.9.3 The preferred pronominal argument structure and the Old Irish clause types — **146**
- 4.10 Summary and prospect — **147**

- 5 Subordination in Old Irish — 150**
- 5.1 Introduction — **150**
- 5.2 Formal strategies of subordination in Old Irish — **151**
- 5.3 Dependent and independent relative verbal complex — **152**
- 5.3.1 Type I: Dependent form as the marker of relative clause type — **152**
- 5.3.2 Type II: Independent form with relative morphology — **154**
- 5.4 Subordinating conjunct particle (or particle chain) — **156**
- 5.4.1 Type IIIa: [Negative conjunct particle + dependent form] — **156**
- 5.4.2 Type IIIb: [Oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - + dependent form] — **157**
- 5.4.3 Type IIIc: [Subordinating conjunct particle + dependent form] — **160**
- 5.4.4 Type III d: Incorporated independent conjunction — **162**
- 5.5 Subordinating conjunction — **165**
- 5.5.1 Type IV: [Subordinating conjunction + relative verb] — **165**
- 5.5.2 Type V: [Subordinating conjunction + declarative verb] — **168**
- 5.6 Form and function in Old Irish subordination — **172**
- 5.6.1 Morphological and syntactic (in)dependency in Old Irish subordination — **172**
- 5.6.2 On the variation between relative and declarative clause type forms in subordinate clauses — **175**
- 5.7 Relative nasalization: Functional definition and diachrony — **181**

- 5.7.1 The functions of relative nasalization in Old Irish — **181**
- 5.7.2 The original domain of relative nasalization — **183**
- 5.7.3 The extensions and retractions of relative nasalization — **185**
- 5.8 Non-finite forms and subordination in Old Irish — **186**
- 5.9 Summary — **188**

- 6 Wh-interrogative clause type — 190**
- 6.1 Introduction — **190**
- 6.2 Formal classification of the *wh*-elements — **191**
- 6.3 Interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use — **192**
- 6.3.1 Stressed interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use — **192**
- 6.3.2 Unstressed interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use — **195**
- 6.4 Interrogative pronoun in pre-pronominal use — **198**
- 6.5 Pre-nominal use of interrogative elements — **199**
- 6.5.1 Stereotyped pre-nominal use of the interrogative pronoun — **200**
- 6.5.2 Non-stereotyped pre-nominal use of the interrogative pronoun — **203**
- 6.6 *Wh*-interrogative clause type and other structures in Old Irish — **205**
- 6.7 Concluding remarks — **210**

- 7 Polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types — 212**
- 7.1 Introduction — **212**
- 7.2 The Old Irish polar interrogative clause type — **213**
- 7.3 The Old Irish imperative clause type — **216**
- 7.4 The Old Irish responsive clause type — **220**
- 7.4.1 Formal features of the Old Irish responsive — **220**
- 7.4.2 On the function of the responsive — **223**
- 7.4.3 The responsive in the language of the Glosses — **224**
- 7.4.4 The responsive among the polar interrogative and the imperative clause types — **226**
- 7.5 Concluding remarks — **227**

Part III: The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

- 8 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types — 231**
- 8.1 The case for clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex — **231**
- 8.2 Previous scholarship on the Old Irish clause types — **232**

- 8.3 The morphological expression of clause types in the Old Irish verbal complex — **236**
- 8.3.1 Grammatical categories other than clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex — **236**
- 8.3.2 The pervasiveness of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex — **238**
- 8.3.3 The preferential location of the clause type marking in the Old Irish verbal complex — **240**
- 8.3.4 The exclusive and portmanteau expression of the Old Irish clause types — **241**
- 8.4 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types and its categories — **243**
- 8.5 Paradigmatic cohesion, defectiveness, and distinctiveness — **250**
- 8.5.1 Paradigmatic relationships between the Old Irish clause types — **250**
- 8.5.2 Defectiveness in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types — **252**
- 8.5.3 Distinctiveness and syncretism in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types — **254**
- 8.6 Relevance and asymmetry in the expression of negative polarity — **256**
- 8.7 Concluding remarks — **259**

- 9 Clause types in the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb and copula — 261**
- 9.1 Aims and structure of the chapter — **261**
- 9.2 General remarks on non-verbal predication — **262**
- 9.3 The present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb — **263**
- 9.3.1 Basic paradigmatic constituency — **264**
- 9.3.2 The stems *(·)tá(-)* and *(·)fil(-)* in the declarative vs relative clause type opposition — **267**
- 9.3.3 Special uses of the stem *(·)fil(-)* — **273**
- 9.3.4 The use of the stem *(·)tá(-)* in the expression of possession — **275**
- 9.3.5 The stem *(·)tá(-)* in nasalizing relative clauses — **276**
- 9.3.6 The copula uses of the stem *(·)tá(-)* — **279**
- 9.3.7 Summary — **282**
- 9.4 The present indicative of the Old Irish copula — **285**
- 9.4.1 General outline of the paradigm — **285**
- 9.4.2 The Old Irish copular clause — **287**
- 9.4.3 Absolute and conjunct and the positive declarative paradigm — **289**

- 9.4.4 The Old Irish *wh*-interrogative copular clause — **291**
- 9.4.5 Polar interrogative and responsive — **292**
- 9.4.6 The element *-ta-/-da-* in the paradigm of the Old Irish copula — **294**
- 9.4.7 The ‘conjunct’ 3rd person singular forms — **297**
- 9.4.8 Summary — **300**
- 9.5 Diachronic aspects of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb — **302**
- 9.5.1 The non-present indicative forms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb — **302**
- 9.5.2 On the origin of the stems (*·*)*tá*(*·*) and (*·*)*fil*(*·*) of the substantive verb — **304**
- 9.5.3 The element *-ta-/-da-* in the paradigm of the present indicative of the copula — **307**
- 9.5.4 The 3sg of clause types other than positive declarative — **309**
- 9.6 Concluding remarks: Clause types and non-verbal predicates in Old Irish — **312**

- 10 Personal pronouns and clause typing in Old Irish — 314**
- 10.1 Introductory remarks — **314**
- 10.2 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates — **316**
- 10.2.1 The pragmatic use of the Old Irish tonic pronouns — **317**
- 10.2.2 Basic features of the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates — **318**
- 10.2.3 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with two lexical NPs after COP-PRON — **320**
- 10.2.4 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with one lexical NP after COP-PRON — **323**
- 10.2.5 Referential non-verbal predicates, clause types, and cleft-sentences — **325**
- 10.2.6 On the diachrony of the Old Irish referential non-verbal predication — **328**
- 10.2.7 Summary on tonic pronouns and referential non-verbal predicates — **332**
- 10.3 The cataphoric use of the Old Irish affixal pronouns — **333**
- 10.3.1 Affixal pronouns in the verbal complex — **334**
- 10.3.2 Cataphoric pronominal affixes in the Old Irish verbal complex — **336**
- 10.3.3 Cataphoric pronouns and left-dislocated object NPs — **338**

- 10.4 Desemantized pronominal affixes — **340**
- 10.4.1 General remarks on the desemantized use of pronominal affixes — **340**
- 10.4.2 The ‘reiterative’ use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* — **341**
- 10.4.3 The use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* after the conjunctions *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cíad^l* ‘though’ — **346**
- 10.4.4 The form *rondgab* ‘that (s)he / it is (in...)’ in the paradigm of the substantive verb — **352**
- 10.4.5 Phonotactically advantageous pronominal affixes — **354**
- 10.5 Concluding remarks — **357**

- 11 Conclusions — 360**
- 11.1 Structure of the chapter — **360**
- 11.2 The Old Irish verbal complex: structure and components — **361**
- 11.3 The morphological strategies of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex — **362**
- 11.4 Pervasiveness and cohesiveness of clause type marking in Old Irish — **364**
- 11.5 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types — **366**
- 11.6 Clause typing and subordination in Old Irish — **368**
- 11.7 Clause typing and pragmatically marked constituent order — **369**
- 11.8 Clause typing and non-verbal predicate types — **370**
- 11.9 Clause typing and pronominal references — **371**

Bibliography — 373

Index — 386

Aims and structure of the study

The basic aim of this study is to provide a detailed formal and functional description and analysis of the clause types that are expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex. In particular, this study addresses three general questions:

- (i) What are the Old Irish clause types distinguished in the verbal complex and what are the formal means expressing them?
- (ii) How are Old Irish clause types formally and functionally related to each other?
- (iii) Which other linguistic structures and domains are relevant for or interact in some significant manner with clause typing in Old Irish?

The morphological expression of clause typing in Old Irish reveals a number of functional associations among the clause types under inspection, but also between clause typing in general and other categories and syntactic structures. As a way of providing a framework for the answer to (iii) above, clause typing will be considered in the analysis of:

- (1) a. Subordination,
b. Pragmatically marked structures such as left-dislocation and cleft-sentence,
c. Predicate types,
d. Pronominal arguments.

One of the most significant contributions of this monograph for the general study of clause typing is the illustration of the specific interaction of this category with the phenomena listed in (1). This study does not follow any particular school of linguistic thought, although the general orientation and the basic analytic tools considered come from the typological and functional literature.

The book is structured in three main parts. Part I (Chapters 1 to 3) describes the linguistic evidence on which the study is based and provides the morphological and syntactic descriptive issues that are necessary for a proper consideration of clause typing in Old Irish. Part II (Chapters 4 to 7) analyzes in turn the Old Irish clause types. Part III (Chapters 8 to 11) is devoted to the paradigmatic organization of the clause types described in the previous part, and includes a detailed study of two Old Irish verbal paradigms, those corresponding to the present in-

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-204>

dicative of the copula and of the substantive verb; as a complement to the previous chapters, it also devotes a chapter to the effect and interaction of clause typing with pronominal markers, both stressed and unstressed.

Chapter 1 has two main aims. On the one hand, it introduces the specific features that determine the linguistic evidence on which the present study is based. Special attention is paid to the so-called contemporaneous Old Irish texts, which involve a rather spontaneous linguistic production with a considerable degree of variation. On the other hand, this chapter introduces the notion of clause typing as a grammatical category.

Chapter 2 offers a comprehensive description of the formal aspects of the Old Irish verbal complex. The chapter discusses at length the consideration of this structure as a grammatical or morphosyntactic word, and establishes a theoretical template of six slots as well as their combinatorial restrictions. This description gives quite a systematic account of the elements appearing before and after the verbal stem, with the exception of the inflectional endings, which are left for Part II.

Chapter 3 analyzes and discusses the syntactic structures in which the Old Irish verbal complex appears in a position other than the unmarked V1 position. On the one hand, this chapter describes the cleft-sentence and left-dislocation; on the other, it deals with a group of alternative or irregular structures such as Bergin's Law and tmesis, which are restricted to literary texts.

The four chapters in Part II (Chapters 4 to 7) offer a formal and functional analysis of the six clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex, namely, the declarative, relative, content (or *wh*-) interrogative, polar interrogative, responsive and imperative clause types.

Chapter 4 describes the declarative and relative clause types in Old Irish verbs that have no (meaningful) conjunct particle, i.e. verbal forms that consist of the lexical basis, whether a simple verb or a lexical compound. This means discussing morphological markers of three types, basically: (i) the so-called absolute and conjunct endings, (ii) relative mutations and (iii) affixal pronouns. The pronominal references of the Old Irish verbal complex, those expressed as both inflectional endings and pronominal affixes, play a very important role in the distinction between declarative and relative clause types.

Chapter 5 poses the question as to how subordination is expressed in Old Irish, in view of the fundamental difference between declarative and relative clause type forms established in the previous chapter. A list of five formal strategies expressing subordination in Old Irish is introduced, which includes relative marking of various types, but also declarative clause type forms introduced by a subordinating conjunction. The main idea of the chapter is that the subordinate

clauses which are ‘less’ subordinate are expressed by strategies that involve either relative nasalization or declarative clause type morphology.

Chapter 6 deals with the two strategies used to express content (or *wh*-) interrogative clause types in Old Irish. The most frequent one consists of a periphrastic expression in which the stressed *wh*-form (which may distinguish gender and number) is followed by a relative verb. A less frequent procedure involves the use of a less stressed *wh*-form that occupies the first slot in the template of the verbal complex, a slot that is reserved for pretonic elements.

Chapter 7 considers the three remaining clause types, i.e. polar interrogative, responsive and imperative clause types. These three clause types involve a relatively simple set of formal distinctions and, perhaps with the exception of the responsive clause type, their functional description is quite straightforward.

Part III is mainly devoted to the consideration of general aspects of the resulting paradigm of clause types in Old Irish, apart from the chapter of the conclusions.

Chapter 8 establishes the paradigm of clause types expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex. This paradigm is a sort of summary of the descriptive work of the previous parts, in the sense that it includes the six clause types considered in both their positive and negative forms as well as the possibility of including a pronominal reference.

Chapter 9 offers a detailed description of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb as carriers of two main types of non-verbal predication, namely, attributive and locational non-verbal predicates respectively. Special attention is paid herein to the paradigm of clause types in the present indicative of those two verbs, which display a very remarkable formal variability that includes suppletion determined by clause type distinctions. This chapter classifies and discusses the forms of those two verbal paradigms attested in the Old Irish contemporaneous texts and attempts to give a diachronic explanation for the alluded suppletive forms.

Chapter 10 describes and tries to give a diachronic explanation of some uses of personal pronouns in both their tonic and unstressed (affixal) variants that are somehow related to clause type distinctions. On the one hand, the use of the tonic pronouns that constitute an essential element in the expression of the third main type of non-verbal predication, i.e. the referential type, is considered. On the other, the affixal pronouns included in the Old Irish verbal complex sometimes lose their basic referential use and secondarily serve to mark some aspect related to clause typing.

Chapter 11 summarizes the main results of the study.

List of tables

- Table 1.1: Old Irish consonants — **16**
- Table 1.2: Old Irish vowels — **17**
- Table 1.3: Old Irish diphthongs — **17**
- Table 1.4: The spelling of the Old Irish consonants in the contemporaneous texts — **18**
- Table 1.5: The spelling of the Old Irish vowels in the contemporaneous texts — **18**
- Table 1.6: The spelling of the Old Irish diphthongs in the contemporaneous texts — **18**
- Table 2.1: Theoretical template of the Old Irish verbal complex — **32**
- Table 2.2: Old Irish conjunct particles — **36**
- Table 2.3: Old Irish lexical preverbs (in alphabetical order) — **38**
- Table 2.4: Old Irish deadjectival preverbs — **39**
- Table 2.5: Deuterotonic and prototonic form of the same lexical compound — **42**
- Table 2.6: Mutations in the Old Irish verbal complex and their graphical expression — **49**
- Table 2.7: Affixal pronouns in the Old Irish verbal complex — **53**
- Table 3.1: Formal possibilities in the Old Irish cleft-sentence — **76**
- Table 3.2: Different positions of independent and dependent forms in the expression of positive declarative and relative clause types in Old Irish — **93**
- Table 4.1: Positive declarative and relative 3SG present indicative active of *ceilid* ‘conceals’ — **102**
- Table 4.2: Positive declarative and relative present indicative active of BI (strong) *ceilid* ‘conceals’ — **103**
- Table 4.3: Positive declarative and relative present indicative active of AI (weak) *caraid* ‘loves’ — **104**
- Table 4.4: Positive declarative clause type verb with 3SG n. pronominal affix of the simple verb *caraid* ‘loves’ — **110**

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-205>

- Table 4.5: Allowed combinations of simple verb and suffixed pronoun in Old Irish — **111**
- Table 4.6: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish non-preterite passive (present indicative forms) — **116**
- Table 4.7a: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish simple deponent verb *suidigidir* ‘places’: active forms of the present indicative — **119**
- Table 4.7b: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish simple deponent verb *suidigidir* ‘places’: passive forms of the present indicative — **120**
- Table 4.8: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the *s*-preterite active of *caraid* ‘loves’ — **121**
- Table 4.9: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the suffixless preterite active of *cainid* ‘sings’ — **122**
- Table 4.10: The distribution of relative lenition and nasalization in the verb after a m./f. sg. nominal constituent with object NP_{rel} function — **131**
- Table 4.11: The structural possibilities for the present indicative active and passive of an Old Irish simple verb marked as positive declarative or relative clause type verb and [±pronominal affix] — **141**
- Table 4.12: Present indicative active and passive of the simple BI (strong) *ceilid* ‘conceals’: positive declarative / relative clause type and [±pronominal affix] — **143**
- Table 5.1: Formal strategies and subordinate types in Old Irish — **173**
- Table 5.2: Declarative and nasalizing relative marking in the 3rd person indicative copula after (*h*)*óre* ‘because’ — **177**
- Table 5.3: Declarative and nasalizing relative marking in the 3rd person copula after *amal* ‘as’ — **178**
- Table 6.1: Forms and uses of Old Irish *wh*-interrogative elements — **205**
- Table 6.2: The relative position of the cleft *wh*-interrogative clause type with respect to other Old Irish syntactic structures — **206**
- Table 7.1: Active paradigms of the imperative clause type of *caraid* ‘loves’ — **218**

- Table 7.2: Active paradigms of the imperative clause type of *do-beir* ‘gives, brings’ — **219**
- Table 7.3: Active paradigms of the polar interrogative, imperative and responsive clause types of AI (weak) *caraid* ‘loves’ — **226**
- Table 8.1: Grammatical categories expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex — **239**
- Table 8.2: The Old Irish paradigm of clause types — **244–245**
- Table 8.3: The paradigm of clause types of the active 3SG present indicative of *caraid* ‘loves’ — **247**
- Table 8.4: The paradigm of clause types of the passive 2SG and 3SG present indicative of *caraid* ‘loves’ — **248**
- Table 8.5: The paradigm of clause types of the active and passive 3SG present indicative of *fo-cain* ‘sings’ — **249**
- Table 8.6: The paradigm of clause types of the active and passive 3SG present indicative of *do-gní* ‘makes’ — **249**
- Table 8.7: Positive active clause types of the present indicative of Class AI *caraid* ‘loves’ without pronominal affix — **254**
- Table 8.8: Positive active clause types of the present indicative of Class BI *ceilid* ‘hides’ without pronominal infix — **255**
- Table 8.9: (A)symmetry of the negative form in the active and passive 3SG of the present indicative of simple *caraid* ‘loves’ — **257**
- Table 8.10: (A)symmetry of the negative form in the active and passive 3SG of the present indicative of compound *do-gní* ‘makes’ — **258**
- Table 9.1: The paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb — **265**
- Table 9.2: The present indicative 3SG and 3PL of the Old Irish substantive verb with locational and existential meaning — **283**
- Table 9.3: The paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of the Old Irish copula — **286**
- Table 9.4: The parallel suppletive pattern in the present indicative of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb — **296**
- Table 9.5: The paradigm of the present indicative of the copula with the conjunct particles *co^N*- ‘so that, in order to’ and *í^N*- ‘in which’ — **298**

- Table 9.6: Paradigms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb other than the present indicative — **303**
- Table 9.7: Conjunct particles and 3SG copula ‘conjunct’ forms — **310**
- Table 9.8: The conjunct particle *co*^N- in the 3SG present indicative forms of the copula and of other verbs — **311**
- Table 10.1: Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with two NPs after the V1 — **322**
- Table 10.2: Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with left-dislocated NP — **325**
- Table 10.3: Old Irish allosentential pairs of referential non-verbal predicates with left-dislocated NP and with V1 order — **329**
- Table 10.4: Extension of infix *-d^L-* from the 3SG present indicative of the copula to other verbs in indicative mood — **349**
- Table 10.5: Positive 3PL present indicative active forms of *beirid* ‘brings’ — **356**

List of abbreviations

1	first person	OBL.REL	oblique relative particle
2	second person	PART	particle
3	third person	PASS	passive
ABL	ablative	PERF	perfective aspect marker /form
ACC	accusative	PL	plural
ACT	active	POLINT	polar interrogative-clause particle
ANAPH	anaphorical demonstrative	POSS	possessive pronoun
ART	article	PRES	present
COMP	comparative marker	PRET	preterite
COP	copula	PROX	proximal demonstrative
DAT	dative	PRT	participle
DECL	declarative-clause marker /form	PRT.NEC	participle of necessity
DIST	distal demonstrative	PV	lexical preverb
F	feminine	REL	relative-clause marker/form
FUT	future	RESP	responsive form
GEN	genitive	RSM	reported speaker marker
IMPF	imperfect	SG	singular
IMPV	imperative	SUBJ	subjunctive
IND	indicative	SUBSTV	substantive verb
LHEAD	light head	SUPERL	superlative marker/form
M	masculine	VOC	vocative
N	neuter	VOCP	vocative particle
NA	<i>nota augens</i>	WH	<i>wh</i> -element or pronoun
NEG	negative particle		
NOM	nominative		

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-206>

Part I: **Preliminary chapters**

1 Old Irish and the notion of clause typing

1.1 Aims of the chapter

This chapter has two main aims. On the one hand, it introduces the reader, especially the non-Celticist one, to the main points of the chronology, attestation and basic linguistic features of the Old Irish language. In this sense, this chapter will defend the idea that it is possible to make reliable descriptive observations and, correspondingly, to put forward significant hypotheses about Old Irish morphological, syntactic and pragmatic phenomena. On the other hand, this chapter introduces the notion of clause typing as the grammatical category morphologically expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex that will be considered systematically in this study.

In order to accomplish the first main task of the chapter, Section 1.2 establishes the geographic, chronological, and cultural coordinates of the Old Irish language. Section 1.3 introduces the Old Irish glosses attested in contemporaneous manuscripts, which constitute the main evidential basis of this study, and it also discusses the value of the linguistic evidence of other texts that have come down to us in later manuscripts. Section 1.4 presents some Old Irish glosses as a peculiar type of text and describes how they work, i.e., their motivations and, to some extent, even the process by which they are written; this section also deals with the linguistic variation that can be observed in the Old Irish glosses. Section 1.5 offers a basic description of the Old Irish phonemes and their corresponding spelling in the glosses, and Section 1.6 describes the ways in which the verbal complex will be represented in this study.

The second main aim of this chapter is addressed in Section 1.7, which introduces the notions of clause typing and clause type, as well as other related notions to be considered in this book and the specific clause types to be considered for Old Irish. Section 1.8 summarizes the main findings of the chapter.

1.2 Old Irish as a Medieval West European Celtic language

The term Old Irish refers to the period between the 7th and the 9th centuries AD in the historical development of this Celtic language spoken in Ireland. Old Irish represents the earliest stage of a Celtic language in which we have a fairly complete image of the linguistic system, especially in the fields of verbal morphology

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-001>

and syntax, the fields that will be analyzed in detail in this study. Before that period, the Irish language is attested in the so-called Ogamic inscriptions dated mainly in the 5th and 6th centuries, which offer only proper names and a few appellatives such as ‘son’, ‘daughter’, and so on. The monographs by McManus (1991) and Ziegler (1994) constitute the basic reference nowadays for this Irish linguistic material.

Irish, along with Scots Gaelic and Manx, is classified as a member of the Goidelic group of the Insular Celtic language family. The other Insular Celtic group, the Brittonic (or Brythonic) group, includes Welsh, Cornish (already extinct), as well as the Breton language spoken on the Continent, which is the outcome of a relatively late migration from Britain. The oldest witness of Brittonic, Old Welsh, attested from the 8th to the 12th centuries, is known only in some glosses, proper names and a few continuous texts. This is why Middle Welsh (12th-14th centuries) most often constitutes the main reference in the study of the Brittonic branch of the Celtic languages. For this chronology, see Jackson (1953: 5–6).

Continental Celtic is the other main group of Celtic, which belongs to the Indo-European linguistic family. Continental Celtic is known at an earlier date than Insular Celtic in epigraphic sources found in the Iberian Peninsula (Celtiberian), Gaul (Gaulish), and Northern Italy (Lepontic and Gaulish). Some Lepontic texts are considerably old, attested in the 6th century BC, and the most recent ones date from the 1st century BC. Gaulish is first dated in the 3rd century BC and it survived until the Christian age; as in the case of Celtiberian, dated between the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, it is not clear when it went out of use. The Continental Celtic languages were written down in varieties of both the Latin and Greek alphabets, and also in graphical systems perhaps originally derived, but in the end different, from the former. The Continental Celtic languages have a fragmentary attestation, that is to say, their lexicon, syntax, morphology and even phonology is only partially known. The obvious consequence of this fragmentary character is that the most important texts in Continental Celtic are intelligible only to a limited extent. Frequently, their general sense can be ascertained with some confidence, but the exact meaning of many words, sometimes even their segmentation, remains unclear.

In Medieval Western Europe, the emergence of the vernacular literary traditions in most of the non-Romance languages such as Irish predate those of their Romance counterparts, but this still happened later than in the case of Eastern European languages such as Gothic or Armenian, which are known since (or, in the case of the Gothic language, in) the 4th century A.D. The reason for the differing dates of attestation is to be sought in the various manners in which the Christian religion and its basic text, the Bible, were made known and spread in several

parts of Europe and, as a secondary but related factor, in the specific character of the language used in this process of Christianization. Thus, whereas the Bible received a kind of canonical translation into the vernacular language in the Eastern part of the ancient Roman Empire, that is to say, in Byzantium, which brought about the Gothic and Armenian translations from basically Greek originals of the Bible, a comparable enterprise with the Latin version of the Bible was more problematical in Western Europe. Certainly, as van Liere (2014: 190) points out, “[t]here is no evidence of any prohibition in the Early Middle Ages against Bible translation in the vernacular”, but van Liere (2014: 178) himself recognizes that “the authoritative Bible remained the Vulgate text”, the primacy of which was beyond doubt.

The practical consequence of the previous situation for Christian(ized) Western Europe in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages is that knowledge of the Latin language became indispensable for everyone interested in religious and, more generally, intellectual matters. In addition to the primary role played by the Biblical text, the Roman classical literary tradition was of paramount importance in the cultural environment of Western Europe, at least for merely instrumental reasons, since the Latin linguistic model followed even in the Biblical text was precisely that of the canonical Roman authors who were active in the Late Republic and Early Empire.

The rise of the literary tradition, and even the first texts of vernaculars in Medieval Western Europe are therefore inextricably bound with a cultural milieu in which the Latin language and texts occupied the central place of intellectual activity. In this regard, however, there were some differences between countries in which languages derived from Latin were spoken and those countries with a language of a different origin. In the Early Medieval period, it is difficult to differentiate between Romance proper and various varieties of (Vulgar) Latin since there was a considerable amount of interference and mutual influence between these linguistic systems. By contrast, such an influence was not possible in countries with languages such as Irish or Anglo-Saxon, which were clearly different from Latin and exerted no interference in the knowledge of this classical language. This is why, as a part of the political measures that ultimately brought about the so-called Carolingian Renaissance, which aimed at a generalized good command of the Latin language by the intellectual and administrative heads of the Roman-Germanic Empire led by Charlemagne (died in 814 AD at the age of approximately 60 years), Irish and English scholars were brought to the Continent to teach Latin, among other duties. To a great extent, the fact that the most important Old Irish texts are included in manuscripts preserved in monastic or ecclesiastic libraries on the Continent is the consequence of this historical circumstance.

1.3 Old Irish sources

Old Irish is attested in manuscript texts and, as customary in Celtic linguistics, a clear distinction must be stated between texts transmitted in manuscripts that come directly from the Old Irish period, on the one hand, and those that were probably composed at that time, but that have come down to us by means of copies made at a later date, on the other. In the second case, the original grammar of the Old Irish text may have been altered more or less according to the linguistic standard of the moment in which the text was copied. The two main groups of this division are considered in turn in this section.

1.3.1 Old Irish contemporaneous texts

Thurneysen's (1946) *A Grammar of Old Irish* relies mainly on the linguistic evidence provided by contemporaneous manuscripts, basically, the collections of glosses of Würzburg (= Wb), dated approximately 750 A.D., Milan (= MI) and St. Gall (= Sg), both from approximately 850 A.D. The place names of these three collections of glosses refer to the libraries in which each manuscript has been preserved. These glosses as well as other texts that will also be considered in this study were edited by Whitley Stokes and John Strachan in the monumental *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, the corpus of Old Irish contemporaneous texts that appeared in 1901–1903. These glosses are often a single word, but on many occasions they consist of a series of clauses of considerable length.

The Old Irish glosses are included in Latin manuscripts and are primarily aimed at clarifying some aspect of the corresponding Latin text that the Old Irish scholar felt was a possible source of interpretative problems. It could be a rare or contextually difficult word, which is often translated simply by the corresponding Irish term, though longer explanations are also sometimes given. In addition to these bare lexical glosses, there are morphosyntactic and pragmatic glosses, that is to say, explanations on a particular morphological, syntactic or pragmatic aspect of the Latin text. Apart from these 'linguistic' glosses, which may be of various sizes, the glossators may also comment on some cultural, religious or historical point implied or mentioned in the Latin text.¹

¹ Hofman (1996: i.83–93) provides a more sophisticated classification of the function of the Old Irish glosses. For a wider perspective of the use and function of the glosses in the Western non-Romance vernacular literatures, see Schiegg (2016) and Blom (2017).

The practical consequence of the previous description is that the Old Irish gloss must be interpreted together with the Latin text, passage or word to which it refers, a point emphasized by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 6), who went so far as to say that the Latin text and its corresponding Old Irish gloss should be taken as two constitutive parts of one and the same linguistic message. One may understand and largely share this claim by Mac Coisdealbha, who was one of the first scholars to study systematically syntactic and pragmatic aspects of the language of the Old Irish glosses. To be sure, the Old Irish glossators also made annotations in Latin, and hybrid glosses that combine Latin and Old Irish material are not uncommon, but Mac Coisdealbha probably has more in mind cases in which an exclusively Irish gloss anaphorically refers to some element mentioned in the Latin text, so that one can assume that both texts constitute a pragmatic or discourse unit. Nevertheless, cases in which the Latin text and its Old Irish gloss are related only notionally are typical. This is not to say that a proper understanding of the Old Irish text does not need to take into consideration the Latin context, but the connection between them is in this case not even relevant for the pragmatic interpretation of the Irish message.

The types of glosses just mentioned are all represented in the three main collections of glosses quoted above, though there are some differences between the collections, and a brief mention of the Latin texts to which they refer may serve to explain, to some extent at least, the prevalent nature of the glosses on each collection. Thus, the (at least three) Old Irish scholars who wrote the Wb glosses on the Pauline Epistles were mainly concerned with conceptual and theological questions, and this is probably why their comments tend to be longer and more elaborate. The Ml glosses are added to Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary of the Psalter, and many of them are aimed at making clear the pragmatic aspects (e.g. the addressee, the speaker) of the frequent interpellations of David to God. Finally, the (apparently, three) authors of the Sg glosses on Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae* devote much of their efforts to the translation of particularly difficult Latin words quoted in the text, as well as technical terms used or meant in the grammatical explanations. Hofman's (1993: 122) conclusion on the preoccupations of the Sg glossators can therefore be applied to the remaining collections: "the glossators focused pretty narrowly upon Latin, explaining Latin phenomena through other Latin phenomena (and authors) without thinking of turning aside to the vernacular." In sum, the Old Irish glosses have a merely instrumental value, and this means that the Old Irish language used in them is not a goal in itself.

The corpus of Old Irish contemporaneous texts compiled in the *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus* still constitutes the basis for every study on Old Irish. The editorial procedure most often followed by Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903) involves maintaining the form attested in the original document, so that what they offer is a rather diplomatic edition of the texts, i.e. the forms are mostly rendered in the way they are attested in the manuscript, with minimal or no philological manipulation.

In relatively more recent times, the linguistic material of the manuscripts of the Old Irish contemporaneous texts has received a systematic analysis and presentation, and alternative readings for difficult places have been proposed by some scholars. Due to their thorough character, the following contributions should be mentioned at this moment: Kavanagh (2001) offers a glossary of Wb; Hofman (1996) and Hofman and Moran (2014) include not only the Old Irish, but also the Latin glosses of Sg and comment on them, whereas Griffith (2012) and Bauer (2015) offer a very rich and sophisticated digital glossary of Ml and Sg respectively, with a systematic linguistic analysis of the forms; Griffith and Stifter (2014) offer quite a number of corrected ms. readings of Ml.

Some relevant aspects of the language of the Old Irish glosses will be dealt with in the next sections, in which some glosses are also given in order to illustrate the type of text that represents the main basis of this study. At the moment, it is enough to say that those contemporaneous texts offer a fairly complete picture of Old Irish, at least in its more basic and systematic features. Certainly, the fact that they are mainly texts of an expository nature represents a certain limitation and, in fact, some phenomena relevant for the present study such as the responsive clause type (Chapter 7), or the syntactic structures known as *tmesis* and *Bergin's Law* (Chapter 3) are only seldom or never found in the language of the Glosses.

1.3.2 Texts attested in later manuscripts

Some other texts, mainly of a literary nature, and transmitted in manuscripts copied at a later date, were most likely composed in the Old Irish period as well. This chronology is assumed on the basis of linguistic features attributable to that period that can be observed in the text. See e.g. Stifter's (2015: 52–58) discussion on the assumable composition date of *The Poems of Blathmac* (= *Blathm.*). These later copies made possible the survival of various texts that would otherwise have been lost. However, the consequence of this process of manuscript copying is that

the original linguistic form has been changed more or less according to the language of the moment at which the text was copied, typically in the Middle Irish period.

Due largely to the linguistic changes displayed by the copies in which they have come to us, the editing of those assumable Old Irish texts represents a difficult endeavor. In this very respect, McCone (1996b: 28–29) considers four basic editorial policies, to wit, diplomatic, ‘codex optimus’, critical and normalized. The four types are ordered according to the degree of philological (in the widest sense of the term) manipulation of the text, which is minimal in the diplomatic and maximal in the normalized type. Whereas the first two types essentially consist of rendering the forms as they stand in the manuscript, the critical and normalized types involve the use of linguistic arguments and the latter aims at restoring the original text in its linguistically Old Irish shape, so that a brief reference to the difference between these two editorial strategies seems in order. As McCone (1996b: 28–29) notes, the critical method works on the basis of extant manuscripts of a given text and tries to establish their common source, which does not need to be the original text. In order to illustrate the potential difference between this and the normalizing editorial procedure, McCone refers to Thurneysen’s (1935) edition of *Scéla Muicce Meic Da Thó* (= Sc.M², ‘Tidings of the pig of MacDathó’) on the basis of three manuscripts. Though the estimated date for the original text is about 800 AD, the version from which these three manuscripts must have been copied dates from the 10th or 11th centuries, judging from some linguistic innovative forms appearing in all extant manuscripts that are not Old Irish (e.g. the 2SG *tánacais* ‘you came’ in Sc.M² §11, with hypercharacterizing ending *-ais*, instead of the Old Irish regular form *tánac*). With respect to the critical edition, which does not go back in time beyond the version of the 10th or 11th centuries, the normalized one would go one step further and would restore the presumable original form according to the Old Irish standard determined on the basis of the contemporaneous texts referred to in the previous section, even regardless of the manuscript evidence.

The difference between the actually attested text or texts and the restored (or reconstructed) one of a normalized edition may be considerable, an idea of which may be gained by examining McCone’s (= McCone 2000) edition of the narrative *Echtrae Chonnlai* (= EC, ‘The adventure of Connlae’). To mention only one example related to verbal morphology, McCone (2000: 128) edits EC §1 *boíe*, the absolute relative clause type 3SG preterite form of the so-called substantive verb (‘who was (in ...)’), a form that is attested in the contemporaneous texts, and which is considered here in Section 4.6.2. However, the form that appears in the extant manuscripts is *boí* (i.e. the corresponding absolute declarative clause type form).

This simple case perfectly illustrates the manner in which normalization goes beyond the strict limits of the critical method, which would propose only *boí*.

A further observation on the possible problems of the critical and normalizing editorial practices hitherto considered is that it is sometimes not completely clear what the Old Irish norm may be. A form in Meid's (2019) edition of the narrative *Táin Bó Froích* (= TBF, lit. 'The Cattle Raid of Froech') perfectly illustrates this point. Instead, or rather, on the basis of the manuscript reading *tairlengait*, which shows an absolute declarative clause type ending *-ait*, Meid (2019: 44,145) correctly edits TBF 38 *tairlengat* 'they dismount', the 3PL present indicative of the compound verb *do-airling* 'descends', with the conjunct ending *-at* expected in an Old Irish lexical compound. The problem of the edited form *tairlengat* is that it could also have been *do-airlengat* in Old Irish, i.e. with the full form of the lexical preverb *to-* (for which, see Sections 2.3.2 and 2.4.2 below) in pretonic position.

In other words, one may confidently formulate an Old Irish linguistic standard, according to the relatively uniform picture of the language used in the contemporaneous texts, but this language also displays a certain amount of variation. This important feature of the language of the Glosses will be addressed in the next section.

The Old Irish texts transmitted in later manuscripts therefore have a relative value as witnesses of the Old Irish language, though, of course, they cannot be dismissed for its study, especially when they provide further evidence for a given phenomenon firmly established on the basis of the contemporaneous evidence. An example of this procedure is, I think, the study on the deadjectival preverbs in García-Castillero (2014) summarized in Section 2.3.3 below, which – on the basis of Thurneysen's (1946) scattered observations – takes the evidence of the contemporaneous texts to state the class as such as well as most of the preverbs involved, whereas texts attested in later manuscripts provide more instances of those preverbs and a couple of them not found in the contemporaneous texts. In lexical issues, especially, the independent evidence provided by texts attested at a later date may be handled with some confidence. However, for the definition of most of the basic morphosyntactic rules, the texts attested in later manuscripts play a fairly secondary role.

1.4 The Old Irish Glosses as a linguistic document

The aim of this section is to introduce two general aspects of the Old Irish Glosses that characterize their language as a rather spontaneous linguistic production. First, Section 1.4.1 illustrates in some detail the relationship between two Old Irish Glosses and their corresponding Latin text. Second, Section 1.4.2 lists a

number of cases of linguistic variation that can be observed in the corpus provided by the Glosses.

1.4.1 Some Old Irish glosses

Two Old Irish glosses attached to two Latin passages are given below in order to illustrate the medium and more or less long types mentioned above in Section 1.3.1 respectively. Special attention will be paid in this section to the manner in which the Old Irish linguistic material can be interpreted according to the Latin context.

First, the gloss in (2), which may be deemed as of medium size, serves to illustrate how the pragmatic roles of the terms involved in a given passage of the Latin text are made clear by the glossator.

- (2) *ambás tiagmeni doáirci bethid dúibsi .i. is arbethid dúibsi tiágmíni bás* (Wb 15b28)

a ^N -bás	tiag-me-ni	
ART.NOM.SG.N-death/NOM.SG.N	go/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL-NA.1PL	
do-áir-ci	beth-id	dú-ib-si
PV·DECL/PV-cause/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	life-ACC.SG.M	to-2PL-NA.2PL
is-ar-beth-id		dú-ib-si
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-for-life-ACC.SG.M		to-2PL-NA.2PL
tiágmí-ni	bás	
go/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.DECL-NA.1PL	death/ACC.SG.N	
'the death to which we go causes life unto you; that is, it is for the sake of life to you that we go to death'.		

This Wb gloss is attached to the Latin sentence *Ergo mors in nobis operatur, uita autem in uobis* 'so that death works in us; life, however, in you'. In the general context of this Latin sentence, the term that is being dealt with and repeatedly referred to is *mors* 'death', which constitutes the topic of the Latin sentence to which the Old Irish gloss is added. This pragmatic role is quite faithfully reflected in the first sentence of the gloss, in which *ambás tiagmeni* 'the death to which we go' (lit. 'the death which we go') is an extracausal left-dislocated constituent (see Section 3.3 below), which directly precedes the clause initial declarative verb *doáirci* 'it causes'. In the Latin sentence quoted above, the conceptually opposite Latin term *uita* 'life' is confronted with this topic, a contrast reinforced by *autem*. This contrastive value of *uita* in the Latin text is further reflected in the Old Irish

gloss by means of the cleft-sentence *is arbethid dúibsi tiágmíni bás*, in which the prepositional phrase with the corresponding form of the Old Irish noun *bethu* ‘life’ occupies the focused position (see Section 3.2 below). Note that both syntactic structures in (2), the one with a left-dislocated constituent and the cleft-sentence dealt with at length in Chapter 3 below, are constituted by almost the same lexical elements and basically have the same propositional content, namely the causal relationship that the glossator establishes between the ‘death’ and the ‘life’ of the Latin passage.

Second, a somewhat longer gloss is given in (3), which comments on the Latin expression *Vos autem estis corpus Christi, et membra de membro* ‘you constitute Christ’s body, however, and are members of a member’. After a long digression on the various ways in which the members of the (human) body relate to each other and to the whole body, as an example of the abstract idea of variety in unity, this Latin sentence reassumes the point at issue in the Pauline Epistle, i.e., the spiritual unity of Christians.

- (3) *issuaichnid tra cid diatuiced incosmuilius cosse .i. amal file óentid eterbaullu coirp duini conroib oíntu etrunni dano hore ammicorp crist et ammi-boill coirp crist* (Wb 12b12)

is-suaichnid		tra		cid
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-apparent/NOM.SG.N		then		WH.SG.N
di-a ^N .t-uic-ed		in-cosmuilius		
for-OBL.REL.PV-put-PRET.PASS.3SG		ART.NOM.SG.M-similitude/NOM.SG.M		
co-sse	amal	fil-e		óent-id
to-PROX.ACC.SG.N	as	SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL		unity-ACC.SG.M
eter-baull-u		coirp		duini
between-member-ACC.PL.M		body/GEN.SG.M		man/GEN.SG.M
co ^N .roi-b		oínt-u		etr-un-ni
so that·PERF-SUBSTV.PRES.SUBJ.3SG		unity-NOM.SG.M		between-1PL-NA.1PL
dano hore	ammi-corp			crist et
also because	COP.PRES.IND.1PL.DECL-body/NOM.SG.M			Christ and
ammi-boill		coirp		crist
COP.PRES.IND.1PL.DECL-member/NOM.PL.M		body/GEN.SG.M		Christ

‘i.e. it is apparent, then, for what the similitude has been put hitherto, to wit, as there is unity among the members of a human being’s body, that there be union among us also, because we are Christ’s body and we are members of Christ’s body’.

The gloss in (3) emphasizes the fact that the Latin sentence to which it is attached restates the main idea of spiritual unity, and explicitly establishes the conceptual link between the example developed up to that point (*cosse* ‘hitherto’), summarized in the subordinate clause introduced by *amal* ‘as’, and the idea of unity among Christians, expressed in the clause introduced by the substantive verb to express an existential predicate: *conroib ointu...* lit. ‘so that there be union...’. Somewhat unexpectedly, the form *conroib* is a consecutive subordinate clause, and not a (main) declarative clause, probably because the glossator wanted to state its character of logical consequence of the previous part. The gloss ends with an almost literal translation of the Latin text introduced by the causal subordinating conjunction *hore* ‘because’, with the declarative clause type form of the copula. The glossator expresses in this manner that his previous statements are justified in the sense of the Latin text. Note incidentally that the Old Irish scholar includes himself in the intended audience of the Epistle when he uses the 1st person corresponding to the 2PL of the Latin text.

The gloss in (3) is quite representative of the syntactic complexity that may be found in lengthy texts included in the contemporaneous manuscripts: it contains six verbal complexes, three declarative forms (the copular predicates *is-suaichnid*, *ammi-corp* and *ammi-boill*, the latter two introduced by the subordinating conjunction *hore* ‘because’), two relative forms (*diatuiced* and *file*, the former dependent on *cid* ‘what’ and the latter on *amal* ‘as’), and the form *conroib* as a consecutive subordinate, as already stated.

Two concluding observations can be made about the Old Irish Glosses exemplified in (2) and (3). On the one hand, and in line with what has also been stated in Section 1.3.1 above, they serve the sole purpose of commenting on a specific aspect of a Latin text, i.e. they have a very concrete and contingent purpose and the scholars who wrote them actually had a reduced number of potential readers in mind. The Old Irish Glosses are thus different to literary texts, which aim at a broader audience and have more general purposes. On the other, glosses of that type are numerous enough as to provide a sufficient corpus in which hypotheses about the use of various syntactic structures may be tested with some confidence.

1.4.2 Linguistic variation in the Old Irish Glosses

A non-dismissible aspect of the linguistic evidence of the Glosses that deserves mention in this introductory chapter is that it shows a certain degree of variation, most probably due to the lack of an explicit grammatical and orthographical norm. Though the borderline between linguistic and mere graphic variation is not

always easy to state, this section focuses on the former, whereas the latter is mentioned in Section 1.5.

The six cases mentioned in this section are related to the Old Irish verbal complex, and it is not an exhaustive list. The first two, i.e. (i) and (ii), have already been dealt with elsewhere by the present author, and receive no systematic treatment in this study, so that they will be briefly described with the corresponding bibliographical reference. The remaining cases are here simply mentioned and the reader is referred to the corresponding section, in which they are analyzed in detail.

The cases of this type of variation mentioned in this section are (i) the use of prototonic instead of deuterotonic form in some specific lexical compounds, (ii) the variable position of the conjunct particle *ro* within the verbal complex, (iii) the variation of lenition and nasalization marking in bare relative forms with an m./f. sg. object antecedent, to be discussed in Section 4.7.3, and (iv) the variation between nasalizing relative and declarative clause type forms after some subordinating conjunctions, considered in Section 5.6.2. Whereas these four cases can be observed in all three collections of glosses, there seems to have been a change in the period of hundred years or so that goes from Wb, on the one hand, to Ml and Sg, on the other: this is clear in the case of (v) the use of relative mutations in simple verbs, something initially found only in compound verbs; see Section 4.7.4 for this issue. Finally, (vi) the different vocalism of Classes B and C of infixed pronouns in Wb and Ml is considered in Section 2.6.

Point (i) is precisely the possibility mentioned in Section 1.4.2 above that the form *tairlengat* ‘they dismount’ (i.e. the prototonic form) may also appear as *do-airlengat* (i.e. the deuterotonic one). Old Irish lexical compounds that have a lexical preverb with the shape CV- (i.e. *do-*) and a tonic part beginning with a vowel, i.e. *-airlengat* (henceforth CV₁-V₂C(-)) may appear in the prototonic form CV₂C(-) (i.e. *tairlengat*) in cases in which the deuterotonic form CV₁-V₂C(-) (i.e. *do-airlengat*) is expected. The implications and reasons for these two forms, namely, for the prototonic and deuterotonic forms respectively, are considered in Section 2.4.2 below; the important point at the moment is the very existence of a remarkable formal variation, which is determined by several factors considered in García-Castillero (2015a).

Point (ii) represents a case of variation that is due to the process of morphological externalization of the conjunct particle *ro-* during the Old Irish period, as stated in García-Castillero (2013a). The pair of forms Ml 38a13 *nimthorgaith* ‘(my expectation) has not deceived me’, and Wb16a22 *niruthógait sam* ‘we have not deceived’, both of the lexical compound *do-gáitha* illustrate this variation: whereas the former has the particle *ro-* (without vowel) directly after *-tho-*, i.e. in a more

internal position, the latter has it in its full form before *-thó-*, i.e. in a more external position. Note that the form with externalized *ro-* is that of Wb, whereas it is the Ml form in which the original position of that particle is preserved, so that the externalization of *ro-* is an ongoing process already at the time of Wb.

The limited scope and aim of the Old Irish texts considered in this study and illustrated in Section 1.4.1 as well as the linguistic variation exemplified in this section are two circumstances that clearly point to the idea that the Glosses represent a rather spontaneous linguistic production, with little or no literary intention on the part of the Old Irish glossators.

1.5 On the sounds and spelling in the Old Irish contemporaneous texts

This section aims at providing the reader with the spelling rules, tendencies and possibilities of variation that can be found in the Old Irish forms. The most adequate way to do this is to introduce first the phonological system that may be assumed for Old Irish, and to see later how that reality is reflected in the spelling used in the contemporaneous texts. As is well-known, Old Irish makes morphological use of some phonological distinctions, namely the so-called mutations. These morphophonological markers (the mutations known as lenition and nasalization) play an important role in the verbal morphology, in particular in clause type marking, and will be dealt with in Section 2.5. This section introduces the phonological description of the lenited sounds: Section 1.5.1 gives the basic description of the Old Irish phonological system, the spelling of which is considered in Section 1.5.2.

1.5.1 The Old Irish phonological system

The present description is based on recent or relatively recent accounts, namely, those of McCone (1996a: 26–35, 2005: 12–19) and Stifter (2009: 61–64), and therefore excludes the series of velarized consonants proposed by earlier scholars.

The Old Irish consonant system is based on the labial, dental and velar articulatory places for stops, which vary according to the following features: (i) [\pm voiced]; (ii) [\pm lenited] (or lenis vs fortis; note that the lenited versions of the stops are fricatives); (iii) [\pm palatalized]. The features (ii) and (iii) apply also to the nasal /m/, /n/, the lateral /r/ and /l/ consonants, as well as to the sibilant /s/ (the lenited version of which is the aspiration /h/). The velarized nasal /ŋ/ shows only

variation according to the [\pm palatalized] feature. There is no doubt about the existence of the sound /h/ in Old Irish, at least when it is the outcome of the lenition of /s/.

Whereas the opposition voiced vs voiceless has no distributional restrictions, the consonants that precede immediately the stressed vowel are unlenited, and lenited sounds in that position are due to the effect of this morphophonological mutation (i.e. of lenition). Both this mutation and nasalization are described in Section 2.5 below. Word internally, both lenited and unlenited consonants may appear. The palatal or non-palatal character of the consonant before the stressed vowel is automatically determined by the palatal (i.e. /e/ and /i/) or non-palatal (i.e. /o/, /a/ and /u/) character of that vowel; however, the palatal character of consonants after the stressed vowel is phonemic, and it often has morphological value in itself.

There are in sum forty-five consonantal phonemes in Old Irish, included in Table 1.1. I make use of the symbols in the International Phonetic Alphabet, in line with Stifter's contribution quoted at the beginning of this section. In Table 1.1, the fortis vs lenis variants have been put one after another, so that they can easily be checked in order to find out most leniting effects.

Tab. 1.1: Old Irish consonants

	Voiceless plosive	Voiceless fricative	Voiced plosive	Voiced fricative	Fortis nasal	Lenis nasal	Fortis liquid	Lenis liquid
Labial	/p/ /pʲ/	/f/ /fʲ/	/b/ /bʲ/	/β/ /βʲ/	/m/ /mʲ/	/ṽ/ /ṽʲ/		
Dental	/t/ /tʲ/	/θ/ /θʲ/	/d/ /dʲ/	/ð/ /ðʲ/	/n:/ /n:ʲ/	/n/ /nʲ/	/l:/ /l:ʲ/	/l/ /lʲ/
							/r:/ /r:ʲ/	/r/ /rʲ/
Alveolar		/s/ /sʲ/ (probably = /ʃ/)						
Velar	/k/ /kʲ/	/x/ /xʲ/	/g/ /gʲ/	/ɣ/ /ɣʲ/	/ŋ/ /ŋʲ/			
Glottal		/h/						

The Old Irish vocalic system includes the five standard positions with a general opposition of length, in addition to a mid-central vowel /ə/, which has no long counterpart. See Table 1.2 below for a schematic presentation. The distribution of the vowels is the following: (i) in stressed and absolute final positions (which can be stressed or unstressed), all vowels (long and short) appear with the exception of /ə/, though long vowels are less frequent in unstressed absolute final position; (ii) in unstressed medial position, only /u/ and /ə/ appear.

Both the vowels and the diphthongs show a great deal of diachronic and merely graphic variation, and it is not always easy to decide which of the two

possibilities is involved; see e.g. the case of the alternation between spellings with <u> and <o> for the element which is given as *no-* in Section 2.3.1, or the problem discussed in Section 9.5.3 fn. Among the diphthongs with /j/ glide, i.e. /aj/, /oj/, /uj/, the first two are in the process of being fused already in Old Irish, judging from the frequent confusion in their spelling. The diphthongs with /w/ glide may have either long or short /a/, /e/, /i/ as their first member, (i.e. /a(:)w/, /e(:)w/, /i(:)w/), and it seems that /a:w/ is being monophthongized as /o:/ (cf. *atáu* and *ató* for ‘I am (in...)’; see Section 9.3), and /aw/ as /u/. These diachronic variants are not included in Table 1.3.

Tab. 1.2: Old Irish vowels

	Front	Central	Back
High	/i:/ /i/		/u/ /u:/
Middle	/e:/ /e/	/ə/	/o/ /o:/
Low		/a:/ /a/	

Tab. 1.3: Old Irish diphthongs

Vowel – <i>j</i> -glide	Vowel – <i>w</i> -glide	Glide – vowel
/uj/	/iw/ /i:w/	
/oj/	/ew/ /e:w/	
/aj/	/au/ /a:w/	/ja/ /ua/

Tables 1.1 to 1.3 offer the phonological subsystems of the Old Irish language. The spelling used to render these sounds are given in Tables 1.4 to 1.6 in the next section.

1.5.2 The spelling of the Old Irish sounds in the contemporaneous manuscripts

The Old Irish writers use the Latin alphabet, but with the phonemic values with which the Romano-British speakers pronounced Latin. This is due to the fact that the Christianization of Ireland during the 5th and 6th centuries was carried throughout by Romano-British people. As Russell (2005: 416) puts it, “[t]he well documented influence of British ecclesiastics and the regular contact between Britain and Ireland seem to have led to the adoption of this British Latin correspondence between sound and symbol in the spelling of Old Irish.” One of the

consequences of this fact is the ambiguity of some letters used by the Old Irish scholars.

As for the consonants, the writing system most normally used in the Old Irish contemporaneous texts can be summarized in the following four rules. (i) <ph>, <th>, and <ch> unequivocally mark the corresponding voiceless fricatives /f/, /θ/ and /x/ in any position. (ii) <p>, <t>, and <c> reflect the corresponding fortis sounds when immediately preceding the stressed vowel, i.e. at the beginning of the word or after a pretonic element. (iii) <p>, <t>, and <c> after the stressed vowel in postvocalic or postconsonantic position stand for either /p/, /t/, and /k/ or /b/, /d/, and /g/. (iv) , <d>, <g>, <m>, <n>, <l>, and <r> express either the corresponding fortis sounds (i.e. /b/, /d/, /g/, /m/, /n:/, /l:/, and /r:/) in word initial position, after a pretonic element and after a consonant, or the corresponding lenis sounds (/v/, /ð/, /ɣ/, /ʃ/, /n/, /l/, and /r/) in word internal position.

Tab. 1.4: The spelling of the Old Irish consonants in the contemporaneous texts

	Voiceless plosive	Voiceless fricative	Voiced plosive	Voiced fricative	Fortis nasal	Lenis nasal	Fortis liquid	Lenis liquid
Labial	<p(p)>	<f, ph>	<b(b)-> <-p(-)>		<m(m)>	<m>		
Dental	<t(t)>	<th>	<d(d)-> <-t(-)>	<d>	<n(n)>	<n>	<l(l)> <r(r)>	<l> <r>
Alveolar		<s>						
Velar	<c(c)>	<ch>	<g(g)-> <-c(-)>	<g>	<ng>			
Glottal		<h>						

Tab. 1.5: The spelling of the Old Irish vowels in the contemporaneous texts

	Front	Central	Back
High	<i, í> <i>		<u> <u, ú>
Middle	<e, é, æ, æ> <e, æ>		<o> <o, ó>
Low		<a, á> <a>	

Tab. 1.6: The spelling of the Old Irish diphthongs in the contemporaneous texts

Vowel – j-glide	Vowel – w-glide	Glide – vowel
<uí, ui>	<iu> <íu, iu>	
<óí, oí, óe, oe>	<eu> <éu, eu>	
<aí, aí, áe, ae>	<au> <áu, au>	<ía, ia> <úa, ua>

The graphic geminates <bb>, <dd>, <gg>, <mm>, <nn>, <ll>, and <rr> might also be found to express the fortis variants /b/, /d/, /g/, /m/, /n:/, /l:/, and /r:/ directly

before the stressed vowel, but this is very rare in the case of the stops, and somewhat less rare for the nasals and liquids. See Feuth (1983: 148–151), for a collection of the cases found in the Glosses.

As for palatalization, the consonants that immediately precede stressed vowels are identified as palatal or not depending on the vowel, as stated above, and no special graphic device is used to differentiate them. For consonants after the stress vowel, the following three cases are characteristic. (i) A palatal consonant after a stressed /a/, /o/, /u/, and /e/ is often marked by adding <i> between that vowel and the consonant: thus, *léicid* ‘leaves’ stands for /'l'e:gʲəðʲ/, *beirid* ‘brings’ for /'b'ɛrʲəðʲ/. (ii) A palatal consonant followed by /a/, /o/, /u/ can be marked by the insertion of <e,i> before that vowel (i.e. -ea, -eo, -iu), as in *-léicea* ‘(s)he may leave’ /-'l'e:gʲa/ or *guidiu* ‘I pray’ /'guðʲu/. (iii) A non-palatal consonant followed by /e/ or /i/ can be marked with an <a>, e.g. *lug(a)e* ‘oath’ /'luɣe/. The use of the glide vowel to mark the palatal character of a consonant is a tendency, but not a systematic rule in Old Irish texts attested in contemporary manuscripts.

Due to variability in the notation of palatal sounds, the interpretation of vowels and, in particular, diphthongs is another source of ambiguity in the Old Irish spelling system, in addition to that of the representation of voiceless and voiced medial stops noted above.

1.6 The representation of the Old Irish verbal complex in this study

Following García-Castillero (2013a: 112 fn.5), I offer the Old Irish verbs in basically three ways: (i) the attested form; (ii) the surface morphological analysis; (iii) the underlying morphological analysis. The details and basic reasons for each of these representations are given in turn.

First, the starting point in every case will be the attested form, mostly as edited in the *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*. This involves maintaining the spelling as a single graphical word or in separated elements, as observed in Section 2.2.3 below, and of course with the formal variation noted in Section 1.4.2 and with the graphical variants described in Section 1.5.2, among others. These forms are provided with their reference if they are only quoted in the current text. Despite its basic diplomatic character, on some occasions, the form edited by Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903) involves changing the actually attested form in a non-irrelevant manner. In these cases, if the manuscript reading is or may be significant for some reason, this will be made explicit, with the exception of the case in which the pretonic part of the verbal complex is written separately in the manuscript; in this case, I prefer to maintain the original spelling. As usual, these Old

Irish forms are quoted in italics, and the normal type that may appear in parts of these forms are the outcome of a restoration by the editors.

Second, the surface morphological analysis of the verbal complexes, which is applied to the attested form and is also used in the linguistic glosses, marks the boundaries between the components by means of hyphens, with the sole exception of the boundary between pretonic and tonic part of the verbal complex, which is marked by means of the elevated dot typically used in Celtic linguistics; if they are relevant for the analysis, the markers for the mutations signaled above (i.e. ^L for lenition and ^N for nasalization), and for palatalization (ʲ) will also be applied. Absence of mutation is left unmarked, contrary to other scholars, who use superscript ^H in those places in which mutation may (but does not) take place. The linguistic glosses of the examples are based on the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

Third, for the sake of clarity, the underlying form of the verbal complex or of some of its components will also be given along with the analysis in order to make clear some specific point about the constituency of the verbal complex at stake that – for some reason – has been blurred in the Old Irish form. In addition to the conventions included in the previous analysis, this type of representation – which is given in square brackets and normal type – restores the form that may be diachronically assumed for one or more of the components of the verbal complex, and makes use of the notation of the components as they are presented in Chapter 2, in particular the pretonic elements in Section 2.3 and the pronominal affixes in Section 2.6. Since the focus is on the morphological constituency of the Old Irish verbal complex, I do not apply the phonological transliteration according to the phonological description in Section 1.5.1, nor give I an etymological form for the verbal stem which differs from the attested form. Such a representation would most often bring about too big of a formal distance between attested form and analysis, the main aim of which is to make clear the morphological composition of the form at stake.

Not every form needs to be rendered in the three ways alluded to, the essential one being of course the attested one. Some verbal complexes have a fairly simple structure, e.g. the irregular absolute declarative 3SG present indicative form Ml 67d24 *teit* '(s)he goes', which marks the 3SG by means of the final palatalized /dʲ/. Cases with discontinuous spelling, such as Ml 37a10 *nad fetammar* (quoted in Table 2.6) may require morphological analysis in order to make clear the pretonic part, apart from the non-explicit but assumable mutation, as in *nad-^Nfeta-mm̄ar*. On other occasions, however, the diachronically underlying form may help to understand the form, as in the case of the *f*-future Wb 11d3 *foirfea* 'which will produce' (also in Table 2.6), which may be represented as [fo·(f)irf^f-a] in order to make clear its paradigmatic ascription to the verb *fo-fera*.

To conclude this section, something should be said about the verbal forms that are presented in the various paradigms proposed in this study, especially in Chapters 4, 7 and 8, because some of these forms are actually not attested in the Old Irish Glosses or elsewhere. In Chapter 9 on the Old Irish copula and substantive verb, by contrast, the paradigms proposed are based only on attested forms. Anyway, since the notion of paradigm and the assumption of paradigmatic relationships play a relevant role in this study, the non-Celtist reader must know that, as is usually the case in Celtic linguistics, I follow the procedure that Weigel (2013: 484–485), in a contribution on precisely this problem, observes in Thurneysen (1946), that is to say, the invented or retrieved forms appearing in the paradigm of a given verb are only proposed on the basis of analogous forms attested for analogous verbs.

1.7 The notion of clause typing

This section establishes the theoretical basis of the grammatical category termed clause typing and introduces the clause types expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex. Section 1.7.1 establishes the role of illocutionary force as the pragmatic basis of clause typing, and Section 1.7.2 discusses the terminological choice for this grammatical category. After that, Section 1.7.3 introduces the six clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex and considers the cross-linguistic evidence provided in the literature for each of them.

1.7.1 Illocutionary force, clause typing, and clause types

The term clause typing refers to a grammatical category and is based on the pragmatic phenomenon usually called illocutionary force in the linguistic literature. This pragmatic principle was proposed within the speech act theory of John L. Austin and John Searle (see Sadock 2004 for references), and has been incorporated into various linguistic theories: e.g., in Generative Linguistics, Speas and Tenny (2003: 317); in Role and Reference Grammar, Van Valin (2005: 10); in Discourse Functional Grammar, Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 68); in Systemic Functional Linguistics, Matthiessen (2004: 610) uses the term “mood” for this category. In a rather intensional definition, illocutionary force is part of the pragmatic component of the language and corresponds to the intention of the speaker to modify the addressee(s) behavior and/or cognitive situation when the former presents some propositional content or, in more general terms, some linguistic expression to the latter. In more specific (or extensional) terms, reference is made

to the speaker's intention to get some piece of information from the addressee(s), or the other way around, i.e. to confer the addressee(s) some piece of information, and to change or direct the behavior of the addressee(s).

The term used in this study for the conventionalized, i.e. the grammatical expression of illocutionary force is clause typing. The term clause type refers to the specific function formally distinguished within this general category, e.g. 'imperative clause type', or 'interrogative clause type'. In a language such as Old Irish, in which the category of clause typing is expressed in the verbal morphology, it will be necessary to speak about 'imperative (clause type) form' or 'declarative (clause type) morphology'.

This basic notion of clause typing and clause type(s) is also stated by Portner (2009: 262–263), who, within the general category of illocutionary force mentioned above, further distinguishes between 'sentential force', i.e. "the conversational uses conventionally associated with" clause types, and 'illocutionary force', i.e. "the type of communicative act which the speaker intends on a particular occasion." The above notion of clause typing coincides with the German term 'Satzmodus' (roughly, 'clause mood'), in the way this term is used by Altmann (1993) and Hentschel (1998: 181–182). The latter considers 'Satzmodus' as standing in an intermediate position between the propositional meaning (the logical meaning), and the "illokutive Bedeutung, die häufig, aber keineswegs immer mit der Grundfunktion des Satzmodus übereinstimmt" ['the illocutive meaning, which often but not always coincides with the basic function of clause typing']: "Satzmodi sind sprachliche Markierungen auf Satzebene, die zwischen der Proposition und der Illokution vermitteln, indem sie für bestimmte grundlegende illokutive Akte standardisierte Ausdrucksformen zur Verfügung stellen" ['Clause types are linguistic markers at the clausal level, which stand between proposition and illocution, since they provide conventionalized expressions for specific basic illocutive acts']. For a more fine-grained classification, see Zaefferer (1987).

In order to explain the directive intention of an English declarative clause type such as *I wonder if you can tell me the time*, that is to say, the phenomenon of 'indirect' illocution, Portner (2009: 263) distinguishes between the sentential force of assertion and the illocutionary force of asking. In a similar manner, in his study on the Irish subjunctive, McQuillan (1997: 1) refers to a 'directive' illocutionary force as a 'semantic / pragmatic notion' that involves "commitment to action, desirability of action, intention to bring about action or an event either through the speaker's own agency and/or that of others." Though this directive force can be expressed by the imperative, present subjunctive, and future indicative, McQuillan (1997: 8) states that the imperative "is by far the preponderant

category used to issue directives,” and that “in terms of frequency it overwhelms any other category.”

The present treatment is semasiologically oriented, so that each clause type formally distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex will be considered as the basic unit of description and analysis, the illocutionary force that they may ‘indirectly’ convey being a relatively secondary issue.

1.7.2 Other notions directly related to clause typing

The core of this study is the formal and functional analysis of the clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex, but this inevitably involves reference to, and sometimes detailed consideration of, three other notions and phenomena, namely, predicate types, pragmatically marked structures, and subordination.

In fact, as noted by Dryer (2007: 224), the term ‘clause type’ has been applied in the linguistic literature to four different notions: (a) formal distinctions expressing illocutionary force (‘clause type’ in this study, but ‘sentence type’ in Dryer’s account); (b) the difference between main and subordinate clauses; (c) strategies of information packaging (which include voice as well as topic and focus variation); and (d) types of predicates (to which Dryer applies the term ‘clause type’). In the following, I will offer the reasons why I consider the term ‘clause type’ to be more appropriate for the first meaning. In doing so, I will compare in turn the notion of clause typing just established with the three other meanings on Dryer’s list. At the same time, however, I will also reveal the close relationships between clause typing and each of these other meanings.

First, according to Lyons’ (1999: 149–152) basic definitions of ‘sentence’ (“the maximal unit of grammatical analysis”), and ‘clause’ (which is “composed of a subject and a predicate”), sentence and clause may certainly coincide on many occasions, but a sentence represents a unit of higher rank than a clause, since it may contain more than one clause (when it includes a main and a subordinate clause), and since – as a further possibility noted by Van Valin (2005: 4–6), among others – it also includes other syntactic constituents which are normally excluded from the clausal domain such as dislocated Topic or Focus. Old Irish is a regular V1 language and nominal elements appearing before the verb that pertain to the same sentence, in this case, left-dislocated NPs and focused constituents, must be considered as extraclausal constituents. The ‘strategies of information packaging’ mentioned by Dryer are therefore something that can conceivably be distinguished from the bare expression of clause typing in the V1

position. However, it is also clear that a pragmatically based category such as clause typing cannot be considered in isolation without paying attention to the most immediate pragmatic environment. This approach will prove to be fruitful in the study of the Old Irish clause types, and it is probably so in general. This is why Chapter 3, to conclude the introductory part of this study, devotes quite a lot of space to left-dislocation and, as the main structure used to express focusing, cleft-sentence in Old Irish.

Second, the Old Irish verbal complex also distinguishes relative clause types by means of a formal expression that runs parallel to other clause types such as the declarative one. For such subordinate clauses, the term ‘sentence type’ would be inappropriate. By contrast, the term ‘clause type’ allows us to include Old Irish clauses with finite verbs marked as relative as well as other main verbs like imperatives, declaratives, and so on. In this study, the term ‘clause’ will also be applied to main and subordinate clauses, but it must be clearly stated that the Old Irish declarative and relative clause types are not coextensive with these: whereas the relative clause type form may be viewed as a subordinate clause, a declarative clause type form of the Old Irish language does not only appear in main clauses; in other words, declarative clause type forms can be (and in fact are) used in some types of subordinate clauses, as stated in Chapter 5, in which the various formal strategies used in the expression of subordination will be classified. The reason for this asymmetry is the different level of linguistic analysis to which each characterization belongs: whereas ‘declarative (or imperative) clause’ is a pragmatic characterization, ‘main clause’ is a syntactic one. As in the case of the usual coincidence of the functions of topic and subject (and agent) in the nominal field, a declarative clause is most often a main clause, though this is not always true, as Old Irish clearly shows. The definition of the Old Irish relative clause type in terms of illocutionary force will be dealt with in the next section.

Third, the very notion of predicate type, as well as the main types considered in its subcategorization, namely, the basic oppositions between transitive and intransitive predicates, and even between verbal and non-verbal predicates, represents a unit of analysis that leaves out of consideration a constitutive part of the clause, which is the subject. However, clause types and predicate types may coincide on many occasions, and this makes it easy to understand why they have received the same term. Thinking again in terms of the various levels of analysis assumed for NP functions, it seems that predicate types correspond to the semantic level of analysis. Be that as it may, the structural interaction between predicate and clause types as defined here is especially clear in Old Irish, as I hope to show in Chapter 4, in which the paradigmatic design of the clause type expression for transitive and inherently intransitive clauses such as the passive is considered,

and in Chapter 9, in which the suppletive paradigms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb are analyzed. Once again, I think it is valid in general for all languages.

1.7.3 The clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex

The clause types that are distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex, a morphological structure that will be described in the next chapter, are the declarative, relative, *wh*-interrogative, polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types. With the exception of the relative verb form, the clause types distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex are included in current treatments on this grammatical category (see Sadock and Zwicky 1985, König and Siemund 2007).

The cross-linguistically basic clause types are declarative, interrogative, and imperative, corresponding to the basic illocutions: see Sadock and Zwicky (1985: 160), Lang and Pasch (1988: 8), Dik (1997: 238–239), Hengeveld (2004: 1190–1191), König and Siemund (2007: 277), Hengeveld et alii (2007: 81), Kaufmann (2012: 1–7). Albeit less usual, the responsive can be classified along with the ‘echo systems’ described by Sadock and Zwicky (1985: 191) and König and Siemund (2007: 320–321), who significantly report on the Welsh case. A further ‘minor sentence type’ considered by König and Siemund (2007: 320), the so-called ‘non-finite presentative’, can be found in the Old Irish construction introduced by the particle *os-/ot-* (see García-Castillero 2013b: 23–27 for examples), but the fact that it lacks a clearly finite component has been taken here as the decisive argument for keeping it apart from the proposed system of clause types.

In general, the main feature of relative clauses is that they are basically deprived of illocutionary force: see Lehmann (1984: 169–173), Lang and Pasch (1988: 7), Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 449), Huddleston (1999: 337), Diessel (2001: 437), Cristofaro (2003: 34); as Hengeveld (2004: 1199) says, “...in subordinate clauses basic illocution and illocutionary modification cannot be expressed.” The Old Irish relative verb can therefore be regarded as opposed to the remaining clause types, which do not count in themselves as subordinate verbs. The previous account fully applies to the Old Irish leniting relative clause type and to some uses of the nasalizing relative, but some other uses of the latter must be considered as less subordinate. This difference in the degree of subordinate character is one of the main issues of Chapter 5.

In this regard, it should be stressed that the declarative clause type cannot be seen as a sort of default or neutral type, definable in terms of absence of other clause type characteristics like those of the interrogative or the imperative. As just

observed, the lack of illocutionary force can be assumed for the relative clause. There is probably much work to be done about this issue, but one may preliminarily state that the declarative clause type can be identified both formally and functionally. Formally differentiated declarative clauses can be observed in some languages, either in terms of word order (e.g. the Modern German or Dutch V2 position), specific particles (the so-called enunciative *que* in Gascon dealt with by Pusch 2000), or even specific verbal affixes, as in the Greenlandic Eskimo forms reported by König and Siemund (2007: 278–279) and, more recently, the assertive person endings of Ecuadorian Siona reported by Bruil (2014). The primary function of the declarative clause type is to give information (to the addressee), and Rehbock (1992: 94–95) takes the reference (‘Referenz’) to an object, or – in more general terms – to a given entity or circumstance of the actual world (or of an imagined one) as the distinctive feature of this type of illocution. Devine and Stephens (2006: 150) observe on the difference between declarative and imperative that “[w]e can think of declaratives as being under the scope of an illocutionary operator assert, which favours (but does not require) categorical articulation, while imperatives are under the scope of an illocutionary operator direct, which favours a thetic perspective.” Certainly, it could be argued that the (content) interrogative clause is also related to reference, but the crucial difference lies in the fact that this type of interrogative involves a focused unknown element. Further observations on the distinctive character of the declarative clause type can be found in Sadock and Zwicky (1985: 165–166), Rehbock (1992: 94), König and Siemund (2007: 284–287).

The morphological expression of clause types is not completely unknown in the Indo-European linguistic family, in which there is an imperative form usually characterized by a specific set of endings. The systematic expression of clause types in the morphology of the verbal complex, however, represents a comparatively rare phenomenon in the Indo-European languages.

1.8 Concluding remarks

The linguistic evidence of the Old Irish contemporaneous manuscripts, which was presented in Sections 1.2 to 1.6, is appropriate and representative for the study of the grammatical category of clause typing introduced in Section 1.7.

It is true that written texts may hide proper features of spoken communication, a case in point being the almost complete lack of responsive forms in the language of the Glosses, as already mentioned in Section 1.3.1 above. Furthermore, it is true that, as Hofman (1996: 48) notes, the Glosses are “not representative for ordinary speech in early Medieval Ireland,” for the simple reason that

only a few people talked about Latin texts in the way observed in Section 1.4.1. The linguistic consequence of this situation, as Hofman further observes, is the amount of calques and loan translations in the Old Irish Glosses. However, the fact that the Latin language has exerted a notable influence on the Old Irish vocabulary of the language of the Glosses does not mean that its morphosyntactic and pragmatic aspects must equally be conditioned. In fact, no such interferences are easily found in those fields, and some important and definitory features of the Glosses considered in this chapter allow us to assume that they represent a genuine usage of the language, which could even be closer to oral language than initially expected. Given that their main purpose was to clarify obscure aspects of the Latin text to an Old Irish reader, it is fair to assume that the language should be intelligible for a normal speaker. By their very nature, the Glosses represent discontinuous messages that have very little of planned discourse, not to mention the degree of elaboration of literary texts. The unsystematic spelling described in Section 1.5, as well as the linguistic variation observed in Section 1.4.2, point to a situation in which there was apparently no orthographic or grammatical norms, in the sense of norms taught at the school. In line with the observations by Russell (2005: 444–445), the Glosses must therefore be taken as relatively spontaneous linguistic material that is not determined by any strict norm or literary purpose, and, given this scenario, one may safely expect that they reflect quite faithfully the morphosyntactic and pragmatic traits of the Old Irish language, which are the main fields of research in this study.

2 The Old Irish verbal complex: Morphological structure and components

2.1 Introduction

This chapter centers on the Old Irish verbal complex, which consists of more than the typical verbal expression of the Indo-European finite verb in which there is a stem and an inflectional ending. In this Old Irish morphological structure, the various clause type markers are expressed, along with the markers of other grammatical categories. Though some references to syntactic and semantic aspects are inevitable, what this chapter offers is basically a description of the possible structures the Old Irish verbal complex may adopt, of the constituents it may include, as well as of the rules governing the combination of the latter into the former.

This description will try to adopt a view as free as possible from diachronic considerations, and this may well be why it can depart from previous presentations. Bearing in mind this methodological requirement, the general concern of this chapter is the practical need to take the verbal complex as the basic starting point in the description of the finite verbal expression of the Old Irish language, as well as – as a further issue to be discussed – its status of grammatical or morphosyntactic word. Some basic arguments of a practical nature are discussed immediately below at the beginning of Section 2.2, in which the basic template of the Old Irish verbal complex and the main rules that determine its basic formal variants are also presented. The next four sections offer a detailed account of important components of the verbal complex other than lexical stems: Section 2.3 establishes the types and morphotactic behavior of the preverbal elements, Section 2.4 introduces the notions of deuterotonic and prototonic forms, Section 2.5 deals with the mutations operating in the verbal complex, and Section 2.6 describes the pronominal affixes of the verbal complex as well as the morphological strategies they involve. The affixal status of the components introduced in these four sections is considered in Section 2.7, which rounds off the discussion initiated in Section 2.2. Section 2.8 considers the minimal and maximal constituency as well as some combinatorial restrictions of the Old Irish verbal complex. Section 2.9 summarizes the main points of the chapter.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-002>

2.2 The Old Irish verbal complex: Preliminary notions

The Old Irish verbal complex is a prosodically unitary structure with the verbal stem as its center (or, in the case of copular predicates, with the nominal element as its center), and which also includes the so-called conjunct particles, deadjectival preverbs, lexical preverbs, affixal pronouns, which are either infixes or suffixes, and person endings. These elements or formatives – to use Bickel and Nichols' (2007: 172) general term in a preliminary manner – are mostly of a segmental nature. In addition, the description of the Old Irish verbal complex requires considering the morphophonological markers known as mutations, as well as the allomorphic variation between deuterotonic and prototonic form of lexical compounds.

The main aim of this initial section is to underscore the need to work with the verbal complex as the basic descriptive notion in Old Irish verbal morphology. This constitutes the first argument for the question whether the verbal complex can be considered a 'grammatical word', which is defined by Dixon and Aikhenvald (2002: 7) as the 'inflected form of a lexeme', or to use the equivalent term preferred by Haspelmath (2011: 37 + fn. 9), 'a morphosyntactic word'.

The term 'verbal complex', which has been used in Celtic linguistics for some decades, see e.g. Koch (1987), Acquaviva (1990: 696–698), McCone (1997a: 2, 2006: 1), therefore refers to a morphological structure which comprises more than the simple verbal form with stem and ending usually identified and considered in the traditional analysis of other ancient Indo-European languages such as Greek, Latin, and Old Indic. Certainly, some Old Irish verbal complexes consist of precisely those two components, i.e. the minimal constituency observed in Section 2.8 below, but many other cases include much more than that. The important issue at this moment is that some verbal categories can only be expressed in Old Irish by means of the 'additional' elements or formatives just alluded to. In order to clarify this point, Section 2.2.1 deals with the obligatory character of the pronominal affixes in the Old Irish verbal complex. Once this basic argument has been established, Section 2.2.2 then proceeds to state the schema or template of the Old Irish verbal complex, and Section 2.2.3 offers an overview of the spelling of the verbal complex in the Glosses.

2.2.1 The obligatory character of the affixal pronominal references

The pronominal markers intended are the affixes that have traditionally been called infixes and suffixed pronouns, introduced in Section 2.6 below. These af-

fixal pronouns are not the only obligatory element of the Old Irish verbal complex, but their relevance for the structure of the verbal complex is so clear that they must occupy a prominent position in the discussion on the notion of verbal complex in Old Irish.

These affixal pronominal markers are obligatory in two senses. The first refers to the fact that, roughly speaking, the pragmatically unmarked pronominal references of the clause that have the function of object or subject can only be expressed within the structure of the verbal complex. The second sense involves a stricter notion of obligatoriness, which is that some paradigms can only express person by means of the so-called infixes. These two senses are detailed in turn in the following, and sufficiently fulfill the main criteria put forward by Dixon and Aikhenvald (2002: 18–19) to consider the ‘grammatical word’, which “consists of a number of grammatical elements which (a) always occur together, rather than scattered through the clause...,” “(b) occur in a fixed order,” and “(c) have a conventionalised coherence and meaning.”

First, the pragmatically unmarked pronominal arguments of the clause that express the syntactic roles of subject and object of any type of verb can only be expressed within the structure of the verbal complex. Note that, in this first sense, the pronominal references intended are also expressed by means of inflectional endings, typically for the subject of active transitive and intransitive verbs, and that object affixes are not obligatory for each verbal complex, since objects can be of a nominal nature or do not appear in the clause. However, if such a pragmatically unmarked pronominal reference with the role of object is expressed, it must appear within the structure of the verbal complex. Old Irish also has a set of stressed pronouns, but these forms are mainly used to express pragmatically marked pronominal references, and are excluded from the clausal environment introduced by the finite verb appearing in the first position of the clause. A more detailed description of these pragmatically marked uses of the Old Irish stressed pronouns can be found in Section 10.2.1 below.

The position of the pronominal affixes within the verbal complex depends basically on the lexically simple or compound character of the verb. To give one example, the lexical compound *as-beir* ‘(s)he says’, the basic verb of speaking in Old Irish that represents the lexicalized combination of the lexical preverb *as-* ‘out from’ and the simple verb *beirid* ‘brings’, expresses a pronominal object only by means of an infix between the lexical preverb and the verbal stem: e.g. Wb 2a12 (*amal*) *asndonberat* ‘(as) they say (of) us’ contains the (Class C) infix *-don-* ‘us’ between the preverb *as-* and the verbal stem of *-berat*, a form that is attested in e.g. Ml 24d23 *asberat* ‘they say’. In general, pronominal affixes are not obligatory in the sense that every verbal complex must include at least one. The point

is that a (pragmatically unmarked) pronominal reference such as the 1PL object illustrated in *asndonberat* can only be expressed within the structure of the verbal complex and specifically in that position. This situation meets Dixon and Aikhenvald's (a) and (b) criteria quoted above.

Second, and more importantly, every passive 1st and 2nd person form is obligatorily expressed by means of such pronominal infixes, even in basically simple verbs. Thus, again from the lexical compound *as-beir* '(s)he says', consider e.g. Ml 114a7 *asndanbertheni* 'we used to be called', where *-dan-*, basically the same Class C infix as before, is inserted into the passive 3SG imperfect form *as-berthe*. Lexically simple verbs, i.e. verbs that have no lexical preverb, must also infix the marker with the aid of the semantically void conjunct particle *no-* (also spelled as *nu-*) considered in Section 2.3.1 (iv) below when no other preverb is used, as in e.g. Ml 63c4 *nundan mórthar* '(that) we are magnified' (i.e. *nu^N-dan-mór-thar*), from *móraid* '(s)he magnifies, exalts'. This rule, according to which the passive forms for the 1st and 2nd persons obligatorily involve an infixed pronoun preceded by some sort of preverbal element, has no exceptions in Old Irish. In my view, this requirement is a clear example of Dixon and Aikhenvald's (c) criterion above.

The discussion on the character of 'grammatical' or 'morphosyntactic' word of the Old Irish verbal complex continues in Section 2.7 below, in which all the other formatives that are described in the next sections will be considered. The argument offered in this section, however, allows us to make the following statement: if preverbal elements such as the infixed pronouns are an obligatory component for some specific categories of the Old Irish verbal expression, then they must be included in the basic description of that structure, regardless of the fact that they do not need to be present on every occasion. The templatic structure proposed in the next section is justified on the basis of this conclusion.

2.2.2 The template of the Old Irish verbal complex

The Old Irish verbal complex can be articulated in an overall template of six slots, as in Table 2.1. This structure is partly based on descriptions such as those by McCone (2006: 3–11) and Lewis (1986: 7–9), and with respect to the template presented in García-Castillero (2012, 2013a), it suppresses a final slot, numbered as slot 7, in which the so-called *notae augentes* appear. The *notae augentes*, which are basically pronominal markers repeating a pronominal reference already expressed in the verbal complex as either an affixal pronoun or an inflectional ending, are not obligatory components of the verbal complex, they can be added to

grammatical words other than the verbal complex, and they do not contribute with any grammatical meaning; their function is certainly difficult to grasp. Due to these reasons, these *notae augentes* are not considered systematically in the present work; see Griffith (2008, 2011).

Tab. 2.1: Theoretical template of the Old Irish verbal complex

Slot 1 Particle(s) / preverb	Slot 2 Infixd pronoun	Slot 3 Particle / Preverb(s)	Slot 4 Verbal stem	Slot 5 Inflectional ending	Slot 6 Suffixed pronoun
– Conjunct parti- cle(s)	Classes A, B, C	– Deadjectival preverb	– Present	– Absolute declarative and relative active	
– Deadjec- tival pre- verb		– Lexical pre- verb(s)	– Subjunctive	– Absolute declarative and relative depo- nent and passive	
– Lexical preverb		– <i>ro-</i>	– Future	– Conjunct active	
			– Active preter- ite / perfect	– Conjunct deponent and passive	
			– Passive pret- erite / per- fect	– Active and passive imperative	

Topologically, one may talk about slots 1 and 2 as the left edge, slots 5 and 6 as the right edge, and slots 3 and 4 as the central part of the verbal complex.

Most of the elements included in Table 2.1 will be dealt with in either this or another chapter of this study. An exhaustive list of the elements that appear in slots 1 and 3 is given in Section 2.3. The grammatically relevant mutations are applied to the first sound of the stressed element located in either slot 3 or 4; their phonological, graphic, and positional aspects are introduced in Section 2.5, whereas their functional aspects are discussed in Sections 4.7 and 5.7 below. The infixd pronouns in slot 2 and the suffixed ones in slot 6 are dealt with in Section 2.6, but they are also considered in other chapters, notably in Chapters 4, 8, and 10. For the use of the term ‘affix’ for these elements instead of the more traditional ‘clitic’, I refer to Griffith’s (2011) arguments. Two Old Irish verbs used in the expression of non-verbal predicates, the copula and the substantive verb, will receive a detailed consideration in Chapter 9, in which their suppletive pattern determined by clause type distinctions will be analyzed in detail. Not every ending is described in detail in this study: the reader may consult Sections 4.2 to 4.6 for absolute (declarative and relative) and conjunct active, declarative and passive endings, and Section 7.3 for the specific imperative endings.

Section 2.8 below in this chapter will give a more accurate idea of the maximal and minimal forms of the verbal complex, but this is the moment to state a

basic rule in the inflectional possibilities of the verbal complex regarding affixal pronouns. The verbal complex only admits one affixal pronoun, in either slot 2 or 6, depending on a number of stipulations to be established below. The important point now is that, if slot 2 is occupied, then slot 1 is occupied as well. The contrary does not hold in Old Irish, in which slot 1 may be the sole pretonic element. If slot 6 is occupied (by a pronominal affix), slots 1 to 3 are then unoccupied.

The *notae augentes* are combined with any verbal complex, including cases in which there is a suffixed pronoun in slot 6: e.g. Wb 32d8 *oenichthisom* ‘he unites himself’ [4 *oenich* - 5 (i)th^l - 6 i -som], cf. Breatnach (1977: 87); in this verbal complex, the suffixed pronoun *-i*, with reflexive value, is attached to the simple deponent verb *oénigidir* ‘unites’, that then takes the active ending; see Section 2.6(b) below; *Thes.* ii 242.14 *foitsiside* ‘he sent it’ [4 *foits* - 5 \emptyset - 6 i -side].

The main reason for distinguishing three slots before the verbal stem is their behavior regarding the main stress of the verbal complex. For it is possible to describe in this schema the place of the main stress of the verbal complex by means of two simple rules: (1) if there is no element occupying slot 3, then the accent will fall on the first syllable of the element in slot 4; (2) if slot 3 is occupied by one element (or by more), then the accent will fall on the first syllable of that element (or of the first of them).

These two accentual rules apply in Old Irish irrespective of variables such as the one between suffixed or infixal pronouns just observed or, as a further possibility, the basically simple or compound character of the verb, a point to be dealt with in Section 2.3. That is to say, slot 1 or slots 1 and 2 may be occupied for different reasons, but they always come before the main stress appearing in slots 3 or 4; the presence of a pretonic element of whichever type in slot 1 automatically involves a deuterotonic compound verb. In order to observe the possible deuterotonic forms, and how they can be opposed to the prototonic variant, which is addressed in Section 2.4, it is necessary to first state the preverbal elements of the Old Irish verbal complex, which will be described in Section 2.3.

2.2.3 The spelling of the verbal complex in the contemporaneous texts

In order to round off this introductory presentation of the Old Irish verbal complex, it is worth offering a brief look at the way it is written in the language of the Glosses. In this regard, attention will be primarily paid to those verbal complexes that include a somewhat lengthy pretonic part.

A cursory glance at the relevant examples appearing throughout this study permits us to say that the verbal complex is most often written as a single word,

even in cases in which it has a relatively complex structure. Recall the forms *asndonberat* ‘they say (of) us’ and *asñdanbertheni* ‘we used to be called’ just quoted in Section 2.2.1. A further example of this tendency is the passive form *cotammeicnighthersa* in (4) below, from the verb *con-éicnigedar* ‘compels’.

- (4) *ithésíde cotammeicnighthersa* (Ml 21b10)
 it-hé-side
 COP.PRES.IND.3PL.DECL-3PL-PROX
 co(n)-tamm-eicnig-ther-sa
 PV-1SG/DECL-compel/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS-NA.1SG
 ‘it is these by which I am compelled’.

This form can be analyzed as [co(m)-tamm^l-eicnig-ther-sa], in which the following elements can be identified: a pretonic part *co-tamm^l-*, which consists of the lexical preverb *con-* in slot 1 and the Class B 1SG infix pronoun *-tamm^l-* in slot 2; the lexical stem *-eicnig-* in slot 4, in which the first syllable bears the main stress of the verbal complex, the passive ending *-ther* in slot 5, and the final (1SG) *nota augens -sa*.

However, the verbal complex is on some occasions spelled separately. When this happens, the writer most often reflects the boundary between the pretonic part and the rest of the verbal complex. An example is *nundan mórthar* ‘(that) we are magnified’, quoted in Section 2.2.1 above. A further example is *cotob sechfíder* in (5a), from the lexical compound *con-secha* ‘corrects’: the sequence *cotob* is the combination of the lexical preverb *con-* with the Class B 2PL infix *-tob-* (i.e. slots 1 and 2). In (5b), the pretonic sequence *fortat-* (slots 1 and 2) contains the lexical preverb *for-* and the Class B 2SG *-tat-* infix, and it is separated from the stressed monosyllabic form *-tet-* (slot 4); example (5b) further illustrates the graphic separation of the *nota augens*, in this case, the 2SG *-su*. The *nota augens* is also often written apart from its host, as in example (5c), where the subordinating conjunct particle *i^N-* (slot 1) is written together with *-bi-at* (slots 4 and 5).

- (5) a. *cotob sechfíder* (Wb 9a23)
 ‘you (pl.) will be corrected’.
- b. *fortat tet su* (Ml 43b11)
 ‘it helps you (sg.)’.
- c. *imbiat som* (Ml 36a18b)
 ‘in which they are’.

Spellings other than the previous ones are fairly rare, and they sometimes reflect in still more detail the morphological composition of the verbal complex. Take the relative verbal complex *do da intá* ‘that renders it’ in (6), from the compound verb *do-intái* ‘renders, translates’.

- (6) *condib ·p-s do da intá* (Sg 20b10)
 co^N-dib-*ps* do-da-intá
 so that-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG-*ps* PV-3SG.F/REL-render/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 ‘so that it may be *ps* that renders it’.

The spelling *do da intá* separates the lexical preverb *do-* in slot 1, the Class C 3SG f. infix *-da-* in slot 2, both constituents of the pretonic part of the verbal complex, and the verbal stem *-intá*, which bears the main stress in its first syllable; recall that the graphic acute marks vowel length in the Old Irish texts.

2.3 Preverbal elements

The ‘preverbal elements’ of the Old Irish verbal complex are here classified in three main groups, (a) conjunct particles (Section 2.3.1), (b) lexical preverbs (Section 2.3.2), and (c) deadjectival preverbs (Section 2.3.3). All these elements can appear in the pretonic slot 1. However, some of them, namely, groups (b) and (c), can also be tonic, that is to say, they can appear in slot 3. In other words, the elements of group (a), with the exception of the particle *ro-*, are only used as pretonic elements. The conditions relevant for and the consequences of this positional variation of groups (b) and (c) are described in Section 2.4 below.

From a functional viewpoint, the functions of the three groups of preverbal elements stand in the “continuum that ranges from lexical to inflectional” assumed for morphological markers by Bybee (1985: 27, 85).

2.3.1 Conjunct particles

Conjunct particles are (mostly) pretonic formatives of the Old Irish verbal complex with a decidedly grammatical value. In addition to the negative, interrogative, and relative conjunct particles, one must count the semantically void particle *no-* (which is used as stated in (iv) below), as well as the marker of perfective aspect and potentiality *ro-* and the marker of reciprocity *imm(a)-*. The two latter forms represent grammaticalized versions of lexical preverbs that are also considered in the next section. For the particle *ro-*, see the extensive treatment by

McCone (1997a: 89–162). Table 2.2 offers an exhaustive list of the Old Irish conjunct particles.

Tab. 2.2: Old Irish conjunct particles

Conjunct particle	Function
<i>ní-</i> (<i>nicon-</i>)	Negative declarative clause type
<i>nad^{L/N-}</i> (<i>nadc(h)on^{L/N-}</i>), <i>-na-</i>	Negative relative clause type
<i>nach-</i>	Negative relative clause type for infixed pronouns
<i>na-</i>	Negative imperative clause type
<i>nach-</i>	Negative imperative clause type for infixed pronouns
<i>in^{N-}</i>	Positive polar interrogative clause type
<i>innad^{N-}</i>	Negative polar interrogative clause type
<i>cani-</i>	Negative polar interrogative clause type
<i>cí(a)-</i>	Positive <i>wh</i> -interrogative clause type
<i>cích-</i>	Positive <i>wh</i> -interrogative clause type for infixed pronouns
<i>co-</i>	Positive <i>wh</i> -interrogative clause type ‘how?’
<i>-(s)a^{N-}</i>	Oblique relative clause type
<i>cech(a)- / cach(a)-</i>	Free-choice indefinite relative clause type
<i>no-</i>	Semantically void particle for various functions
<i>ro-</i>	Perfective aspect and potentiality
<i>imm(a)-</i>	Reciprocity

(i) Negative particles distinguish clause types: *ní-* (and its variant *ní(con)-*)² is used for declarative, *na-* for imperative, *innad^{N-}* / *cani-* for negative polar interrogative, and *ná(d)^{L-}* / *na(d)^{L-}* / *nadc(h)on-/nacon-* for relative clause type without infixed pronoun. The form *nach-* is used in relative and imperative clause types when an infixed pronoun is expressed. Instead of *nach-*, *nad-* is sometimes used in combination with infixed pronouns, especially when the relative clause belongs to the functional type otherwise expressed by relative nasalization (see Section 4.7 and Thurneysen 1946: 265–266, Ó hUiginn 1987: 177–178).

(ii) The polar interrogative clause type is marked by *in^{N-}* (for the positive) and *innad-* / *cani-* (for the negative version). The variation of the negative version is

² The value of the form *-con-* in *nicon-* and *nadcon-* is disputed. The reader is referred to Lambert (2014: 126), who understands the negative particle form with *-con-* as a form expressing ‘duration’, in opposition to the bare negation *ní-* / *nad-*, without such meaning. The negative form with *-con-* is frequent with verbs indicating a state and/or perception: e.g. *nicon·fitir* ‘(s)he does not know’, which is opposed to the positive form *ro·fitir* ‘(s)he knows’. See further Section 2.4.4 fn. below. The lexical preverb *for* is perhaps used in this manner, according to Breatnach (2017: 227–232).

considered in Section 7.2. Though less frequent, the *wh*-interrogative form *ci(a)*- can appear as a conjunct particle with the form *cich*- as the variant to include the expression of a pronominal infix. Examples of these conjunct particles and of *co*- ‘how?’ can be found in Section 6.3.2.

(iii) The conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*- is always preceded by a preposition, and expresses a relative clause in which the antecedent has oblique NP_{rel} function (e.g. Engl. *the man for which I work*; see Section 5.4.2 for this notion and for examples). For the forms *i^N*- ‘in which’, and *co^N*- ‘so that’, which are given as separate conjunct particles by some scholars, see Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 respectively. The conjunct particle *cech(a)*- / *cach(a)*- ‘which-, whoever, all that ...’, clearly related to the *wh*-interrogative pronoun, rather belongs to this set of conjunct particles; these forms are illustrated in Section 5.4.3.

(iv) If no other pretonic element (whether a conjunct particle, a lexical preverb or a deadjectival preverb) is used, the semantically void conjunct particle *no*- is obligatorily anteposed to positive simple verbs in order to express a number of forms, which mostly pertain to the declarative and relative clause types: every form of the imperfect, past subjunctive and conditional paradigms (Section 4.2), the 1SG, 2SG, and 2PL of the relative clause type active paradigm (Section 4.3), quite a number of combinations of a declarative clause type active form with an object affix (Section 4.4), every 1st and 2nd passive person (as stated in the previous section and in Section 4.5) and, finally, every combination of a relative verb with an infix (Section 4.8). In addition to that, this conjunct particle *no*- is also used in the imperative clause type form to include every pronominal affix (Section 7.3).

2.3.2 Lexical preverbs

The Old Irish lexical preverbs often have clear correspondences in other Indo-European languages, and modify the meaning of the verb with which they are combined, whether simple or already compound with (an)other lexical preverb(s). See Section 2.8 below for the maximal number of lexical preverbs in a verbal complex. The Old Irish lexical preverbs are given in Table 2.3, in which the left-most column gives the form of the preverb as it appears in the analysis given in square brackets, which is a form closer to the etymological origin; the central column gives an example of lexical compound with the usual form of the preverb in pretonic position (i.e. before the elevated dot), and the right-most column its prepositional equivalent, if any. Note that some lexical preverbs have basically the same form in the pretonic position: this is notably the case of *dí*-/*de*- ‘of, from’ and *to*-, both *do*- in pretonic position.

Tab. 2.3: Old Irish lexical preverbs (in alphabetical order)

Lexical preverb	Pretonic form in a compound verb	Preposition
<i>ad-</i> 'to, towards'	<i>ad-roilli</i> 'deserves' (<i>ad-ro-slí-</i> , no simple <i>slí-</i>)	—
<i>ar(e)-</i> 'before, for'	<i>ar-gair</i> 'forbids' (cf. simple <i>gairid</i> 'calls')	<i>ar^l</i>
<i>ath-, ad-</i> 're-, ex-'	<i>ad-muinethar</i> 'remembers' (cf. simple <i>muinithir</i> 'thinks')	—
<i>céta-</i> '*along'	<i>ceta-bí</i> 'feels' (cf. simple <i>bíid</i> 'uses to be')	—
<i>com-</i> 'with'	<i>con-ic</i> 'can' (no simple <i>ic-</i>)	<i>co^N</i>
<i>dī-/de-</i> 'of, from'	<i>do-gaib</i> 'diminishes' (cf. simple <i>gaibid</i> 'takes')	<i>dí^l</i>
<i>ess-</i> 'out of'	<i>as-beir</i> 'says' (cf. simple <i>beirid</i> 'brings')	<i>a(s)</i>
<i>etar-</i> 'between'	<i>etar-scara</i> 'separates' (cf. simple <i>scaraid</i> 'separates')	<i>etar</i>
<i>fo-</i> 'under'	<i>fo-gní</i> 'serves' (cf. simple <i>gni-id</i> 'does')	<i>fo^l</i>
<i>for-</i> 'on, over'	<i>for-tét</i> 'helps' (cf. simple <i>tétit</i> 'goes')	<i>for</i>
<i>frith-</i> 'against'	<i>fris-gair</i> 'answers' (cf. simple <i>gairid</i> 'calls')	<i>fri</i>
<i>íarmo/i-</i> 'after'	<i>dod-íarmórat</i> 'which follows it' (cf. simple <i>reithid</i> 'runs')	<i>íar</i>
<i>im(b/m)-</i> 'about'	<i>im-ráid</i> 'thinks' (cf. simple <i>ráidid</i> 'speaks')	<i>imm^l</i>
<i>in(d)-</i> 'in'	<i>in-gaib</i> 'reproaches' (cf. simple <i>gaibid</i> 'takes')	<i>í^N</i>
<i>ne-/ni-</i> 'down'	<i>con-nessa</i> 'tramples under foot, condemns' (<i>com-ne-stā-</i>)	—
<i>ocu-</i> 'at'	<i>ocu-ben</i> 'touches' (cf. simple <i>bíid</i> 'uses to be')	<i>oc</i>
<i>os-</i> (<i>uss</i>) 'up, off'	<i>as-boind</i> 'refuses' (no simple <i>boind-</i>)	—
<i>remi-</i> 'before, pre-'	<i>remi-canar</i> 'it is sung before' (cf. simple <i>canaid</i> 'sings')	<i>re</i>
<i>ro-</i>	<i>ro-saig</i> 'reaches' (cf. simple <i>saigid</i> 'seeks')	—
<i>sechmo/i-</i> 'beyond'	<i>sechmo-ella</i> 'lacks' (Sg 196b2)	<i>sech</i>
<i>tarmi-</i> 'across, over'	<i>darmi-regtais</i> 'they would go over' (cf. simple <i>tétit</i> 'goes')	<i>tar/dar</i>
<i>to-</i> 'to, towards'	<i>du-tét</i> 'comes' (cf. simple <i>tétit</i> 'goes')	—
<i>tremi-</i> 'through'	<i>tremi-teiched</i> 'he used to flee across' (cf. simple <i>teichid</i> 'flees')	<i>tri</i>

A few lexical preverbs can also be used to express a grammatical meaning. The lexical preverbs *imm-* 'around' and *ro-* have been included in the list of conjunct particles in the previous section, though they are still used as lexical preverbs. In compound verbs with the lexical preverb *ro-*, e.g. *ro-saig* 'reaches', *ro-icc* 'reaches', or even *as-roilli* 'deserves' [ad-ro-slí], the semantic contribution of the preverb cannot be identified easily. The lexical preverbs *com-* and *ad-* are also used to express perfective aspect, but much less frequently.

The productivity of these lexical preverbs varies greatly. On the one hand, the lexical preverb *céta-* (not to be confused with *céta-* 'first', seen in the next section) is only found in combination with the substantive verb, and *ne-/ni-* is used in about three verbs and never appears in slot 1, so that it could even be eliminated from the list of Old Irish lexical preverbs. On the other hand, the lexical preverb that is most frequently used is *to-* (almost always *do-* in pretonic position). The meaning of these lexical preverbs may be determined with certainty

on many occasions, but some preverbs such as *ro-* (as already observed) or the frequent *to-* (*do-*) can receive only an approximate translation, if any. A thorough description of these lexical preverbs may be found in Thurneysen (1946: 495–534).

2.3.3 Deadjectival preverbs

Due mainly to its clear etymological relationship to adjectives or (more rarely) adverbs attested in Old Irish (see Thurneysen 1946: 240–241, 248 and, more recently, García-Castillero 2014), and to their special semantics, a group of preverbal elements that are much less frequently used than the previous two types can be considered as a separate group of preverbal elements of the Old Irish verbal complex. The forms are given in Table 2.4, which also includes an attested example of its use.

Roughly speaking, these preverbal elements have adverbial meaning, but it is possible to give a more accurate semantic description of them, according to two main groups: (i) relative time (*cein-* ‘long’, *ceta-* / *cetu-* ‘first’, *mos-* ‘soon’, *nuie-* ‘newly’) and (ii) evaluation (*caín-* ‘well’, *dechmo-* ‘best’, *mad-* ‘well’, *mí-* ‘badly, mis-’, *slán-* ‘safely’); *uile* ‘all’ is isolated as a quantifier.

Tab.2.4: Old Irish deadjectival preverbs

Deadjectival preverb	Example of compound verb
<i>caín-</i> ‘well’	<i>mani cáinairlithir</i> ‘unless thou take good heed’ (Wb 5b38) (<i>airlithir</i> ‘advises’)
<i>cein-</i> ‘long’	<i>céin mair</i> ‘long live he’ (<i>Stories fr. Táin</i> 11,52) (<i>mairid</i> ‘remains’)
<i>ceta-</i> / <i>cetu-</i> ‘first’	<i>ceturupridach</i> ‘who has first preached’ (Wb 26c4) (<i>pridchaid</i> ‘preaches’)
<i>dechmo-</i> ‘best’	<i>dechmo-ro-chich</i> ‘who has bewailed best’ (Thurneysen 1930: 398) (<i>ciid</i> ‘cries’)
<i>mad-</i> ‘well’	<i>madgenatar</i> ‘they are blessed’ lit. ‘well-born’ (Ml 90b12) (<i>gainithir</i> ‘is born’)
<i>mí-</i> ‘badly, mis-’	<i>mitnimret</i> ‘that they deceive him’ (Ml 74b22) (<i>imm-beir</i> ‘plays, handles’)
<i>mos-</i> ‘soon’	<i>mos riccubsa</i> ‘I shall soon come’ (Wb 28c9) (<i>ro-icc</i> ‘reaches’)
<i>nuie-</i> ‘newly’	<i>nuie tanicc</i> ‘he has newly come’ (Wb 7c7) (<i>do-icc</i> ‘comes’)
<i>slán-</i> ‘safely’	<i>slán-seiss</i> ‘hail!’ lit. ‘you should sit save’ (LU 8242) (<i>saidid</i> ‘sits’)
<i>ule-</i> ‘wholly’	<i>nisnulemairbfe</i> ‘you will not wholly slay them’ (Ml 77a15) (<i>marbaid</i> ‘kills’)

Whereas conjunct particles have an inflectional and lexical preverbs a clearly lexical nature, the deadjectival preverbs stand somewhere in the middle of those two poles. If any, they should be included in the group of lexical preverbs, since they are decidedly not grammatical, but they rarely involve a change in the lexical meaning of the verb (whether simple or compound) to which they are added. These functional differences between the three groups of preverbal elements in the Old Irish verbal complex are related to the relative ordering in the preverbal field, as observed in next section.

2.4 Deuterotonic and prototonic forms

As stated above in Section 2.2.2, the deuterotonic character in the Old Irish verbal complex involves the articulation in a first, pretonic part (i.e. slot 1 or slots 1 and 2) and a second one that bears the main stress on its first syllable (i.e. slots 4 and 5 or slots 3, 4, and 5). This definition of deuterotonic form is purely formal, and it is based on the meaning of the word ‘deuterotonic’ (i.e. ‘stressed on the second syllable or element’), regardless of whether the element that occupies slot 1 is a conjunct particle or a lexical preverb. The term ‘prototonic’ (or proterotonic) refers to the structure in which the stress falls on the first component, and it is specifically applied to the structures in which slots 3, 4 and 5 are occupied, i.e. when the verb has a lexical preverb in slot 3.

The previous definition implies that the opposition between the deuterotonic and prototonic variants is possible with lexical compounds, that is to say, with verbs that have at least one lexical preverb. The extent of this definition of the deuterotonic and prototonic forms can only be fully understood after looking at the positional behavior of the three types of preverbal elements, a point dealt with in Section 2.4.1; the formal variation arising from this opposition in lexical compounds is illustrated in Section 2.4.2; Section 2.4.3 discusses the notion of deuterotonic boundary and its morphological implications. Finally, Section 2.4.4 gives a summary of the rules governing the use of the prototonic and deuterotonic forms.

2.4.1 The position of the three types of preverbal elements

The position of the three types of preverbal elements described in the previous section is determined by the following rules.

(i) All three types can appear in slot 1, and this means that the compounds in which one of those preverbal elements appears in slot 1 must be considered as

deuterotonic in basically the same way: in other words, the combination of a simple verb such as *beirid* ‘bears’ with the lexical preverb *as-*, i.e. *as·beir* ‘(s)he says’, must receive the same structural consideration as that with the negative conjunct particle *ní-*, i.e. *ní·beir* ‘(s)he does not bear’, i.e. both represent the basic deuterotonic structure [1 - 4 (- 5)]. The same consideration is valid when a lexical compound is taken as the basic form: the lexical compound *ro-icc* ‘comes’ [1 - 4 (- 5)] takes the prototonic form *(-)ricc* [(-)r(o)-ing], i.e. [3 - 4 (- 5)] when compounded with a further lexical preverb such as *con-*, as in e.g. Wb 7d9 *conricc* ‘comes together, meets’ [com·r(o)-ing]; and this *con-ricc* is structurally equivalent to the one resulting when a conjunct particle is added to *ro-icc*, e.g. Ml 36c10 *ní ric* [ní·r(o)-ing]; that is to say, both *con-ricc* and *ní-ricc* represent the deuterotonic structure [1 - 3 - 4 (- 5)].

(ii) With the exception of the frequent conjunct particle *ro-*, which – due to its origin as a lexical preverb – can also appear in slot 3, the conjunct particles can only appear in slot 1, whereas lexical and, with some exceptions, deadjectival preverbs appear in slots 1 and 3 for a number of reasons to be explained elsewhere. The position of the lexical preverb in slot 3 involves the so-called prototonic compound form: e.g. *(-)epir* [(-)e(ss)-ber^l], i.e. [(-) 3 - 4 (- 5)] is the prototonic variant of the deuterotonic form *as·beir* [ess·ber^l], i.e. [1 - 4 (- 5)] quoted above; as already stated, *(-)ricc* is the prototonic version of the deuterotonic form *ro-icc*. These prototonic forms or variants can be preceded by conjunct particles such as the negative one as in *ní·epir* ‘(s)he doesn’t say’ [ní·e(ss)-ber^l], i.e. [1 - 3 - 4 (- 5)] or by a further lexical preverb in slot 1. The deadjectival preverb *ule-* ‘all’ appears in slot 3 (i.e. after the infixed pronoun *-s^N-* in slot 2) in the form *nisnulemairbfe* [nis^N·ule-marbf^l-e] quoted in Table 2.4. For the possible combinations of lexical preverbs in the same lexical compound, see below in Section 2.8.

(iii) Deadjectival preverbs come before lexical preverbs and after conjunct particles (with the exception of *ro-*): compare Ml 56d16 *ní míaípir* ‘he does not speak evil’, i.e. [1 ní - 3 mí-e(ss) - 4 ber^l] to Sg 215a3 *cáineperr* ‘it is well said’, i.e. [1 cain - 3 e(ss) - 4 ber - 5 (a)r], both from *as·beir* ‘(s)he says’.

The practical consequence of these rules is that the variation between deuterotonic and prototonic articulation of the combination of preverbal element and verbal stem is only possible when the preverbal element is a lexical preverb or a deadjectival preverb. Apart from the presence of a further lexical preverb, a point considered later in Section 2.8, the basic opposition between deuterotonic (e.g. *as·beir*) and prototonic (e.g. *(·)epir*) forms, which is determined by the position of the main stress, is functionally triggered by clause type distinctions, as stated in Section 2.4.4 below.

2.4.2 The deuterotonic and prototonic forms of a lexical compound

One of the most difficult points of Old Irish verbal morphology is the difference between the prototonic and the deuterotonic variants of the same lexical compound. This is not the place to deal in depth with this difference, which is initially a phonological allomorphy (see Haspelmath and Sims 2010: 211) that can give rise to a considerable formal divergence, even a partial suppletion, in terms of Corbett (2007: 16). This point has recently been pointed out by Kim (2019: 46). Due to its relevance for clause typing, a brief illustration of this important aspect of Old Irish verbal morphology seems unavoidable, however.

Table 2.5, which is based on Thurneysen's (1946: 534–536) comments, gives a short list of the deuterotonic and prototonic forms of the same lexical compound. To work with a type of verbal complex frequently attested, the column of the prototonic forms in Table 2.5 gives the negative version of the form given in the deuterotonic column, which is generally the declarative 3SG present indicative active, except in one case, namely, the 1SG forms in *con-icim* 'I can' / (*·*)*cumcim*. The forms of each column therefore differ minimally in polarity. This is, however, only one of the possible reasons for the use of the prototonic form of a lexical compound: most conjunct particles seen in Section 2.3.1 above can be used instead of *ní-*, and the prototonic form can also be used in isolation in order to express a different clause type. See Section 2.4.4 for a complete list of uses of each variant.

Tab. 2.5: Deuterotonic and prototonic form of the same lexical compound

	Deuterotonic form	<i>ní-</i> + Prototonic form
a. CV ₁ ·CV ₂ (-)	<i>do-dona</i> 'consoles' <i>do-léici</i> 'leaves' <i>do-luigi</i> 'forgives' <i>do-gní</i> 'does' <i>do-beir</i> 'gives, brings'	<i>ní-dídna</i> 'does not console' [nī-dī-d(o)n-a] <i>ní-teilci</i> 'does not leave' [nī-to-l(ē)c ^l -i] <i>ní-dílgi</i> 'does not forgive' [nī-dī-l(u)g-i] <i>ní-déni</i> 'does not do' [nī-de-(g)ni] <i>ní-tabir</i> 'does not bring' [nī-to-ber ^l]
b. (C)V ₁ C·V ₂ C(-)	<i>con-icc</i> '(s)he can' <i>con-icim</i> 'I can' <i>fris-oirc</i> 'injures'	<i>ní-cumuing</i> '(s)he cannot' [nī-com-ing] <i>ní-cumcim</i> 'I cannot' [nī-com-(i)ng-im] <i>ní-frithoirc</i> 'does not injure' [nī-frith-org ^l]
c. (C)V ₁ C·CV ₂ C(-)	<i>ad-rími</i> 'counts' <i>ad-roilli</i> 'deserves' <i>fris-gair</i> 'answers' <i>im-soí</i> 'turns'	<i>ní-áirmi</i> 'does not count' [nī-ad-r(i)m ^l -i] <i>ní-arilli</i> 'does not deserve' [nī-ad-r(o)-sli] <i>ní-freair</i> 'does not answer' [nī-frith-gar ^l] <i>ní-impáí</i> 'does not turn' [nī-imb-so-í]
d. CV ₁ ·V ₂ C(-)	<i>do-adbat</i> 'shows' <i>do-áirci</i> 'causes' <i>ro-icc</i> 'reaches'	<i>ní-tadbat</i> 'does not show' [nī-t(o)-ad-fed] <i>ní-tárci</i> 'does not cause' [nī-t(o)-ar(e)-(i)ng-i] <i>ní-ricc</i> 'does not reach' [nī-r(o)-ing]

The letters (a) to (d) in Table 2.5 correspond to the basic phonotactic combination of the sounds around the boundary between pretonic and tonic part, i.e. the ‘deuterotonic boundary’ dealt with in the next section, and involve all the possible combinations of vowel and consonant: (a) CV₁·CV₂(-), (b) (C)V₁C·V₂C(-), (c) (C)V₁C·CV₂C(-), (d) CV₁·V₂C(-).

The formal divergence between the deuterotonic and prototonic variants of a given lexical compound ultimately depends on the sounds involved, but the basic phonotactic structure of the deuterotonic variant, i.e. types (a) to (d) in Table 2.5, represents a general condition according to which that divergence can be predicted to some extent. With the exception of the lexical compounds of type (d), in which the stress falls on the same syllable in both the deuterotonic and prototonic forms, the difference between both forms is basically due to the fact that the main stress of the verbal complex falls on different syllables, according to the stipulation in Section 2.2.2 above.

Very often the prototonic form, in which the stress fell on the form of the preverb, has undergone syncope of the non-final second vowel (e.g. *-didna* ‘does not console’ < **-dī- d(o)na*), a vowel that was maintained in the deuterotonic form, in which the stress fell on the first syllable of the second element (i.e. on the first vowel of *-dona*). In other words, in compounds with the basic shape CV₁·CV₂(-), i.e. group (a) in Table 2.5, and when the sequence is specifically CV₁·CV₂CV₃(-), the prototonic form regularly appears as (·)CV₁CCV₃(-), as in the first three verbs of the table.

Within the same group (a), the frequent verbs *do·gní* ‘makes, does’ and *do·beir* ‘brings, gives’, have a different prototonic outcome due to the quality of the specific sounds that come into play: in the former the original structure (·)CV₁CCV₂ has maintained the original vowel of the lexical preverb (*dī-/de-* ‘of, from’ (*do-* in pretonic position) and the post-vocalic /g/ has been lost before the nasal (i.e. *-gn-* > *-n-*). Similarly, the lexical compounds of types (b) and (c), with the basic structure (C)V₁C·V₂C(-) and (C)V₁C·CV₂C(-) respectively, eliminate the V₂ in the prototonic form if there is a further syllable: this gives rise to the noticeable intraparadigmatic variation between two prototonic forms such as e.g. *ní·cumcim* ‘I cannot’ and *ní·cumuing* ‘(s)he cannot’. Finally, in type (d) in Table 2.5, which is characterized by the deuterotonic hiatus, i.e. CV₁·V₂C(-), the formal divergence between deuterotonic and prototonic is more limited due to the fact that the latter most often involves the elision of the vowel of the lexical preverb. More details about these verbs with deuterotonic hiatus, which were alluded to in Section 1.4.2 above, may be found in García-Castillero (2015a: 81–82 + fn.4).

The examples in (7) consist of two Old Irish Glosses that include the two variants of a lexical compound included in Table 2.5. In (7a), the prototonic form of

the verb *do-luigi* ‘forgives’ is used in *diandilgidsi* [1 do-(s)a^N - 2 d^L - 3 dī - 4 l(u)g - 5 id^l - si], with preposition *do-* ‘to’ (different from the lexical preverb *to-*) + oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* + Class C infix 3SG n. infix *-d^L* + *dī-l(u)g-* + 2PL conjunct ending *-id* + 2PL *nota augens*, whereas *dalugubsa* [1 d(i) - 2 a^L - 4 lugub - sa] represents the deuterotonic form of the future of *do-luigi* with Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^L* + 1SG *nota augens*. In (7b), the 3PL present indicative of *ad-roilli* ‘deserves’ appears as deuterotonic in *(ci-)at-roillet* [1 a(d) - 2 t^L - 3 ro - 4 (s)lī - 5 et] with Class B 3SG n. infix *-t^L*, and as prototonic in *(ci-)ní-arillet* [1 ní - 2 (a)^L - 3 a(d) - r(o) - 4 (s)lī - 5 et], with the negative declarative conjunct particle *ní-* and Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^L*. For the form and behavior of the pronominal infixes, see Section 2.6 below.

(7) a. *intí diandilgidsi dalugubsa dano* (Wb 14d24)

intí di-a^N-d^L-dī-lg-id-si

LHEAD/NOM.SG.M to-OBL.REL-3SG.N/REL.PV-forgive/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT-NA.2PL

d-a^L-lug-ub-sa dano

PV-3SG.N/DECL-forgive-FUT/1SG.ACT-NA.1SG also

‘to him to whom you forgive it, I also will forgive it’.

b. *ciatroillet ciniarillet* (Wb 31c23)

ci^L-a(d)-t^L-roi-ll-et

though-PV-3SG.N/DECL-PV-deserve/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT

ci^L-ní-^L-a(d)-ri-ll-et

though-NEG.DECL-3SG.N/DECL-PV-PV-deserve/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT

‘whether they deserve it, or deserve it not’.

Apparently, the prototonic version arising from the combination with a deadjectival preverb causes no such formal divergences between prototonic and deuterotonic variants. This is probably due to the scarcity of the deadjectival preverbs and, partly also, to the relatively late chronology that can be assumed for them.

2.4.3 The deuterotonic boundary

The morphological boundary between the pretonic and tonic parts of the deuterotonic compound, which in this study is called the ‘deuterotonic boundary’, has been traditionally noted in the editorial practice of the Old Irish texts (and in many grammatical treatments, including this study) by an elevated dot, e.g. *for-cain* /for-‘kan/ ‘(s)he teaches’, a lexical compound derived from the simple *canaid* ‘(s)he sings’, though other devices are also used: McCone (1997a) uses the

colon, and others scholars a hyphen. The graphical representation chosen in this study is the most traditional one, which is sometimes found in the Old Irish texts, as in *doda·ic*, quoted in example (153), and allows for a distinction between this and other morphological boundaries in the analysis of the Old Irish verbal complexes.

McCone (1997a: 4) considers this morphological boundary in the deuterotonic verbal complex as a “kind of barrier or juncture across which certain otherwise normal processes do not occur,” referring to the lack of mutation that usually characterizes the deuterotonic compound verb that expresses declarative clause type. Since this lack of mutation is precisely the contrastive formal marker of the declarative clause compound verb (see Section 4.7 below), the term ‘normal’ in McCone’s quote can arguably be disputed, because it apparently points to the idea that the lack of mutation is something phonemically irregular. However, this is a premature assumption that dismisses the morphological side of the elements concerned. In Old Irish, there are other combinations of pretonic and tonic elements, such as that constituted by the definite article and the noun, in which the lack of mutation in the tonic element (i.e. in the first sound of the noun) constitutes the formal feature of some grammatical cases like the nominative singular masculine: e.g. from *corp* ‘body’, Wb 3a14 *incorp* ‘the body’ (*in·corp*), as opposed to other cases of the same paradigm such as the genitive singular, which is characterized by the effect of lenition, e.g. Wb 3a14 *inchoirp* ‘of the body’ (*in^l·corp^l*).

2.4.4 Distribution of prototonic vs deuterotonic and the notion of dependency

A summary of the conditions that require a prototonic or a deuterotonic form seems appropriate at this point. The reference to some clause types and components of the verbal complex is necessary, and the reader is then referred to the specific places in which those elements are dealt with.

The deuterotonic shape of the verbal complex regularly obtains (i) from the combination of either a simple or lexical compound verb with a conjunct particle: e.g., from the simple *beirid*, the negative declarative form *ni·beir* ‘(s)he doesn’t bring’ or the positive polar interrogative form *in·mbeir* ‘does (s)he bring?’ have deuterotonic shape; from the compound *as·beir* ‘(s)he says’, the negative declarative *ni·epir* ‘(s)he doesn’t say’ also has deuterotonic shape. (ii) When an infixed pronoun is added to a lexical compound, as illustrated in Section 4.8, and in Section 4.4.1 for some forms of simple verbs; imperative clause type forms regularly

take infix pronouns, see Section 7.3, regardless of the basically simple or compound character of the verb. (iii) In lexical compounds, to express positive relative (by the addition of the relative lenition and nasalization, see Sections 2.5 and 4.7 below) and declarative clause type (by the lack of any mutation).

For a given lexical compound, the prototonic form is obligatory in the following circumstances. (iv) When it is combined with a conjunct particle: the lexical compounds *ro·icc* ‘reaches’ and *as·beir* ‘says’ take the prototonic form (-)ricc and (-)epir when they combine with a conjunct particle, as in e.g. *ni·ricc* ‘does not reach’ and *ni·epir* ‘does not say’. (v) When a lexical compound has more than one lexical preverb, the set of preverb(s) plus verbal stem departing from the second preverb makes up a prototonic form in the case of the positive declarative and relative verbs: the sequence of *ro·icc* ‘reaches’ takes the prototonic form when it takes a further lexical preverb, as in *con·r(o)·icc* ‘meets’ (see Section 2.8 below for this accumulation of lexical preverbs). (vi) For lexical compounds, the prototonic form is used to express positive responsive and imperative clause type (see Chapter 7 for these two clause types in Old Irish), provided that the latter takes no affixal pronoun.

The previous conditions on the use of prototonic and deuterotonic forms are subject to the following exceptions. (vii) Some lexical compounds lose their lexical preverb when preceded by the negative particle, so that the lexical preverb does not appear in slot 3, and there is thus no prototonic variant of the deuterotonic form in which it occupies slot 1: for instance, the negative version of *ro·finnathar* ‘finds out’ (in which the lexical preverb *ro-* occupies slot 1) is *ni·finnathar* ‘doesn’t find out’ (i.e. *ro-* is not used in the negative version); the same applies to *ro·laimethar* ‘dares’, *ro·cluinthar* ‘hears’.³ (viii) In a few cases, the relative character is expressed by the prototonic form (see Section 5.3.1 below). (ix) This trend is especially clear in the lexical verbs with deuterotonic shape in hiatus (i.e. CV₁·V₂C(-)), as noted above in Section 2.4.2, but these verbs also express the declarative clause by means of the prototonic form. (x) Finally, the part of the so-called ‘Bergin’s Law’ that affects compound verbs formed with a lexical preverb represents a further exception to the previous stipulations for the deuterotonic form; but see Section 3.4 below for this ‘Law’.

³ McCone (1997a: 114–115) suggests that the telic semantics of the lexical preverb *ro-* in the positive compound could be in contradiction with the negative prefix, that – on its behalf – implies that the action was not accomplished. The grammaticalization of the lexical preverb *ro-* as a conjunct particle expressing perfectivity (and potentiality) has probably begun in lexical compounds like these ones. Looked at more broadly, this effect of negation on the verbal meaning is stated by Miestamo (2005: 214–215).

The prototonic and deuterotonic variants have been interpreted by McCone (1997a: 2–3) as dependent and independent forms respectively. The basic idea is that, since the prototonic form is often determined by the presence of a conjunct particle, according to point (iv) above, it is a form that depends on the presence of another element; by contrast, the deuterotonic form of the same lexical preverb is taken to be independent. The same applies to the conjunct form of the simple verb, which is frequently introduced by a conjunct particle; the independent counterpart of the simple verb is the absolute form, for which I refer the reader to Section 4.2. The pair dependent vs independent is a useful notion that embraces at once the pairs prototonic vs deuterotonic forms (for lexical compounds), and conjunct vs absolute forms (for simple verbs) respectively. However, this pair dependent vs independent must be understood in a purely morphological sense, and it must be clearly stated that its oppositional character is only operative in the positive declarative and relative clause types, in accordance with stipulation (iii) of this section, which is developed in Section 4.2, but not in other clause types distinguished in Old Irish such as the responsive and the imperative clause types, in line with stipulation (vi) above, which is considered at length in Section 7.3.

2.5 Phonological effects and spelling of the Old Irish mutations in the verbal complex

The mutation known as lenition is best defined as the substitution of a given phoneme by a phonologically related phoneme (or, in the case of /f/, by null) operating on the first sounds of words or morpheme level constituents. Depending on the sound involved, nasalization also involves phonemic substitution (of course, with different results) or the addition of a nasal. These mutations are either triggered by a preceding word (be stressed or not) or morphological constituent, or, as a further possibility, apply autonomously as the morphophonological marker of a given grammatical category. This section deals with the phonological, graphic, and positional aspects of the mutations within the verbal complex as observed in the contemporaneous texts. It is important to stress that, in the latter case, lenition and nasalization must be viewed as morphological markers. The specific functions of these two mutations used as relative markers (or, more broadly, as markers of subordinate clause) are considered in Sections 4.7, 5.3 and 5.5.1.

2.5.1 Phonological effects of lenition and nasalization

The phonological consequence of lenition involves the use of the spirant (lenis) version of each plosive, the lenis variant of nasals and liquids, aspiration of /s/ in /h/, and loss of /f/; lenited /s/ and /f/ are sometimes marked by a dot over the corresponding letter, also known as *punctum delens* (i.e. <š>, <ḟ>). Section 1.5.1 has presented these lenited sounds in their phonological shape. Lenition has no effect on a following vowel. In the morphological analysis, lenition might be marked by means of the superscript ^l: for instance, the form *forchain* ‘who / that teaches’ of example (44b), can also be rendered as *for.^lcain*.

Nasalization (^N) applies to vowels, plosives and *f*- (but not liquids, nasals or *s*-): e.g. *dungena* (i.e. *du.^Ngena*) is the 3SG positive nasalizing relative form of the future of *do·gní* ‘does’, quoted in example (46b) below. The effect of nasalization on voiceless plosives involves their voiced version (i.e. ^Nt- = /d/ and so on), and on voiced plosives the sequence of homorganic nasal plus the corresponding plosive (i.e. ^Nb- = /mb/ and so on).⁴ Nasalization of a vowel involves adding an /n/ to it. Occasionally, the letter used to mark nasalization bears the *punctum delens* seen above, which is perhaps a way to mark the corresponding sound as the outcome of a mutation. For more details, I refer to McCone (2005: 17–19) and Stifter (2009: 64–66). For examples of both lenition and nasalization, see Table 2.6 below.

2.5.2 The graphical notation of the Old Irish mutations in the Glosses

Though these two morphophonological mutations constitute an undoubtedly working system in Old Irish, their spelling in the contemporaneous texts is limited in various ways, apart from the fact that, as just noted, in some phonotactic configurations, the mutations simply do not apply: lenition has no effect on a following vowel, nor has nasalization any effect on a following nasal, liquid and /s/.

In all other cases, the mutations are linguistically effective, but they are graphically expressed in an unsystematic manner. In this sense, I consider two

⁴ For this interpretation, see Feuth (1982). Quin (1979–80) studies the frequency with which the nasalization of /b-, d-, g-/ after the article and the interrogative particle *in^N* is spelled. See the comments on this point in the recent paper by Roma (2018: 3–4), which is specifically devoted to nasalization appearing between nominal elements.

main situations, depending on whether the mutated phoneme cannot (i) or can (ii) be graphically expressed.

(i) The lenited outcome of /b/, /d/, /g/, /m:/, /n:/, /l:/ and /r:/, i.e. /v/, /ð/, /ɣ/, /ṽ/, /n/, /l/ and /r/ respectively, have no graphical marking in Old Irish: e.g. the leniting relative clause type form *do-beir* /do-'v'eri/ is written the same as its declarative counterpart /do-'b'eri/. For these sounds, and on very few occasions, the unmutated sound is graphically geminated.

Tab. 2.6: Mutations in the Old Irish verbal complex and their graphical expression

Un-mutated form	Lenited form	Nasalized form
/p/ <i>pridchim</i> (Wb 24d1)	<i>nopridchim</i> /f/ (Wb 11a15)	<i>nocridchim</i> /b/ (Wb 27c22)
/t/ <i>teit</i> (Ml 67d24)	<i>mathéis</i> /θ/ (Wb 14a14)	<i>déte</i> /d/ (Wb 11d7) but <i>notes</i> /d/ (Ml 29d2)
<i>attósa</i> (Wb 29d6)	<i>nomthá</i> /θ/ (Wb 13c10)	<i>oldái</i> /d/ (Wb 1d21), but <i>oltai</i> /d/ (Ml 112c2)
/k/ <i>carid</i> (Wb 25d5)	<i>nímcharatsa</i> /x/ (Wb 5c6)	<i>nocari</i> /g/ (Wb 6c8)
/b/ <i>dobeir</i> (Wb 1c15)	<i>andobeir</i> /v/ (Wb 10d28)	<i>dombeir</i> /mb/ (Wb 5b42)
/d/ <i>fodaimisiu</i> (Ml 55d14)	<i>fodaim</i> /ð/ (Ml 38d14)	<i>fondamtar</i> /nd/ (Ml 46d6)
/g/ <i>dogní</i> (Ml 16c10)	<i>dogní</i> /ɣ/ (Wb 6a8)	<i>dongní</i> /ng/ (Wb 24d10)
/f/ <i>fofera</i> (Wb 2a17)	<i>foirfea</i> i.e. [fo-fir-] (Wb 11d3)	
<i>rofitemmar</i> (Wb 6c16)	<i>arnietetár</i> [ni-fet-] (Wb 21d1), <i>rafesed</i> (Sg 148a6), but <i>airrafetatar</i> (Ml 54b14)	<i>nad fetammar</i> /v/ (Ml 37a10)
/s/ <i>rosuidigestar</i> (Ml 46c20)		
<i>ronsoír</i> (Wb 24c18)	<i>romsóirsa</i> /h/ (Wb 3d20)	<i>rosoirtha</i> /s/ (Ml 38d8)
/m/ <i>nimolat</i> (Ml 130b6)	<i>rundammoladsa</i> /ṽ/ (Ml 88a17)	<i>arindmoldais</i> /m:/ (Ml 102d3)
/n:/ <i>nertid</i> (Wb 5d20)	<i>corronertamni</i> /n/ (Wb 14b13)	<i>arrunert</i> /n:/ (Ml 130b2)
/l:/ <i>roléiced</i> (Wb 5b3)	<i>nandléicci</i> /l/ (Wb 3d13)	<i>dialeicid</i> /l:/ (Wb 13b12)
/r:/ <i>diroscai</i> (Ml 133a4)	<i>diroscaat</i> /r/ (Ml 66d12)	<i>anduróscai</i> /r:/ (Ml 134c4)
V <i>doecomnacht</i> (Ml 54c26)	<i>du écomnacht</i> (Ml 77c5)	<i>donecomnacht</i> (Ml 54c23)

(ii) The graphical marking of the mutated sound is unsystematic in different degrees: lenited /t/, /k/ (i.e. /θ/, /x/ respectively) and nasalized /b/, /d/, /g/ (i.e. /mb/, /nd/ and /ng/ respectively) are frequently marked, but not always. The nasalization of /p/, /t/, /k/ (e.g. the nasalizing relative form *nocari* ‘whom you love’ /no'gari/, in example (33b) below) is only seldom marked by means of the spellings , <d>, <g>; similarly, the lenition of /p/ (i.e. /f/) is rarely spelled. Finally, the lenited effect on /s/ and /f/ (i.e. /h/ and zero respectively) is very rarely marked in the spelling of verbs and nouns that have an unmutated variant side

by side this form. Though cases with lenited sound do exist, those two letters are so often maintained in the spelling, even without *punctum delens*, that one might suspect that the unmutated sounds have been maintained or analogically reintroduced.⁵

Table 2.6 includes examples of verbal forms attested in the Glosses. The forms in each row belong to the same basic verbal lexeme, but perfect minimal pairs are difficult to find in the available evidence. Most of the forms showing mutation are relative clause type forms. The assumption of the (un-)mutated form in all those cases is based on the grammatical character of the form, determined unproblematically by the context. Note finally that, for some specific cases, two different spellings of the same sound are given. The fact that only one form has been noted for the mutated cases with unambiguous notation does not mean that variation is not found in such situations; it only means that this spelling is the most usual.

2.5.3 The mutation effects in the Old Irish verbal complex

There are four reasons for mutations in Old Irish. They can be caused by (i) a preceding stressed word, (ii) a preceding unstressed element, (iii) a given morphological constituent, and there may be also (iv) autonomous mutation, i.e. the mutation that applies in a specific element of the verbal complex and is not caused by the presence of a preceding element. The examples considered in this section pertain only to verbal morphology.

(i) Mutation of the first sound of the verbal complex as due to a preceding independent stressed word is perhaps to be assumed in the case of some grammaticalized subordinating conjunctions onto a simple verb: e.g. *intain* ‘when’, described in Section 5.5.1 below, clearly represents the grammaticalized accusative singular of the feminine noun *tán* ‘time’ with the article: in cases like *intain mbís hísiu* ‘when he is here’ in (71a), the nasalization of the simple form ^N*bis* may well be due to the bare nasalizing effect of the accusative singular form of the preceding noun. The stressed character of *intain* ‘when’ is indisputable from a

⁵ In fact, the form Wb 21d1 *arnietetár* [ar ni-fet-etar] included in Table 2.6 as an example of lenited /f/ in the deuterotonic boundary of *ro-fitir* ‘knows’ (as the perfect of *ro-finnadar* ‘finds’), which is not assured according to Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 726), would be the only case of this frequent verb in the three collections of glosses that clearly displays the effect of this lenition. To be sure, there are cases of other verbs in which /f/ is lenited in that position of the verbal complex, but then the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* appears in slot 2, i.e. just before the deuterotonic boundary, as in the case of forms such as *fodera*, considered in Section 10.4.5.

diachronic point of view (see Section 5.7.2), but this conjunction becomes unstressed in Old Irish: while *intain* is the most frequent spelling in Wb, it appears mostly as *intan* in Ml, i.e. with the lack of palatalization due to the loss of stressed character; the unstressed character involves case (ii) below. In addition, the combination of this and other similar subordinating conjunctions with compound verbs involves nasalization in the internal part of the verbal complex, i.e. case (iv) below.

(ii) Mutations are clearly the effect of an unstressed element that is not included in the structure of the verbal complex. The conditional conjunction *ma^L* ‘if’ considered in Sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 lenites the first sound of the following verb: e.g. *mathéis* ‘if he go’, included in Table 2.6, probably /ma-‘θe:f/, where *téis* /‘tʰe:f/ would be the unmutated form of the 3SG present subjunctive of the simple verb *téit* ‘goes’. Nasalization on a pretonic element is triggered by the unstressed conjunction *a^N* ‘when’ considered in Section 5.5.1, as in e.g. Ml 55d11 *anasmbeir* ‘when he says’; note that this forms of the verb *as-beir* includes nasalization of the type considered in (iv).

(iii) The Old Irish mutations are also the constitutive effect of some components of the verbal complex. This is the case of the polar interrogative particles noted in Section 2.3.1 above, and of some pronominal infixes in slot 2 described in Section 2.6 below. The conjunct particle *ro-* produces lenition when it appears as the last element in slot 1. In these cases, the mutation expresses no function by itself. The nasalization of the oblique relative particle *-(s)a^N* is probably to be interpreted in terms of relative marking, but it must be primarily taken as a constitutive effect of the particle; see Section 5.7.1 for this issue. The mutations provoked by the negative relative particle *nad^{L/N}* are to be included in the following point.

(iv) Autonomous mutation, i.e. when the sole mutation is the marker of a grammatical category, is the case of so-called relative mutations, which typically apply onto the first sound in slots 3 or 4 of compound verbs: e.g. *for-chain* ‘who / that teaches’ /for-‘xanⁱ/ seen in example (44b) below, the 3SG positive leniting relative form corresponding to the declarative clause type form *for-cain* ‘(s)he teaches’ /for-‘kanⁱ/’. The form *(-)asmbeir* (i.e. *as-^Nbeir*) quoted above in point (ii) is a case of autonomous relative nasalization. Cases of such mutation effects onto a simple verbal form, in line with the forms considered in (i) above, are also analyzed in Sections 4.7.4 and 5.3.2. Autonomous mutation can also be the morphological expression of a pronominal reference under certain circumstances considered in the following section on pronominal affixes.

2.6 Pronominal affixes

As stated in Section 2.2.1 above, the Old Irish verbal complex regularly includes the pragmatically unmarked pronominal references expressing the core arguments of the clause. This section leaves apart the inflectional endings in slot 5, and focuses on the pronominal affixes appearing in slot 2 (infixes), and in slot 6 (suffixes). In accordance with the main aim of this chapter, this section will only concentrate on the formal side of these affixal pronouns. Other issues concerning these important constituents of the verbal complex will be considered in various chapters, mainly in Chapters 4, 8, and 10.

The Old Irish verbal forms with a suffixed pronoun have been studied by Breatnach (1977), whereas the verbal complexes including an infixal pronoun in basically the three main collections of glosses have been collected and briefly analyzed by Sommer (1897). A classical presentation of the affixal forms is Thurneysen (1946: 259–260, 270–271).

Both the suffixed and the infixal pronouns are presented in Table 2.7. In the 1st and 2nd persons of Classes B and C, the forms with *-o-* vocalism are those used in Wb, whereas those with *-a-* vocalism are used in Ml and Sg. The unstressed character of these elements is responsible for this variation, but the two uses are quite consistent in their respective collections, there being virtually no exceptions.

Classes A and B are basically used for declarative clauses and the selection of A or B is decided by the phonotactic structure of the lexical preverb appearing in slot 1. Class A is used with the lexical preverbs *dī-/de-*, *fo-*, *ro-*, *to-*, as well as with *im(b/m)-* and *ar(e)-*, which originally ended in a vowel; Class A is therefore added to (-)CV- lexical preverbs. Class B is found with the lexical preverbs *ad-*, *ath-*, *com-*, *ess-*, *etar-*, *for-*, *frith-*, *in(d)-*, *os-*, which have the shape (-)VC.⁶ Class C is basically used to express relative clause type with any lexical preverb. As for the conjunct particles, *no-* and *ro-* vary between Class A and C, depending on

6 The phonotactic structure of the lexical preverb seems therefore to be the decisive reason for the difference between Classes A and B. Class B is limited to lexical preverbs, whereas Class A appears in both lexical preverbs and conjunct particles. Due to the lack of relevant forms, it is not clear which Class, A or B, is used after the other lexical preverbs in Table 2.3. The 3PL infix *-ta-* in the relative form *remitatét* ‘which precedes them’, given in (25c) below, must be of Class C. After the deadjectival preverb *mí-* ‘mis-’, it seems that Class B is used, at least according to the form *mitnimret* ‘that they deceive him’ [mí-t^N-im(m)-(be)r-et] given in Table 2.4 above, which should be interpreted as a declarative clause type form used in a complement clause, in line with Section 5.3.2 below. See Section 4.8 and García-Castillero (forthc.) for more details on the use of Class B of infixal pronouns and the latter for a diachronic explanation.

whether the verb is declarative or relative. This formal and functional opposition is analyzed in detail in Section 4.8. The negative relative particle *nach-* takes the 3SG f. and 3PL *-a·* variant, which is given here as Class C; see Section 4.8.3 for this form.

Tab. 2.7: Affixal pronouns in the Old Irish verbal complex

	Infixed			Suffixed
	Class A	Class B	Class C	
1SG	<i>-m^L</i>	<i>-dom^L / -tom^L / -dam^L / -tam^L</i>	<i>-dom^L / -dam^L</i>	<i>-um</i>
2SG	<i>-t^L</i>	<i>-tot^L / -tat^L</i>	<i>-dat^L</i>	<i>-ut</i>
3SG f.	<i>-s^(N)</i>	<i>-da· / -ta·</i>	<i>-da· / -a·</i>	<i>-us</i>
3SG m.	<i>-a^N</i>	<i>-t^N</i>	<i>-d^N / -id^N / -did^N</i>	<i>-i⁷</i>
3SG n.	<i>-a^L</i>	<i>-t^L</i>	<i>-d^L / -id^L / -did^L</i>	
1PL	<i>-n·</i>	<i>-don· / -ton· / -tan·</i>	<i>-don· / -dan·</i>	<i>-un(n)</i>
2PL	<i>-b·</i>	<i>-dob· / -tob· / -tab·</i>	<i>-dob· / -dab·</i>	<i>-ib</i>
3PL	<i>-s^(N)</i>	<i>-da· / -ta·</i>	<i>-da· / -a·</i>	<i>-us</i>

The present description departs from previous treatments in that it adopts a synchronic perspective, and leaves out of consideration diachronic aspects. Taking the declarative clause type form as the form with respect to which the morphological modifications apply (i.e. as the basic form), the expression of the affixal pronouns involves applying either one or more of the following morphological operations: (i) addition of a segmental element, (ii) phoneme elision, (iii) phoneme replacement, and (iv) mutation. Note that lenition and nasalization are treated as a different type, though they (in particular, lenition) could be taken as a case of the non-concatenative formative “substitution or replacement” considered by Bickel and Nichols (2007: 182). The combination of two of these strategies in the expression of a pronominal reference in the Old Irish verbal complex is common, and mutation mostly accompanies one of the other strategies; in fact, this concomitant mutation (or the lack thereof) characterizes each specific infix form in the way stated in Table 2.7. Points (a) to (e) in the following describe the morphological behavior of the affixal pronouns.

(a) Most infixal pronouns in Table 2.7 involve the addition of an overt morpheme that may cause mutation to the sound that comes thereafter. This is the case of the Class A and C infixes (except for the Class A 3SG m./n. forms), and of Class B in combination with the lexical preverbs *for-* and *etar-*. An example of this

⁷ The variant *-(i)t* of the basic form *-i* of this suffixed pronominal form is dealt with in Sections 4.4, 4.9.1, and 10.4.5.

morphological procedure is the Class C 1PL infix *-don-* observed in Section 2.2.1 above, which in the (nasalizing) relative form *asndonberat* ‘they say (of) us’ is inserted between the lexical preverb *as-* and the form *-berat* of *as-berat* ‘they say’.⁸ An example with a Class B pronoun is *fortat tet su* ‘it helps you’ seen in example (5b) above, to be analyzed as *for-tat*.⁽¹⁾*tet-su*, which can be compared with the corresponding form without infix *for-tét* ‘(s)he / it helps’.

(b) Suffixed pronouns are remarkable in that the addition of an overt morpheme is mostly (but not always, see Section 4.4.3 below) accompanied by the loss of the vowel of the desinence in the corresponding basic form. For instance, as against the declarative 3SG form without suffix *beirid* ‘(s)he brings’, the form with the suffixed pronoun is *beirthi* ‘(s)he brings it’, given in example (24) below, which comes from a previous form **ber-ith-i* and is analyzed as [ber-(i)th^l-i]. If the suffixed pronoun is added to a deponent verb, the elimination of the segment */-ir/* of the basic declarative form is added to the previous modification: thus, with respect to the 3SG form *oénigidir* ‘(s)he unites’ (i.e. *oénig-idir*), we have the form *oenichthi(-som)* ‘he unites him(self)’ [oénig-(i)th^l-i] seen above in Section 2.2.2. The suffixed pronouns produce no mutation at all in the following word.

(c) Typical forms of Class B infixes involve replacement by the corresponding dental fortis of the final consonant of the preverbs *ad-*, *ath-* (both → e.g. *atam^l-*), elision of the final consonant of the lexical preverbs *as-*, *fris-*, *con-* (→ e.g. *atam^l-*, *fritam^l-*, *cotam^l-*), and replacement of the whole preverb in the case of the preverb *in-* (→ e.g. *atam^l-*), apart from the mutations also observed in the Class A forms. For example, with respect to the 3PL *as·berat* ‘they say’, the form Ml 44c19 *at berat* ‘they say it’ implies elision of the final *-s-* of the preverb by the *-t^l-* of the infix form; similarly, the form *cotammeicnighthersa* ‘(by which) I am compelled’, a form of the deponent *con-éicnigedar* ‘compels’ analyzed in example (4) above, represents elision of the *-n-* of *con-*. With respect to the 3PL *in-grennat* ‘they persecute’ without any pronominal affix, the form *atamgrennat* ‘they persecute me’, quoted in example (52a), has the Class B 1SG infix *-tam^l-*, and shows the complete replacement of the preverb *in-*.

(d) One of the strategies of the Class A 3SG m./n. infix pronouns, which are fairly frequent in the Old Irish texts, is the replacement of the vowel in the CV-preverbal element. This is the combination of a Class A 3SG m./n. infix with a compound verb which has in slot 1 one of the lexical preverbs *to-*, *dī-/de-*, *fo-* and *ro-*

⁸ Note that, if the pretonic string of the relative verb contains a Class C infix, relative nasalization is located before the form of the infix: the example quoted in the text is Wb 2a12 *amal asndonberat* ‘as they say of us’, i.e. *as^N-don-ber-at*. When used alone, the Class C infix values as the marker of relative lenition; see Section 4.8.

seen in Section 2.3.1, or one of the conjunct particles *no-* and *ro-*: in that case, the vowel of the preverbal element is replaced by *-a-* and the initial sound of the tonic part of the verbal complex is lenited or nasalized, depending on the neuter or masculine gender of the pronominal reference respectively. For instance, on the basis of *do·gní* '(s)he does', the form with the neuter form *-a^L-* is Wb 12b34 *daḡní* 'he does it'. In the case of the lexical preverbs *im(b/m)-* and *ar(e)-*, the *-a^{N/L}-* is added to the form (i.e. strategy (a) above), as in e.g. *imma accai* 'he considers it', from *imm·accí*, quoted in (107), and Wb 1d7 *arangairet* 'they forbid it [the evil action, masculine in Old Irish]', [ar(e)-a^N·gar^L-et] from *ar·gair*.

(e) Another strategy used by the Class A 3SG m./n. infixes is the bare mutation effect, and this is found after the negative conjunct particles *ní-* and *nach-*: with respect to *ní·ceíl* '(s)he doesn't conceal', the form with the Class A 3SG n. infix is Wb 5b5 *nícheíl* 'he does not conceal it'. See Section 4.8.3 for more examples of this type.

Strategy (e) is an alternative to strategy (d), in the sense that the replacement of the vowel of the preverbal elements *to-*, *dí-/de-*, *fo-*, *ro-*, and *no-* in combination with the Class A 3SG m./n. infixes has been prevented in the case of the conjunct particle *ní-* due to the grammatical category expressed precisely by its vowel, namely declarative clause type. The maintenance of the vowel of this conjunct particle serves to avoid ambiguity between forms such as the 2PL imperative form Ml 68a15 *nacarid* 'love him!' [n(o)-a^N·car-id^L], and a putative declarative **nacarid* 'you (pl.) love him not' *[n(i)-a^N·car-id^L], which appears instead as *nícarid* [ní-(a)^N·car-id^L], with the morphological process of (e). For the combination of Class A 3SG m./n. infixes *-a^{N/L}-* with *nach-*, see again Section 4.8.3.

2.7 On the affixal character of the elements in slots 1 to 3 and 6

On the basis of the obligatoriness of the affixal pronouns, Section 2.2 has proposed a template of 6 slots for the Old Irish verbal complex as the basic descriptive notion in Old Irish verbal morphology. This has in turn led to the description of a number of components included or implied in the configuration of these 6 slots: conjunct particles, deadjectival preverbs, lexical preverbs, infixes and suffixed pronouns, as well as the relative mutations and the deuterotonic vs proto-tonic allomorphy.

Additionally, Section 2.2 has introduced the question of whether this verbal complex constitutes a grammatical or morphosyntactic word, and has considered Dixon and Aikhenvald's (2002) criteria. By looking at other sets of general criteria, the wordhood of the Old Irish verbal complex will be considered now from a

slightly different perspective, which basically addresses the affixal character of the elements that were considered in Sections 2.3 to 2.6, in particular the elements that appear in slots 1 and 3. There is no doubt about the affixal character of the inflectional endings in slot 5, of the suffixed pronouns in slot 6 (recall the formal variation they cause on the preceding slot, as observed in Section 2.6(b)), as well as of the infixes, which are subject to a noticeable variation depending on a number of factors; for this point, the reader must go back again to the previous section and consider Griffith's (2011) paper quoted in Section 2.2.2.

As for the elements appearing in slot 1, the lexical preverbs, with their noticeable behavior in the deuterotonic vs prototonic allomorphic variation, seem to have a clear affixal profile: on the one hand, their inclusion in slot 3 of the verbal complex points to a great cohesion with the verbal stem, in accordance with their derivational nature, whereas their presence in slot 1 is due to the expression of a specific number of categories, namely, those enumerated in points (ii) and (iii) in Section 2.4.4 above. Henderson (2002: 119) also assumes the status of grammatical words for lexical compound verbs of Eastern / Central Arrernte, which do not appear in isolation and which can be separated by more elements than in the case of the Old Irish verbal complex.

However, there are some differences in the behavior of the conjunct particles with respect to the lexical preverbs according to which the former could perhaps be interpreted as less affixal: in addition to the virtual limitation to slot 1, conjunct particles do not display the allomorphy of the CV-lexical preverbs in deuterotonic schemas such as CV₁V₂C(-), which – as stated in Section 2.4.2 – also appear as CV₂C(-) when the deuterotonic structure is expected; in other words, a conjunct particle such as *ní-* or *na-* never elides its vowel when it appears before a vowel. The question arises then as to whether the conjunct particles, i.e. the preverbal elements that carry grammatical meaning and are restricted to slot 1 (with some exceptions), could be interpreted as affixal.

I will consider three sets of criteria that have been proposed in the literature for the discussion on the affixal character of elements similar to the Old Irish conjunct particles. (1) Dahl's (1979) test to measure the degree of affixal character of 'sentence negation' is relevant at this point, in view of the fact that a good deal of the conjunct particles under consideration are negatives. (2) The criteria proposed by Zwicky and Pullum (1983) to decide the cliticized or affixal status of unstressed elements have also been considered in the discussion of other Old Irish unstressed elements. (3) Haspelmath (2011) critically reviews a number of morphosyntactic criteria of wordhood stressing their relative value and pointing, as a conclusion associated to it, to the gradational nature of the difference between

morphological and syntactic components. The three sets coincide in some of their criteria.

According to Dahl (1979: 83–84), typically morphological features of negative markers are (1a) the “portmanteau realization of Neg,” (1b) the “prosodic unity of Neg and verb (viz. if they share one word stress),” (1c) “the placement of Neg close to the root of the verb (i.e. between the root and other inflectional morphemes),” and (1d) the “morphophonemic alternation in the Negation morpheme.” The features that, according to Dahl, speak for a syntactic nature are (1e) the “movability of Neg,” (1f) the “prosodic independence,” (1g) “in written language: orthographic separation,” and (1h) “if the Neg morpheme by itself carries inflectional affixes.”

In view of these criteria, the Old Irish conjunct particles, and in particular the negative conjunct particles, are decidedly affixal elements: (1a) negative conjunct particles display formal variation according to clause type differences (basically, *ní-* for declarative, *nad-* / *nach-* for relative and *na-* for imperative clause types); (1b,f) the negative conjunct particles are pretonic elements attached to the verbal stem (or to the stem preceded by a lexical preverb); (1c) the negative conjunct particles are only separated from the verbal stem (or the verbal stem preceded by a lexical preverb in slot 3) by the infixed pronouns, by the particles *ro-* and *imm(a)-*, or by some deadjectival preverb; (1d) though the rule has some exceptions, the negative relative forms *nach-* and *nad-* are used depending on whether they are combined with an infix or not respectively; in relative verbal complexes, the negative particle takes the form *-na-* when it is preceded by a further conjunct particle such as the oblique relative *-(s)a^N-*; (1e) the negative particle cannot change its position; for the so-called tmesis in Old Irish, see the observations in Section 3.4 below; (1g) Section 2.2.3 above has pointed to the clear tendency to write the pretonic conjunct particles and the tonic part of the verbal complex and as a single graphic word; (1h) the Old Irish negative conjunct particles carry no inflectional affixes, i.e. the pronominal affixes that may appear after them are a matter of the whole verbal complex.

An adapted version of Zwicky and Pullum’s (1983) criteria for affix- or clitic-hood has been applied by Griffith (2011) to the Old Irish pronominal elements in slots 2 and 6, which have a decidedly affixal profile, especially if they are compared to the *notae augentes* and deictic elements attached at the end of the verbal complex, which have all the features of clitic forms that stand outside the structure of the verbal complex, as stated in Section 2.2.2. In line with Griffith’s contribution, I consider the Old Irish conjunct particles in the light of the original version of those criteria, which were proposed precisely to analyze the English negative marker *-n’t*. When possible, I make use of Anderson’s (2005: 33) and

Griffith's (2011) more concise formulations of Zwicky and Pullum's criteria: (2a) "clitics tend to have a lower degree of host selection than affixes"; (2b) paradigmatic gaps are more likely in /host + affix/ combinations; (2c) "morphophonological idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixes"; (2d) "semantic idiosyncrasies are more common with affixes than with clitics"; (2e) "syntactic rules can affect affixed words, but not groups of /host + clitic(s)"; (2f) "clitics, but not affixes, can be attached to material already containing clitics."

As for criterion (2a), the general selectional properties of the conjunct particles are different depending on the specific particle: the negative and relative particles are limited to verbs, though their range of application is very great here; the conjunct particle *ro-* is more selective: some verbal forms do not take this particle *ro-* because their meaning is already perfective (e.g. the preterite form *táinicc* '(s)he came'), or because it has a specific lexical preverb (e.g. verbs with *com-* as the sole lexical preverb in slot 1 take *ad-* in slot 3 to mark perfective character).⁹ In addition to that, a more specific selectional property of conjunct particles is that they involve the use of the prototonic variant of lexical compounds observed in Section 2.4.2, as well as the so-called conjunct inflection in slot 5, a point to be considered in Section 4.2 below; this is a clear difference with respect to the *notae augentes* just mentioned, which are added to verb forms bearing any type of ending. In the paradigm of the substantive verb analyzed in Section 9.3.2, a number of conjunct particles select a different stem: e.g. *attá* '(s)he is (in...)' vs *nifil* '(s)he is not (in...)'; the special conjunct particles of the copula are a further argument in this sense, as recently noted by Lash (2017: 84). As for (2b), the negative or relative conjunct particles have no paradigmatic restrictions. In reference to criterion (2c), the numerous idiosyncratic features of the particle *ro-* must be mentioned at this stage, in addition to those on negatives included for Dahl's criterion (1d): *ro-* appears in either slot 1 or 3, and in the latter it appears with or without its vowel, depending on the morphotactic context; add to this the so-called 'split for'.¹⁰ As for criterion (2d), the Old Irish conjunct particles are in general not involved in semantic idiosyncrasies; the subordinating conjunct particle *dia^N*- 'if,

⁹ For instance, the preterite *con-tuil* 'slept' has the perfective form *con-at-tail* 'has slept'; see McCone (1997a: 92–93) for other similar cases. In spite of this selective behavior of the conjunct particle *ro-* in the verbal morphology, this particle can be combined with adjectives in order to express 'too' (e.g. from *becc* 'little', *Thes.* ii 241.8 *rubecc* 'too little').

¹⁰ The 'split for' represents an extremely idiosyncratic behavior of the conjunct particle *ro-*: in some Old Irish forms, the lexical preverb *for* splits into the parts /fo-/ and /-r/ in order to include the conjunct particle *ro-*: an example among others is the form Ml 135a1 *foruraithminset* 'that they have remembered' (i.e. *fo-ru-r-aith-mins-et*), from the lexical compound *for-aithminedar*. For a detailed treatment of this 'split for', see García-Castillero (2017d).

when' is surely a special, grammaticalized use of the original value of the form *dia*^N-, which represents the combination of the preposition *do*- plus the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a*^N-, i.e. 'for which'). As for (2e), the conjunct particles cannot be elided in a sequence of coordinated verbal complexes.¹¹ I do not deal with criterion (2f) of Zwicky and Pullum's list.

Haspelmath (2011) suggests using only the following morphosyntactic criteria, which – taken one by one – do not provide a decisive argument: (3a) "potential pauses," (3b) free or fixed occurrence, (3c) "external mobility and internal fixedness," (3d) (un-)interruptability, (3e) (non-)selectivity, (3f) (non-) coordinatability, (3g) "anaphoric islandhood," (3h) "(non-)extractability," (3i) "morphophonological idiosyncrasies," and (3j) "deviations from biuniqueness." In relation to the previous points, the affixal character of the Old Irish conjunct particles is seen in that (3b) they cannot appear by themselves; (3c) they must always appear in the same place of the verbal complex, i.e. Dahl's criterion (1e); (3d) they can be separated from slots 3 or 4 by a very limited set of elements, i.e. Dahl's criterion (1c); (3e) they are combined only with specific forms of verbs, i.e. Zwicky and Pullum's criterion (2a); (3f) they cannot be elided in coordinated verbal complexes, i.e. Zwicky and Pullum's criterion (2e); (3i) they display the idiosyncrasies described in Dahl's criterion (1d) and Zwicky and Pullum's criterion (2c). Criterion (3j), which – according to Haspelmath (2011: 54–59) – does not serve to separate morphological from syntactic phenomena, is Dahl's criterion (1a). For various reasons, (3g) and (3h) are difficult to apply to the verbal complex;¹² criterion (3a) is also considered by Haspelmath as a non-valid argument.

In sum, among the constituents considered above in section 2.2.2 for the Old Irish verbal complex, the pronominal elements in slots 2 and 6 are almost or barely as affixal as typically affixal elements such as the inflectional endings in

11 The regular procedure is observed in e.g. Ml 50a10 *aris cosmail aní fuandrogab infaith 7 funrogab crist* 'for that with reference to which the prophet uttered it and that with reference to which Christ uttered it are alike', where the stressed light head *aní* is elided in the second coordinated NP (by means of 'ʔ' = *ocus* 'and'), but not the pretonic sequence *fo-(s)a*^N- 'with reference to which' or even the preposition of that pretonic sequence.

12 One could argue that some cases of allosentential relationship between cleft-sentence and normal order (in the sense established in Section 3.2.1 below) may provide cases of extraction of a given component, in particular of the deadjectival preverbs and pronominal references. However, the fact that (some of) the adjectives corresponding to deadjectival preverbs can appear as the focused element of a cleft-sentence is no argument for the clitic or even word character of the latter; in the same way as it happens with the opposition between affixal pronouns and inflectional endings, on the one hand, and their stressed variants, on the other, they are simply two versions of the same semantic component with two different uses. Conjunct particles cannot be focused in such a manner.

slot 5. With respect to the lexical preverbs, which can appear in slots 1 or 3, the conjunct particles are mostly (but not exclusively) limited to slot 1, in which they regularly maintain the boundary with the rest of the verbal complex and have a less restricted distribution. Even though this could be taken as a sign of a less affixal character, the conjunct particles are still components of a clear affixal nature: apart from their unstressed character, these exclusive components of the verbal complex occupy a fixed position in this structure, they can be separated from the stem or from the sequence of lexical preverb and stem by a very reduced number of elements, their presence determines a number of morphological features (conjunct endings and, in lexical compounds, prototonic form) in the verbal complex, they cannot be elided in coordinated verbal complexes, and they display quite a few morphophonological idiosyncrasies, in particular the perfectivizing conjunct particle *ro-*.

2.8 Minimal and maximal constituency of the verbal complex

This description of the Old Irish verbal complex has offered a general template with some general rules, as well as an exhaustive list of the preverbal components appearing in slots 1 to 3, of the pronominal suffixes in slot 6, and has discussed the morphological nature of those elements. As the final point of this description, it is also necessary to state the maximal and minimal size of the verbal complex, as a step in the presentation of the real cases that must be analyzed in this study.

(a) Minimal constituency. The minimal string of elements for an Old Irish verbal complex consists of the sequence [4 - 5]: this is the case of the simple verb, that is to say, of the verb that does not take any of the preverbal elements described in Section 2.3 above. Depending on the clause type and tense of the verbal complex, the endings in slot 5 in that sequence [4 - 5] will be the so-called absolute endings (either declarative or relative), the conjunct endings, or those of the imperative. In the case of forms such as the 2SG of the imperative active, there seems to be a zero morpheme in slot 5, as suggested in Section 7.3; in the case of the active conjunct SG persons of some specific present and preterite inflectional classes, as well as in the case of some absolute declarative SG forms of some preterites, there is no overt or segmental marker in slot 5, the corresponding person being marked by the stem vowel and/or by the palatal or neutral character of the final consonant(s) of the verbal stem in slot 4; see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.6.1.

Because of the obligatory expression of certain pronominal references by means of an infix pronoun, as noted above in Section 2.2.1, slot 1 is very frequently occupied in addition to slots 4 and 5. As a further reason, adduced in

Section 2.2.1, this is obligatory for some tenses (imperfect and secondary tense forms, perfective and potential forms marked with *ro*), as well as for some clause types (negative, polar interrogative, and relative clause types with particle $-(s)a^N$). In all those cases, as well as when the verbal stem is preceded by a lexical preverb, the basic structure of the verbal complex is [1 - 4 - 5].

(b) Combinatorial restrictions. (b1) The Old Irish verbal complex admits only one affixal pronoun in its structure. The maximal amount of argument references included in the Old Irish verbal complex is therefore two, one affixal pronoun in either slots 2 or 6 and the person expressed by the inflectional ending in slot 5 or at the end of slot 4. (b2) Suffixed pronouns are not compatible with deponent desinences: to be more precise, the Old Irish affixal pronouns can be suffixed to deponent verbs (always within the general restrictions imposed on pronoun suffixation, see Section 4.4.1), but the resulting form will then be an active verb with suffixed pronoun (see *oenichthi-som* in Section 2.2.2 above). (b3) Pronoun suffixation is completely ruled out with passive verbs (see Section 4.5.1). (b4) 3rd person infixal pronouns are not combined with passive verbs (with the exception of cases such as the ‘conditional’ $-d^l$ - considered in Section 5.5.1 below).

(c) Maximal constituency. The incompatibility of infixal and suffixed pronoun in the same verbal complex precludes the possibility of a structure such as $*[1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6]$; the structure $*[1 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6]$ is also impossible due to the fact that slot 6 involves slots 1 to 3 being void. However, structures such as [1 - 3 - 4 - 5] and [1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5] are very frequent. An example of [1 - 2 - 4 - 5] is Wb 16b17 *dorondonadni* ‘we have been comforted’ [1 di-ro - 2 n - 4 don - 5 ad - ni], from the verb *do-dona*. An example of [1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5] is *diandilgidsi* ‘to whom you forgive it’ [1 do-(s) a^N - 2 d^l - 3 di - 4 l(u)g - 5 id^l - si], a form of the verb *do-luigi* quoted in example (7a) above.

Slot 1 usually includes a single preverbal element of those quoted in Section 2.3. Only one lexical preverb or deadjectival preverb is admitted in this slot, in which, however, two or three conjunct particles can be accumulated. Two conjunct particles appear when *ro-* or *imm(a)-* appear externalized in slot 1: e.g. Wb 18d3 *nímunaccammar* ‘we have not seen one another’ [ní-(i)mma^N·a(d)-ca-mar], with negative declarative *ní-* and reciprocal *-(i)mma-* appearing in slot 1 before the Class A 1PL infix *-n-* in slot 2; if the combination of preposition + oblique conjunct relative particle $-(s)a^N$ counts as one element, a form such as *Thes. ii 23.38 friscita comrici* ‘which you first met’, literally ‘with which you first come into contact’, also contains the deadjectival preverb *cita-* in slot 1, i.e. *friscita comrici* = [frith-((s) a^N ·cita-com-r(o)-ing-i], from the verb *con-ricc* ‘meets’, which is seen below in this section. The form Ml 35c4 *conaruaigsetar* ‘so that they did not fear’

[co^N -na-ro-aigs-etar], has three conjunct particles, subordinating co^N - ‘so that’ (Section 5.4.3), negative na -, and perfective ro -.¹³

The elements accumulated in slot 1 are not arranged in any manner: it seems that ro appears in the rightmost (or most internal) place; $cita$ - ‘first’ comes immediately before ro -; according to the observations in García-Castillero (2014: 78), deadjectival preverbs are preceded by negative particles; finally, the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ -, and the polar interrogative conjunct particle in^N -, which cannot appear in the same verbal complex, are the most external elements.

The maximal number of lexical preverbs that can be combined with a verbal stem is five, though one or a combination of two lexical preverbs is the more usual situation. For an Old Irish compound with more than one lexical preverb, when the stipulations (ii) and (iii) in Section 2.4.4 above meet (i.e. when an infix must be expressed or in the case of the declarative and relative clause type forms), the more external lexical preverb takes slot 1 and the other(s) is / are located in slot 3 of the schema in Section 2.2.2 above. Thus, ro - icc ‘reaches’ has one preverb [1 ro - 4 VERBAL STEM], con - $ricc$ ‘meets’ [1 com - 3 ro - 4 VERBAL STEM] has two; there are three preverbs in Ml 63c8 *doecmungat* ‘that happen’ [1 to - 3 $in(d)$ - com - 4 VERBAL STEM], four in Ml 110d1 *duerchomraici gl. adgregat* [1 to - 3 $ar(e)$ - com - ro - 4 VERBAL STEM], and five in Ml 61b17 *duárchomraicset* ‘they collected’ [1 to - 3 ad - ro - com - ro - 4 VERBAL STEM]. If no conjunct particle is added, therefore, the first lexical preverb takes the pretonic place and the other lexical preverb(s) that come(s) after make(s) up an accentual unit with the verbal stem (that is to say, a prototonic form). For further examples, see the lists of Pedersen (1913: 450–658), Thurneysen (1946: 534–536).

2.9 Concluding remarks

There are sufficient arguments to consider the verbal complex described by means of the template in Section 2.2.2 as a grammatical or morphosyntactic word, the components of which have a rather morphological character. The initial and important argument for the very notion of verbal complex is the obligatoriness of these components: as stated in Section 2.2.1, the pronominal affixes represent the

¹³ Other possibilities that could be assumed, but for which I have no examples, are: (a) as a blend of the pretonic string *friscita*- seen in the text and of e.g. Wb 26c4 *ceturupridach* ‘who has first preached’ [$cetu$ - ro - $pridach$], it could be supposed something like **tres-cetu-ro-pridach* ‘through which he has first preached’ [$tres$ -((s)a)^N- $cetu$ - ro ·], with three elements in slot 1; (b) if one would like to say ‘through which he has not first preached’, it could be something like **tres-na-cetu-ro-pridach* [$tres$ -((s)a)^N- na - $cetu$ - ro ·], with four elements in slot 1.

only possible way to express a pragmatically unmarked pronominal reference within the clause in the function of object and, more specifically, the so-called infixed pronouns are the obligatory way of expressing every passive 1st and 2nd persons in Old Irish. This inflectional feature of the Old Irish passive paradigm requires the presence of an element in slot 1 that hosts these infixed pronouns, and therefore this element must also be considered an obligatory component of the verbal complex. In fact, slot 1 is also an obligatory component of the verbal complex in imperfect, past subjunctive and conditional (see Section 4.2 below), as well as in a number of relative clause type forms, as observed in Section 4.3.1.

In line with the previous observation, the conjunct particles in slot 1 show a considerable degree of affixal character, as argued in Section 2.7. In this regard, there is a certain difference in morphological cohesiveness among the typically inflectional constituents of the verbal complex: the morphological boundary of the conjunct particles in slot 1 is clearer than that of the pronominal references in slots 2 and 6, and also of the inflectional endings in slot 5. In comparison to those elements, the *notae augentes* sometimes attached to the verbal complex are non-obligatory clitics with no interplay with the remaining parts of the verbal complex. The special character of the conjunct particles is probably related to their character as pretonic elements and to the (deuterotonic) boundary they involve; this morphological boundary needs to be clearly marked, since it is the basic placement for the mutations, as observed in Section 2.4.3.

The template proposed in Section 2.2.2 to describe the basic structure of the verbal complex is merely notional, because a form in which all six slots are filled cannot occur. As observed in Section 2.8, the Old Irish verbal complex has a minimal structure of two slots, i.e. [4 - 5] or perhaps one, i.e. [4], and a maximal number of five, i.e. [1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5]. Section 2.8 also leaves clear that some slots sometimes include more than one element and / or can further be analyzed: thus, slots 1 and 3 may contain more than one conjunct particle and lexical preverb respectively; as a point that has not been considered in this chapter, the verbal stem included in slot 4 sometimes has a complex structure in which a temporal or modal suffix is easily identifiable (see, for this analysis, in the linguistic glosses given for the examples), so that one could perhaps think of a more complex template including more than the six slots. However, slot 4 is in general not relevant for the expression of clause typing, with the exception of the suppletive paradigms of the present indicative of the copula and substantive verb described in Chapter 9, as well as of the suppletive imperatives mentioned in Chapter 7. The present chapter does not include either the inflectional endings, in which clause types can be distinguished: this is discussed in Sections 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6, which offer the specific declarative and relative clause type endings, as well as the

clause type neutral endings, and in Section 7.3, in which the special imperative endings are mentioned.

3 The syntax of the Old Irish verbal complex: Unmarked and marked word orders

3.1 Introduction: Unmarked and marked V positions in Old Irish

The Old Irish verbal complex regularly takes the first position of the clause, what is termed the V1 order. The elements given by Pedersen (1913: 303) as preceding what he takes as the Old Irish verb (i.e. the form in slots [4 - 5] of the verbal complex described in Section 2.2.2) correspond to the preverbal elements described above in Section 2.3 and are located in slot 1. The exceptions to this rule considered in this introductory section involve two types of linguistic elements, namely, subordinating conjunctions and discourse particles. These conjunctions are considered in Chapter 5 on subordination: they have a rather clitic-like character and, in fact, some of them seem to be incorporated into the verbal complex, in particular when this already has a pretonic element. It is necessary to state, however, that they do not pertain to the structure of the verbal complex as defined in Chapter 2. The discourse particles appear most often after the V1 and are not considered in this study.

This chapter offers a more detailed presentation and discussion of two groups of Old Irish syntactic structures that represent some type of deviation with respect to the normal, unmarked V1 order. The first group includes the cleft-sentence and the NP left-dislocation, two syntactic structures that are cross-linguistically well-known and appear very often in the Old Irish texts: the former is used to express marked focus and is analyzed in Section 3.2, whereas the latter is the most typical way to state the marked topic of the sentence and is presented in Section 3.3. The second group includes tmesis and Bergin's Law, which are two specific Old Irish structures that are restricted to some specific texts; they are both considered in Section 3.4, together with other, similar structures. Section 3.5 offers a general overview of these alternative orders of Old Irish and Section 3.6 resumes the main results of the chapter and closes this introductory part.

There are good reasons to introduce these structures at this point, i.e. before the analysis of the clause types. On the one hand, the cleft-sentence turns out to be a significant structure in the discussion of various parts of Chapters 4 to 6, which are devoted to the declarative, relative, and *wh*-interrogative clause types. Left-dislocation goes hand in hand with this structure. In general terms, this is

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-003>

due to the relevance of information structure for clause typing anticipated in Section 1.7.2 above. On the other, *tnesis* and, more prominently, *Bergin's Law* have been considered in previous interpretations of the difference between absolute and conjunct endings that must be discussed later on in Chapter 8.

3.2 The Old Irish cleft-sentence

Formally, the Old Irish cleft-sentence is made up of an initial copula that introduces a syntactic constituent that, in the normal order, would either appear after the clause initial verbal complex, or even be included in its structure. The introducing copula and the focused element are followed by a verb that shows either relative or declarative clause type morphology. Functionally, the Old Irish cleft-sentence is a syntactic construction used to focus the constituent located after the initial copula.¹⁴ The focus may be defined as the constituent of the basic proposition that the speaker considers needs to be emphasized due to its informatively more relevant role with respect to the remaining parts of the proposition.

The Old Irish cleft-sentence agrees with the general descriptions by Lambrecht (1994: 230, 2001: 466) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 202) of this cross-linguistically widespread structure. A point in which this pragmatically marked structure may depart from formal equivalents in other languages such as Modern Spanish, with tendential *SVO* order, is its noticeable relevance and productivity, due surely to the fact that, in Mac Coisdealbha's ([1976] 1998: 182–183) words, "it is an order-preserving construction in an order-bound language."

This section centers on the three main formal components of the cleft-sentence just delineated, (a) the focused constituent, in Section 3.2.1, (b) the introducing copula, in Section 3.2.2, and (c) the clause type marking of the post-focus

14 Lambrecht (1994: 226–235) and Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 206–220) distinguish three syntactic types of focus: predicate focus (normally the corresponding to a subject topic), clause focus (when the whole clause, including the subject, is marked) and narrow focus (when a sole constituent is marked, normally by means of a cleft-sentence). According to Pusch (2001: 202–208), the main function of the cleft-sentence is focusing, though it may also have 'presentative' and 'cohesive' value. The semantic functions that have been identified by Poppe (1993: 231–237) in the Old Irish cleft-sentence are: (1) "Kontrastierung," (2) "Identifikation," (3) "Erklärung" ['explanation'], (4) "Parallelität," (5) "Hervorhebung" ['emphasis'], and (6) "Texteinschnitt" ['text insertion']. Isaac (in Mac Coisdealbha [1976] 1998: 258–259) follows Dik's classification, which approximately includes Poppe's functions, though in a hierarchical way that supposes two main types of contrastive focus, 'parallel' and 'counter-presuppositional'. A full discussion on the adequacy of these classifications is beyond the scope of this study, but it can be said that the most usual types in Old Irish are contrastive and identificational focus.

verb, in Section 3.2.3, and pays special attention to the relationship of this structure to the assumed unmarked (i.e. V1) order, i.e. to its unmarked ‘allosentence’, to use Lambrecht’s (1994) term.

3.2.1 Focused constituent

The informatively most important element of the cleft-sentence is the constituent appearing after the initial copula, a position in which virtually every component of a normal clause, i.e. of the unmarked allosentential structure just mentioned, can appear. This includes the subject or object, whether pronominal or not, prepositional phrases, adverbial complements, as well as the verbal or nominal predicate. I classify the syntactic constituents susceptible of being focused in the three following groups: (i) lexical and pronominal elements that are the subject or the object of the presumable basic clause; (ii) prepositional phrases that involve either a lexical or a pronominal referent, and (iii) adjectives in adverbial function as well as the verbal (in form of a verbal noun) and the non-verbal (i.e. nominal) predicate. The reason for this classification is the prevalent morphology of the following verb, a point that is discussed in the Section 3.2.3 below.

(i) A focused lexical NP appears in nominative case, irrespective of the function (subject or object) it would have in the unmarked order (and therefore irrespective of the case form in the V1 order). In (8a), the focused element corresponds to the subject of the following clause, which in the unmarked order would be **míastir macc...* ‘the Son will judge...’, i.e. with declarative clause type marking in the verbal form instead of the relative form *míastar*. In (8b), which properly includes a cleft-sentence within another, the focused element *indocbál crist* ‘Christ’s glory’ corresponds to the object of the clause; the unmarked clause would be **pridchimmi indocbál crist* ‘we preach Christ’s glory’.

(8) a. *ismacc míastar ...* (Wb 1d9)

<i>is-macc</i>	<i>mías-tar</i>
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-son/NOM.SG.M	judge/FUT-3SG.ACT.REL
‘it is the Son who will judge ...’.	

b. *isairi is indocbál crist pridchimme ...* (Wb 15b17)

<i>is-air-i</i>	<i>is-indocbál</i>
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-for-3SG.N	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-glory/NOM.SG.F
<i>crist</i>	<i>pridch-imme</i>
Christ	preach/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL

‘it is for this reason that it is Christ’s glory what we preach ...’.

An important feature of the Old Irish cleft-sentence is that it is one of the few syntactic environments in which tonic pronouns, especially the 1st and 2nd persons, can be expressed. For other uses of the Old Irish tonic pronouns, see Section 10.2.1. In the examples in (9), the focused tonic pronouns correspond to the subject of the following verb, which regularly appears in 3rd person. In the unmarked variant of those examples, the subject would be regularly expressed by means of some marker included in the verbal complex, either the inflectional ending in slot 5 or, in the case of passive verbs, the infixed pronoun in slot 2. Thus, the unmarked allosentence corresponding to (9a) would be the predicative copular clause **am-apstal geinte* ‘I am apostle of (the) Gentiles’ (cf. Wb 10c16 *am-abstal* ‘I am an apostle’). The unmarked clause corresponding to (9b) would be the verbal complex with Class A infix, i.e. **imma-(f)olngi dam* ‘you work it for me’, whereas the one corresponding to (9c) would be **gaibid airechas ...* ‘it gets leadership ...’. Example (9d) shows the Old Irish rule according to which a 1PL or 2PL tonic pronoun is introduced by the 3SG form of the copula, which in this case is the negative declarative form. Finally, (9e) shows the use of the 3PL of the introducing copula when the focused element is a 3PL pronoun, and its unmarked version would be **cretit in ísu* ‘they believe in Jesus’.

(9) a. *ismé asapstal geinte* (Wb 5b17)

is-mé

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-1SG

as-^(L)apstal

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-(REL/)apostle/NOM.SG.M

‘it is I that am apostle of (the) Gentiles’.

geint-e

gentile-GEN.PL.M

b. ... *is tú su immidfolngi dam* (Ml 92a17)

is-tú-su

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-2SG-NA.2SG

immi-d^Lfo-lgn-i

PV-3SG.N/REL-PV-work/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT

‘... it’s you who works it for me’.

da-m

to-1SG

c. *ishé gaibes airechas ...* (Wb 3d15)

is-hé

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M

gaib-es

take/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL

called *figura etymologica*, illustrated in example (12b), and the other is the use of a dummy verb such as ‘to do’, e.g. English *lying is what he does*, for which I refer the reader to García-Castillero (2014: 65–66). For the case in which the predicate of a copular sentence is focused, see Section 9.3.6.

(11) *isbecc pridchimmeni dirúnaib dáee* (Wb 12c6)

is-becc	pridch-imme-ni
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-little/NOM.SG.N	preach/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL-NA.1PL
di-rún-aib	dáee
out of-secret-DAT.PL.F	God/GEN.SG.M
‘It is little we preach of God’s mysteries’.	

(12) a. *isocprecept soscéli attó* (Wb 21c19)

is-oc-precept	soscéli
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-at-preaching/DAT.SG.F	Gospel/GEN.SG.N
at·tó	
PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT	
‘it is teaching (the) Gospel I am’.	

b. *iscúrsagad rondúrsagusa ...* (Wb 19a6)

is-cúrsagad
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-reprimand/NOM.SG.M
ro- ^N -d ^N -cúrsag-us-sa
PERF-REL-3SG.M/REL-reprimand-PRET.ACT.1SG-NA.1SG
‘it is a reprimand with which I have reprimanded him ...’.

A complete classification of the cleft-sentences appearing in Wb 1–15 according to the nature of the post-copular element is given in Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 145–155).

3.2.2 Introductory copula

The examples in (9) above show that 1st and 2nd person tonic pronouns (i.e. both singular and plural) are regularly introduced by the 3SG of the copula, whereas

ma-ssu-beth-u	crist	nammá
if-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-life-NOM.SG.M	Christ	only
cret-me-ni	issiu	
believe/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL-NA.1PL	here	

‘if it is Christ’s life only what we believe here’.

(15) a. *cani messe immoforling cretim dúibsi in domino* (Wb 10c18)

cani-me-sse		
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.POLINT-1SG-NA.1SG		
imm-o ¹ ·fo-r-ling		
PV-REL·PV-PERF-cause/PRET.ACT.3SG		
cretim	dú-ib-si	<i>in domino</i>
belief/ACC.SG.F	to-2PL-NA.2PL	in God

‘is it not I that have caused belief to you in God?’

b. *bad dúdia fognem* (Wb 5d19)

ba-d-dú-dia	fo·gne-m
COP.IMPV-3SG.IMPV-to-God/ACC.SG.M	PV·DECL/serve/PRES.SUBJ-1PL.ACT

‘let it be God whom we serve’.

As for the possibility of the responsive clause type marking in the introductory copula of the cleft-sentence, it is worth noting that the omission of the copula (i.e. the bare nominal predicate) counts as the responsive of the copular predicate, though this omission very often has no such function. This point is dealt with in Section 9.4.5 below, in which the possibility of a cleft-sentence introduced by the responsive form of the copula is considered. Cases of simple omission of the copula in the cleft-sentence are well-known, however, and they are especially frequent when the anteposed element is neither the subject nor the object of the following verb, as in the examples in (16).

(16) a. *frinn fanisin cotondelcfam* (Wb 17b10)

fri-nn	fanisin	co(n)-ton-delc-f-am
towards-1PL	self/1PL	PV-1PL/DECL·compare-FUT-1PL.ACT

‘(it’s) with ourselves we will compare ourselves’.

b. *forsaní as primogenitum tractaid som híc* (Ml 123c8)

for-saní	as- ⁽¹⁾ primogenitum
on-LHEAD/ACC.SG.N	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-(REL/)primogenitum

ar-a ^L ·fo-cair	anúas	act
PV-REL·PV-suggest/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	above	but
is-for-óis		tuaith-e
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-on-people/ACC.SG.M		city-GEN.SG.F
ar·fo-car-ar		
PV·DECL/PV-suggest/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS		
‘it is the alms that he suggests above, but it is to the laity it is announced’.		

This rule has very few exceptions: see (18a), in which the focused conjugated preposition *fris* ‘with reference to it’ is followed by the relative form *ruchét*, instead of the expected declarative *ro·cét*. Such exceptions may well be the outcome of a mere error, but in some cases there may also be a plausible reason. For instance, in a case such as (18b), quoted by Strachan (1903: 63) and Ó hUiginn (1986: 63) as a case of innovative introduction of relative nasalization instead of expected declarative clause type morphology, the nasalizing relative form can be due to the influence of the nasalizing relative form that usually appears in the correlative subordinate clause introduced by *amal* ‘as’.¹⁷

(18) a. *ní fris ruchét* a propheta (Ml 64a13)

ní-fris	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-towards/3SG.N	
ru- ^L cét	<i>a propheta</i>
PERF·REL/sing/PRET.PASS.3SG	by the prophet
‘it is not with reference to it that it was sung by the prophet’.	

b. *issamlid inso asmbertar·* ut (Ml 23a12)

¹⁷ An example of this correlative structure is Ml 74d3 *amal duntluchur biid samlaid* ‘as I ask it, so it is’, in which *duntluchur* [to^N-d^L-tluch-ur] is the 1SG of the deponent *do-tluichethar* with relative nasalization and Class C 3SG n. infix -d^L-; the same ‘correlative’ structure can be found in Wb 10a12, Wb 13a32, Wb 21b2. The gloss in (18b) refers to the Latin passage *dicuntur autem ista cum enfasi, ut...* [‘these things are said emphatically, so that...’], and represents an interesting example of hybrid metalinguistic gloss, since its aim is to explain the value of the Latin subordinating particle *ut*, which may have modal (‘as’) but also final value (‘so that’). The glossator translates the Latin verb *dicuntur* (i.e. *asmbertar*) in a cleft-sentence in which the Old Irish form *samlid* ‘thus, so, in this manner’ is the focused element, as if it were the correlative form of *ut*, which therefore means ‘as’ in that passage. This may well explain other similar hybrid glosses in which the Latin form *sic* is followed by the nasalizing relative form (Ml 56a13, Ml 67d14), as a feature of the Ml glosses noted by Strachan (1903: 67).

is-samlid insin as^N-ber-tar ut
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-thus DIST PV·REL-say/PRES.IND-3PL.PASS so that
 ‘it is thus that they are said, so that’.

(iii) The post-focus verb of the cleft-sentence bears relative nasalization when the focused element is the verbal noun corresponding to the same verb but which does not have the function of subject or object, as in (12b), or when it is an adjective used adverbially, as in (11) above or (19) below, in which the form *nairlethar* must be interpreted as ^N*airlethar*, with *airlethar* as the absolute relative form, according to the rule described in Section 4.5.

(19) *arndip maith nairlethar amuntir ritecht gráid foir* (Wb 28b32)
 ar^N-dip-maith
 so that-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG-good/NOM.SG.N
^N-airlethar a-muntir
 REL-order/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT.REL POSS.3SG.M-household/ACC.SG.F
 ri-techt gráid foir
 before-going/DAT.SG.F order/GEN.SG.N on/3SG.M
 ‘that it may be well that he orders his household before taking orders’.

The three different clause types used in Old Irish for the post-focus verb, leniting relative, nasalizing relative and declarative clause type, correspond to Dik’s (1997: 309–312) distinction between identifying cleft construction, i.e. the prototypical one, and a less prototypical cleft construction that can include either adpositional predicates (e.g. *It was with John that I went to New York*) or adjectival predicates (e.g. *It is good that I have gone to New York*). In particular, this matches Dik’s idea that the less prototypical cleft constructions do not involve relative, but “a general subordinate *that*-clause”. The consequences and implications of this classification of the Old Irish cleft-sentences will be inspected in Chapter 5 on subordination (see in particular Section 5.7 for the use of the nasalizing relative clause type), in Chapter 6 on the *wh*-interrogative clause type (see in particular Section 6.6), and in Section 10.2 on the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates (see in particular Section 10.2.6), among other places.

Finally, it is worth noting here that the relative verbal complex of the cleft-sentence is very rarely formed by means of the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* seen in Sections 2.3.1 and 5.4.2. See Mac Cana (1985) for this point. The only case found by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 19) in Wb 1–15 is (20), where *aridlabrathar* ‘for which he says it’, from the simple *labraithir*, has the mentioned

cleft-sentence related to structural contrast and, as a feature that is important for the *wh*-interrogative clause type, structural similarity, the first aspect that can be mentioned at the present moment is that the functional description of the declarative and relative clause types must include a reference to their use in the types of cleft-sentences as summarized in Table 3.1.

3.3 Left-dislocation in Old Irish

3.3.1 Introductory notes

Left-dislocation, also known as *nominatiuus pendens* in traditional grammar, involves the anteposition of a NP to the initial verb of the clause. As in many other languages, it is normally used in Old Irish to establish a marked topical structure, i.e. to make clear the referent about which something is predicated (see Lambrecht 1994: 181–183). Less frequently, the left-dislocated NP expresses the focus of the sentence, as in e.g. (21c) below. In spite of the syntactic irregularity that it apparently represents in a V1 language, left-dislocation is in Old Irish a relatively usual structure.

The main study on Old Irish left-dislocation is Mac Coisdealbha's ([1976] 1998) monograph on this phenomenon in the language of the Glosses, in which a theoretical analysis in broadly speaking pragmatic terms is consistently carried through. Further examples from other Old Irish sources can be found in Mac Cana (1973).

Most frequently, the topicalized NP corresponds to either the subject or the object of the main clause that follows. Those two nominal constituents, especially the former, are prototypical topics. The same tendency is observed by Traugott (2007: 415–417) for the Old English left-dislocating structure. This is probably why the formal distinction between this structure and the cleft-sentence is more clearly marked when the subject and the object are the anteposed elements in both structures. In comparison to the cleft-sentence, topicalizing left-dislocation anteposes constituents of a more restricted but tendentially longer type.

In Old Irish, the verb after the left-dislocated element is a main, i.e. non-relative verb, most frequently a declarative clause type verb. Due to the involvement of clitic pronouns attached to the verbal complex in the marking of clause types (see Section 4.9 below), it is appropriate to mention at this moment that Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 83) uses the term 'resumptive' for the Old Irish left-dislocating structure, though such a term is descriptively inaccurate, since pronominal resumption can be observed in Old Irish only when the extraposed element is the object of the main clause, the verbal complex of which then displays the

corresponding pronominal affix with object function. Examples of this structure are given in the next section. When it is the subject that is left-dislocated, and this comprises a very high percentage of the extant cases, no pronominal form is found in the following main verb, which is rendered as ‘Ø’ by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 89–91), the ‘overt’ reference (by means of a clitic form such as *side* or *són*) being exceptional. In spite of this difference, there is no place in Old Irish for Foley’s (2007: 443) distinction between left-dislocation (with resumptive pronoun in the clause) and topicalization (without such a resumptive pronoun), since the verb after the anteposed subject NP has the same form as in the case in which this verb precedes its subject, i.e. as in the unmarked order VS; see Section 3.3.3.

Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 88–95) distinguishes whether the left-dislocated NP includes a relative clause (NP +Rel.) or not (NP –Rel.). As stated by Quin (1975: 55), the former type is in general more numerous than the latter. There is actually no functional difference between the two types, but this distinction is relevant because the left-dislocated NP including a relative clause constitutes the basis of a number of subordinating strategies in Old Irish, a point dealt with in Sections 5.5.1 and 5.7.2.

3.3.2 Subject and object left-dislocation

The examples in (21) and (22) include cases of subject left-dislocation. In (21), the anteposed NP includes a relative clause and in (22) it does not contain such a clause. The negative conjunct particle of *ní ágathar* (= *ní·ágathar*, from *ad·ágathar*) in (21a), the absolute ending of *ferid* in (21b), and the Class A infix of *romferat* in (21c) are unequivocally declarative clause type markers. In the form *imfolngi* of (22), the form of the lexical preverb should have been *imme·* in case of a relative verb, and this excludes the possibility of a cleft-sentence with elided copula, as was observed in the examples of (16) given above in the previous section.

- (21) a. ... et *intí cretfes ní ágathar ángreim* (Wb 1a3)
et intí cret-f-es
 and LHEAD/NOM.SG.M believe-FUT-3SG.ACT.REL
ní·ág-athar á^N-greim
 NEG.DECL·fear/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT POSS.3PL-power/ACC.SG.N
 ‘... and he who shall believe, he is not afraid of their power’.

b. *indóinecht araróit som ónni ferid itge frissindeacht ...* (Wb 4b19)

in-dóinecht

ART.NOM.SG.F-manhood/NOM.SG.F

ar-a^l-ró-it-som

ó-n-ni

PV-REL·PERF-assume/PRET.ACT.3SG-NA.3SG.M from-1PL-NA.1PL

fer-id

itge

supply/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL prayer/ACC.SG.M

friss-in-deacht

towards-ART.ACC.SG.F-Godhead/ACC.SG.F

‘the Manhood which he has assumed from us, it makes prayer to the Godhead ...’.

c. *cidnaïmeda forodamarsa cose romferat dom aithirriucht* (Ml 22d5)

cid na-imed-a

even ART.NOM.PL.N-affliction-NOM.PL.N

fo-ro^l-dam-ar-sa

PV-PERF·REL/suffer/PRET.ACT-1SG-NA.1SG

co-se

ro-m-fer-at

to-PROX.ACC.SG.N PV-1SG/DECL·supply/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT

do-m-aithirriucht

to-POSS.1SG-reformation/DAT.SG.N

‘even the afflictions that I have endured hitherto can suffice to me for my reformation’.

(22) *creitem hicridiu imfolngi induine firian* (Wb 4d32)

creitem

hi^N-cridi-u

im·fo-lng-i

belief/NOM.SG.F

in-heart-DAT.SG.N

PV·DECL/PV-cause/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT

in-duine

firian

ART.ACC.SG.M-man/ACC.SG.M

righteous/ACC.SG.M

‘belief in the heart, it makes a man righteous’.

When the anteposed NP is the object of the following clause, as stated above, it normally receives an overt expression by means of a resumptive affixal pronoun in the verbal complex, the null expression being rare in this case. The left-dislocated NPs in (23) include a relative clause, whereas the one in (24) does not. In (23a), the form *ragéni* [r(o)-a^l-géni] is the 3SG perfect form of *gníid*, with -a^l- as the Class A 3SG n. infix referring to the anteposed NP *na comaccobor ... irect*. The same infix is used in *daratsat* [t(o)-a^l-r(o)-ad-d(a)s-at], in (23c), referring back to the left-dislocated NP *aní ... fesin*. In (23b), the declarative verb *nísñdenaith* [ní-s^N-de-

gni-th^l], from *do·gní*, has the Class A 3SG f. -s^N- infix referring back to the NP headed by the noun *brithemnacht*. These infixes were presented in Section 2.6 above.

(23) a. *na comaccobor ararograd irect ragéni peccad in mé* (Wb 3c25)

na	comaccobor	ar-a ^L ·ro-grad
any/NOM.SG.N	desire/NOM.SG.N	PV-REL·PERF-forbid/PRET.PASS.3SG
i ^N -rect	r-a ^L ·géni	
in-law/DAT.SG.N	PERF-3SG.N/DECL·make/PRET.ACT.3SG	
peccad	in mé	
sin/NOM.SG.M	in me	

‘any concupiscence which had been forbidden in (the) Law, sin has wrought it in me’.

b. *brithemnacht bes hu... nísidenaith* (Wb 6b29)

brithemnacht	bes-hu...
judgement/NOM.SG.F	COP.FUT.3SG.REL-?
ní-s ^N ·de-na-ith	
NEG.DECL-3SG.F/DECL·PV·make/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT	

‘further judgement that will ?, you do not pass in it’.¹⁸

c. *aní ba immaircide duthabairt forru fesin daratsat forma* (Ml 73b17)

aní	ba-immaircide
LHEAD/NOM.SG.N	COP.PRET.3SG.REL-fitting/NOM.SG.N
du-thabairt	forr-u fesin
for-bringing/DAT.SG.F	on-3PL self/3PL
d-a ^L ·r-ad-d-s-at	for-m-sa
PV-3SG.N/DECL·PERF·PV·bring-PRET.ACT-3PL.ACT	on-1SG-NA.1SG

‘that which was fitting to be inflicted upon themselves, they have inflicted it upon me’.

(24) *an eorum is do apstalaib beirthi* (Ml 42b7)

¹⁸ In the same gloss, this expression is preceded by the hybrid clause *léicid iudicium deo ...* ‘leave you *iudicium deo* [the judgement to God], ...’. Though the reading after *brithemnacht* is difficult – see Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 725) – it seems clear that it refers to the idea expressed in both the Latin text (*non ... iudicemus*) and the preceding part of the gloss (*iudicium*). As regards that topic, the addressees are requested to refrain from it.

a^N - <i>eorum</i>	is-do-apstal-aib
ART.NOM.SG.N- <i>eorum</i>	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-to-apostle-DAT.PL.M
beir-th-i	
bring/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL-3SG.N	
'the <i>eorum</i> , it is to the apostles that he refers it'.	

Example (24) shows the combination of left-dislocation and a cleft-sentence in the same utterance. The pronominal suffix of the form *beirthi*, which has been mentioned in point (b) of Section 2.6 above, refers to the left-dislocated constituent *an eorum* 'the *eorum*', and this declarative form (see Section 4.4.1) is due to the fact that the focused element is a prepositional phrase, according to the rule established in Section 3.2.3. As for the relative order between left-dislocation and cleft-sentence, the rule, as expected, is that the former is more external than the latter. This allows us to state a further difference between the two structures, in the sense that the whole sentence including a left-dislocated constituent is less prone to be included into another structure as subordinate: this is perhaps the case of example (62) in Section 5.3.2, though the verb of the assumable subordinate clause has declarative morphology with no overt marking of subordination. The cleft-sentence, which cannot be introduced by a (leniting) relative copula form, appears however in a number of subordinate clauses such as complement, conditional, concessive, and causal clauses, as mentioned in Section 3.2.2.

3.3.3 The interplay of left-dislocating structure and normal order

It was observed in Section 3.2.2 above that the change of a pragmatically unmarked clause into its clefted variant implies some morphosyntactic changes, the most important ones being the introduction of a tonic pronoun, if a pronominal reference included in the verbal complex of the pragmatically unmarked clause must be focused, and the relativization of the basic verb, if the anteposed element counts as its subject or object. The alternation between the structure with left-dislocated NP and its corresponding unmarked allosentence has considerably fewer formal consequences, especially when the anteposed element is the subject of the main verb. Consider the examples in (25), which contain clauses with unmarked V1 order.

- (25) a. *dosnucci intí dodarogart* (Wb 22c1)
- | | |
|---|----------------|
| do-s ^N .ucc-i | intí |
| PV-3PL/DECL-understand/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT | LHEAD/NOM.SG.M |

do-da-ro-gar-t

PV-3PL/DECL·PERF-call-PRET.ACT/3SG

‘he who has called them understands them’.

b. *firfidir anasrubart infáith* (Wb 13d23)

fir-f-idir

a^N-as-^Lru-bar-t

verify-FUT-3SG.PASS.DECL LHEAD/NOM.SG.N-PV·REL/PERF-say-PRET.ACT/3SG

in-fáith

ART.NOM.SG.M-prophet/NOM.SG.M

‘what the prophet has said will be verified’.

c. *derbaid cenél dano isuidib aní remitatét* (Sg 197b5)

derb-aid

cenél

dano

certify/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL gender/ACC.SG.N

then

i^N-suid-ib

aní

remi-ta-tét

in-PROX-DAT.PL LHEAD/NOM.SG.N PV-3PL/REL·precede/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

‘what precedes them, then, certifies the gender in them’.

The verbs appearing first in each of the examples in (25), i.e. *dosnucci* [to-s^N·ucc-i], *firfidir* and *derbaid*, are declarative, whereas the second ones are relative clause type forms, i.e. [to-da-ro-gar-t], [ess-^Lro-bart], and [remi-ta-tét] respectively, preceded each by a light head. These sentences with normal V1 order could be converted into left-dislocated structures such as **intí dodarogart dosnucci* for (25a), which is similar to (21a) above, **anasrubart infáith firfidir* for (25b), and **aní remitatet derbaid cenél dano isuidib* for (25c). Taking the translations of the *Thes.* given in (25) as basically correct, the assumed version with left-dislocation should be translated with a resumptive pronoun: **intí dodarogart dosnucci* would be something like ‘he who has called them, he understands them’.

3.3.4 Summary

In Old Irish, left-dislocation and the cleft-sentence are two functionally different structures that become formally more different in the crucial cases in which the subject or the object of the clause are anteposed to be pragmatically marked in one or another way. These two constructions are not mutually exclusive and can be found in one single sentence, but they must then be ordered so that the left-dislocated constituent appears outside the cleft-sentence. This combination just observed in example (24), as well as the possibility of left-dislocating constituents

other than the subject or the object, will be recalled in the diachronic explanation of some types of adverbial subordinate clauses, in Chapter 5. The same combination of left-dislocation and cleft-sentence, as well as the interplay between left-dislocation and normal V1 order, will be two important bases for the diachronic explanation of referential non-verbal predicates in Old Irish, a point that is left for Chapter 10.

3.4 Tmesis and Bergin's Law (and other irregular phenomena)

In texts of a clearly literary character, the verbal complex or just its tonic part sometimes appear in a position other than that of the first place in the clause, in structures that are different from those considered thus far in this chapter. These are mainly (but not solely) the structures known as tmesis and Bergin's Law, which differ from the alternative orders analyzed in the previous sections of this chapter in two main respects. First, both tmesis and Bergin's Law apparently have no pragmatically marked function, and in fact Bergin (1938: 213–214) explicitly states that the structures concerned do not express any type of emphasis. Second, Bergin's Law involves no specific declarative or relative clause type marking.

The main problem with tmesis and Bergin's Law is that they are assumed to have been purely artificial devices aimed at obtaining specific poetical effects, but without any real linguistic support. A look at these two structures is necessary at this point, among other reasons, because Bergin's Law has occupied a prominent place in discussion on so-called absolute endings. It makes methodological sense, I think, to discuss the value of Bergin's Law and tmesis first, before proceeding to include them in the structural and even diachronic consideration of clause typing.

Bergin's Law and tmesis are therefore described in Section 3.4.1, but there are other irregular morphosyntactic structures that do not match with them and that also need a brief consideration in Section 3.4.2. In view of all these forms, Section 3.4.3 discusses the extent to which Bergin's Law and tmesis represent irregular structures, as well as the extent to which they can be taken as the outcome of conscious linguistic manipulation.

3.4.1 A unified description of Bergin's Law and tmesis

Bergin's (1938: 197) own definition of the phenomenon named after him is as follows: "when the verb does not stand at the head of its clause, particularly when

it follows its subject or object, it takes the dependent form, that is, a simple verb has the conjunct ending and a compound verb is prototonic.” In other words, Bergin’s Law establishes a direct relationship between the ‘dependent’ morphology of the verb, which means prototonic for lexically compound verbs and conjunct endings for simple verbs (see Section 2.4.4 above), on the one hand, and the irregular non-initial position in the clause, on the other.

The other syntactically irregular structure referred to above, tmesis, involves the disruption of a deuterotonic verbal complex by putting the pretonic part at the beginning of the clause and introducing one or more elements of the clause before the tonic part of the verbal complex. Bergin’s Law can therefore be differentiated from tmesis. However, there are other irregular syntactic types that are at least as frequent as both pure Bergin and classical tmesis cases, and that can be considered as being somewhere between the two.

I follow here Greene’s (1977: 22–27) and Kelly’s (1986: 1–3) classification, which establishes four types (Tmesis I–IV), whereby Tmesis I represents the classical tmesis and Tmesis IV corresponds to Bergin’s Law.

(a) Tmesis I (or tmesis in the proper sense of the term). The separated pretonic elements are the following: lexical preverbs such as *ath-* in (26a), in which the expected form would be *ad-cuirethar*; conjunct particles such as *ro-* in (26b), in which the expected form would be *ro-da-^{sert}*, the 3SG perfect of *sernaid*; and the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*, as in (26c), in which the expected form would be *óna-berar*, 3SG present indicative passive of *beirid*. When lexical preverbs and the conjunct particles *ro-* *no-* are involved in cases of tmesis, they often bear an infixed pronoun form, as in (26b).

(26) a. *ath mórchathu fri crícha connámat cuirethar* (AM §15)

ath-	mór-chath-u	fri-crích-a
PV-	great-battalion-ACC.PL.M	to-limit-ACC.PL.F
com-námat		-cuir-ethar
fellow-enemy/GEN.PL.M		-dispatch/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT

‘he dispatches great battalions to the borders of hostile neighbors’.

b. *roda sluagaib sert* (CIH 341.14)

ro-da-	sluag-aib	-ser-t
PERF-3PL/REL	host-DAT.PL.M	array-PRET.ACT/3SG

‘who has arrayed them in hosts’.

c. *ona hainces berar* (CIH 1114.32)

o ^N -na-	hainces	-ber-ar
from which-NEG.REL-	problem/NOM.SG.N	-bring/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS

'who is not found to be perplexed' (lit. 'from whom a problem is not brought back [unsolved]').

(b) Tmesis II. The clause is introduced by a negative conjunct particle (*ni-*, *nad-*, *nach-*): the expected form in example (27a) would be *ni-immgabaim*, of *imm-gaib*, and in example (27b), *nad-arnic* or *nad-n-arnic*, the 3SG preterite of *ar-ic*. As Kelly (1986: 2) notes, referring to Bergin (1938: 212), the element *ni* could be understood as the copula form (see Section 9.7.4), and therefore, the example could be also introduced as a case of Tmesis III.

(27) a. *ni mmo guin immgabaim* (LL 13798)

ni-	mmo-guin	-imm-gab-aim
NEG.DECL-	POSS.1SG-slaying/ACC.SG.N	-PV-avoid/PRES.IND-1SG.IND.ACT

'I do not shun my death'.

b. *dursan nad Eirрге Echbel arnic* (LL 14259)

dursan	nad-	Eirрге Echbel	-ar-nic
alas	NEG.REL-	Eirрге Echbel/NOM.SG	-PV-come/PRET.ACT.3SG

'alas that Eirрге Echbel did not come'.

(c) Tmesis III. In this type of tmesis, the clause is introduced by a copula form and the verb appears at the end of the clause with conjunct ending. Many of the cases given by Bergin in support of his rule, such as his first example given here in (28a), can be classified in this type; Bergin (1938: 197) considers those copulas as 'out of construction', but – as Wagner (1967: 302) and Kelly (1986: 2–3) observe – this assumption must be called into question, for those copulas show number and tense agreement with the following verb. Bergin observes that the normal order of (28a) would be **ce nod-bung femmuin mbolgaig* (on the infixed pronoun *-d^h-*, see Section 5.5.1), whereas the clefted version should have been something like **ceso femmun bolgach no-bung*, with nominative case after the form *ceso* and the relative 1SG present indicative active of *boingid*, according to the rule in Section 3.2.3 above. As for example (28b), the cleft-sentence with regular morphology would possibly be **conid iarna durn do-mitar*, with the 3SG present indicative passive of *do-midethar*, and the structure with V1 order **co-toimdither iarna durn*; the attested structure gives the impression of being a mixture of both structures. For *conid* as copula form, see Section 9.4.7.

- (28) a. *ceso femmuin mbolgaig mbung* (Corm. s.u. prull)
 ce-so femmuin^N
 though-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL seaweed/ACC.SG.F
 bolgaig^N bung
 blistered/ACC.SG.F cut/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT
 ‘although I reap blistered seaweed’.

- b. *conid iarna durn toimdither* (CIH 583.8)
 co^N-id iar-na-durn
 so that-COP.PRES.IND.3SG after-ART.DAT.SG.M-fist/DAT.SG.M
 toi-md-ither
 PV-measure/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS
 ‘so that it is measured by his fist’.

It is important to stress here that tmesis II and III, in which conjunctions such as *ma*^L ‘if’ and conjunct particles such as *co*^N- ‘so that’ and negative prefixes have a clear preponderance, are numerically very important.

(d) Bergin’s Law (or Tmesis IV). It has been observed that most verbs included in structures of this type are passive, like the examples included in (29), and that simple verbs are not very frequent. The form in (29a) is the conjunct 3SG present indicative passive of *canaid*, and the expected structure with V1 order would be **canir molad coir*; the one with normal cleft-sentence would be **is molad coir canar*, i.e. basically the same as the one attested, given the similarity between conjunct form and absolute relative form in the passive inflection (see Section 4.5 below). Example (29b) includes the prototonic 3SG present indicative passive of *do-eclainn* ‘selects’, and the expected structure would be *... *do-eclannar do thlachtaib túath*. For more examples, see Kelly (1976: xxxvi–xl) and Corthals (1999: 23–26).

- (29) a. *molad cóir canar* (CIH 1120.4)
 molad cóir can-ar
 praise/NOM.SG.M adequate/NOM.SG.M sing/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS
 ‘fitting praise is sung’.
- b. *ad-mestar cáircha asa cotugi do thlachtaib túath teclannar* (AM §43)
 ad-mes-tar cáirch-a
 PV-DECL/estimate/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT sheep-ACC.PL.N
 as-a-cotugi do-thlacht-aib
 from-POSS.3PL-covering/DAT.SG for-garment-DAT.PL.M

túath t-e-clann-ar
 people/GEN.PL.F PV-PV-select/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS
 'Let him estimate sheep by their covering which is selected for the
 garments of the people'.

Bergin's examples belong either to a declarative or to a subordinate clause introduced by the respective conjunctions; relative verbs such as that in (29b) seem to be less frequent.

3.4.2 Other irregular structures different to Bergin's Law and tmesis

In the same type of texts in which Bergin's Law and tmesis are found, there are other specific cases in which the position and the morphology of the verbal complex is not regular either, though they are different to those two structures in some important respects. I refer here to two main cases, mentioned in (a) and (b) below. Apart from that, the sequence of a *wh*-interrogative particle (or indefinite pronoun) followed by a verb form with conjunct ending, as in, e.g. *cia-beir* 'who takes?' (see Section 6.3.2 for more examples), which was taken by Bergin (1938: 205–211) as a case of his Law, must instead be considered as a verbal complex in which a conjunct particle is followed by the dependent form, like any other verbal complex that includes a conjunct particle of the type described in Section 2.3.1 above.

(a) The type in which a simple verb furnished with a suffixed pronoun appears in non-initial position must be excluded from Bergin's Law, assuming that such a verbal form counts as absolute, as stated in Section 4.4.1. A well-known example is the form *sexus* 'he followed them', which is given in (30) in its whole context, and which must be analyzed as [sechs-us], i.e. as the 3SG *s*-preterite of the deponent verb *sechithir* + 3PL suffix. Similar cases can be found in Bergin (1938: 204–205).

(30) *glinnsius salmu / sluinnsius leig libru libuir ut car Caisseoin / catha gulae gailais / libru Solman sexus* (ACC §§54–57)

glinn-s-ius		salm-u		
settle-PRET.ACT/3SG.DECL-3PL		psalm-ACC.PL.M		
sluinn-s-ius		leig		libr-u
declare-PRET.ACT/3SG.DECL-3PL		law/GEN.SG.N		book-ACC.PL.M
libuir	ut	car		Caisseoin
book-NOM.PL.M	such as	love/PRET.ACT.3SG		Cassian

cath-a	gulae gail-ais	libr-u
battle-NOM.PL.M	win-PRET.ACT/3SG.DECL	book-ACC.PL.M
Solman	sex-us	
Salomon/GEN.SG	follow/PRET.ACT.3SG.DECL-3PL	

‘he ascertained the psalms, / he made books of law known, books *ut* Cassian loved [to make], / the battles of *gula* he won, / the books of Salomon he followed them’.

Though this case of *sexus* is more of a counterexample of Bergin’s Law, the unexpected position of the form is still to be explained. In this sense, Thurneysen (1946: 327) sees a ‘blend’ of a left-dislocated structure (**libuir Solman sexus* ‘the books of Solomon, he followed them’) and a Bergin’s Law construction (**libru Solman sechestar*). As an interpretation that does not contradict the former, Isaac (2003: 189) sees in this example a “rather skillful rhetorical manipulation of the syntactic constructions in well defined chiasmic figures,” referring to the two verses of ACC §§54–55 also included in (30) in which the form with suffixed pronoun (which must be then taken as proleptic) precedes its object in accusative case.

The line prior to that in which *sexus* appears, i.e. ACC §56 *catha gulae gailais*, represents an interpretive problem: the *s*-preterite *gailais* is clearly an absolute declarative clause verb and *catha* can be either nominative or accusative plural. According to the first interpretation, it should be taken as a left-dislocated structure, but then it should be concluded that there is apparently no clear functional difference between this left-dislocated structure and the structure in which *sexus* is included, in which the accusative plural case of *libru* speaks against the same syntactic interpretation. According to the second interpretation, which is favored by the general context, the structure of ACC §56 would be a (further) counterexample of Bergin’s Law, since it shows an absolute declarative form in non-initial position.

(b) In some cases found mostly in poetic texts, the imperfect, past subjunctive, and conditional of a simple verb do not make use of the pretonic preverb *no* that those forms regularly take in Old Irish, as stated in Section 2.3.1 above. O’Brien (1932: 88) and Kelly (1999: 158–159) give some relevant examples and the latter discusses their relationship to Bergin’s Law. One of the examples is (31a), in which the conditional *gébtais*, of the simple *gabaid* ‘takes’, should have appeared as *no-gébtais*; the same applies in (31b) to *croithfínn*, a form of *croithid*, which appears in non-initial position. The conditional form is apparently frequent in this type of construction: ACC §64 *rimfed rind nime* ... ‘he would number the stars of heaven ...’ (of *rímid*); *soirt[h]ni[g]fed soirchobair* ‘would have eased

(my) foolish cry ...' (of *soirthnigidir*) (AC §3a). Some cases can be detected in the Old Irish prose, as in the example of (31c), in which the 3SG of the imperfect of the substantive verb *bíth* stands instead of expected *no-bíth*, as Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: ii 494) observe.

(31) a. *gébtais aingil oca ndil* (*Blathm.* 293)

géb-tais	aingil	oc-a ^N -dil
take/FUT-3PL.IMPF.ACT	angel/NOM.PL.M	at-POSS.3PL-dear/DAT.SG

'angels would side with their beloved'.

b. *cach comlann croithfinn* (AC §6b)

cach	comlann	croith-f-inn
any/ACC.SG.M	opponent/ACC.SG.M	harrass-FUT-1SG.IMPF.ACT

'I would have upset any equal opponent!'

c. *maldachtae air bu ainm leusom maladictus do c(ec)h óin bíth (hí) croi(ch)*
(Tur 136)

maldachtae	air	bu-ainm	
accurst/NOM.SG.M	for	COP.PRET.3SG.(DECL)-name/NOM.SG.N	
le-u-som	<i>maladictus</i>	do-c(ec)h	óin
with-3PL-NA.3PL	<i>maladictus</i>	to-each/ACC.SG.M	one/ACC.SG.M
bí-th	(hí ^N)-croi(ch)		
SUBSTV-3SG.IMPF.ACT	in-cross/DAT.SG.F		

'accurst, for *maladictus* was a name they had for everyone who used to be on a cross'.

The cases adduced do not exactly fit in with Bergin's Law, due mainly to the following reasons. Formally, the forms involved have no possibility of alternation between absolute and conjunct endings, let alone between prototonic and deuterotonic, due to their simple character; nevertheless, the form without *no-* could still be considered 'dependent', in the sense of Section 2.4.4 above. Syntactically, the examples quoted show that the verb without *no-* appears both in the initial, as in (31a), and in a non-initial position of the clause, as in (31b); the form *bíth* in (31c) functions as relative and appears at the beginning of its clause. If the forms in (31a) and (31c) are 'formally' dependent in the sense of Section 2.4.4 above, then they are counterexamples of Bergin's Law due to their clause initial position. Note further that the relative form *bíth* in (31c) could be put on a par with other cases in which this clause type is precisely expressed by the dependent morphology, as observed in Section 5.3.1.

None of the observations in this section suffices to deny the existence of the morphosyntactic phenomena known as Bergin's Law and tmesis, whatever their structural explanation. However, they clearly point to the idea that the association between non-initial position and dependent morphology in the same type of texts in which tmesis and Bergin's Law are attested is not as strict as it may appear according to Bergin's definition. On the one hand, independent forms such as *sexus* and *gailais* appear in non-initial position, in structures that apparently have no pragmatically marked function; on the other, a clause initial form such as the relative *bíth* shows that verbs with unexpected dependent morphology do not need to appear at the end of the clause, contrary to Bergin's definition.

3.4.3 Bergin's Law and tmesis in the Old Irish literary texts

The value as linguistic evidence of the structures considered in the two previous sections, but specifically of Bergin's Law, is a much debated point about which there are two main positions. Some scholars contend that Bergin's Law represents 'real syntax', even though it can be considered a fossilized structure that is only used for literary purposes; others, meanwhile, view Bergin's Law as a purely artificial device.

The former position is defended, among others, by Russell (2005: 446), who states that "... archaic patterns might be artificially sustained in a high literary register through the influence of the late Latin metrical patterns," and Eska (2007: 260–265, 2008: 58), who offers an accurate description of how Bergin's Law is used with a clear poetical intention. In my view, the main argument of these scholars is that the specific combination of dependent form and non-initial clause position considered in Bergin's definition above is a sort of unmotivated morphosyntactic configuration that can be explained only by assuming that it is an old, inherited pattern.

However, this more or less explicit argument is far from convincing, and a number of points considered by adherents of the latter position should be taken into consideration. In this sense, it is important to remember that the literary texts in which Bergin's Law and tmesis appear also include further syntactical irregularities such as the disruption of the copular predicate (which would be a further case of tmesis), or the anteposition and / or disjunction of the adnominal genitive, as in *leig libru* 'the books of the law' in (30), instead of regular *libru leig*. The general impression is that those texts involve a somewhat artificial language, due partly to metrical and alliterative needs, partly to the linguistic differentiation and even artificial character of poetic language, and partly to the imitation of

Latin literary structures, as has been stressed by Wagner (1967) and Corthals (1999), who include Bergin's Law and tmesis in the catalogue of completely artificial poetical devices. McCone (1996b: 20, 1997b: 374–377) seems to favor this position when he points to the fact that the texts involved are in general based on Latin models with contents that are clearly Christian: “compositions of this type were being produced in a literate monastic milieu in the eighth and ninth centuries”; such constructions would be due to “poetic licence for the sake of producing the requisite alliterations and / or final cadences.” Similarly, Isaac (2003: 189, 193). McCone (2000: 154–155) and Isaac (in Mac Coisdealbha [1976] 1998: 246) coincide in taking Bergin's Law and tmesis out of the criteria available to define the so-called ‘Archaic Irish’.

The main problem to be solved for anyone who tries to explain these phenomena (and also Bergin's Law) as artificial is to show that they are a relatively feasible structure for an Old Irish speaker who would be conscious of the expressive possibilities of his / her own language; in other words, that tmesis and Bergin's Law were at hand for somebody who would have been looking for stylistic variation, similar to that of the Latin language known to him / her.

In this line of reasoning, Bergin (1938: 197) rightly observes that the structure of tmesis (here Tmesis I and II) can be “removed by rearranging the words”, but that this is not possible in a case such as *ceso femmuin mbolgaig mbung*, i.e. example (28a) given as a case of Tmesis III above. However, Tmesis III is a problematic structure in itself, due mainly to the lack of pragmatic contrast assumed by Bergin. Henry (1977: 30–33) accepts this pragmatic interpretation and proposes a structure in which the dependent form, e.g. *mbung* in (28a), is ‘subordinated’ to the copula form (in this case *ceso*) or, more specifically, a structure in which “the predicate of *ceso* is the whole of the following proposition”; his tentative translation of (28a) is ‘although it's what I reap the blistered seaweed’. This analysis is also applied by Henry to Tmesis I and II, so that example (27a) is translated as ‘it is not that I shun my death’. As already observed, nevertheless, the idea of a cleft-sentence deprived of any pragmatic force is very problematic. For more comments on Henry's views, see Section 8.4.

In fact, Eska (2008: 47–49) argues that these cases of Tmesis III are artificial due to the fact that “a clause cannot contain two inflected verbs,” and he rightly notes that the nasalization of forms such as *mbung* in (28a) is not regular in Old Irish, though it is not completely ruled out, as observed in Section 4.7.4 below. Eska (2008: 58) concludes that “the inclusion of the copula at the head of many tokens of the construction [i.e. of Bergin's Law] cannot have a historical basis”. Tmesis III could therefore be seen as an artificial ‘blend’ (to use the term quoted in point (a) in Section 3.4.2 above) of two constructions, the cleft-sentence and

Bergin's Law, as if the structure of *ceso femmuin mbolgaig mbung* in example (28a) were a blend of **ceso femmun bolgach no·bung* and **femmuin mbolgaig (m)bung*.

However, the previous explanation for Tmesis III is not the only possible one. A form such as *(m)bung* in (28a) instead of **no·bung* is very similar to the use of *gébtais* instead of **no·gébtais* in (31a) or, if Tmesis III is to be considered a cleft-sentence, *(m)bung* (for *no·bung*) could be the same as the use of the relative form *bíth* instead of *no·bíth* in (31c).

To sum up, Section 3.4.2 has provided cases from literary texts in which the verb appearing in an unexpected non-first position does not display the dependent form (contrary to Bergin's definition), and this section has shown that the texts in which Bergin's Law and the other phenomena described in Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 appear also display other syntactic irregularities in the nominal field that can be perfectly explained as artificial; I, at least, am not aware of any attempt to explain the anteposition of the genitive form as the remnant of a previous linguistic stage. In fact, a good deal of the morphosyntactic irregularities seen in the two previous sections are suspected of being artificial, and the (conscious) contamination of existing morphosyntactic configurations seems to be a feasible explanation even for scholars who defend the genuine character of Bergin's Law.

An argument that must be considered at this point is that, in much the same way as the linguistic effectiveness of these structures should not be denied on the basis of their literary usage, it cannot be sustained solely on the basis of the morphosyntactic changes with respect to other current syntactic structures, as if the Old Irish writers had not been able to minimally manipulate their own language.

Given this picture, one should seriously consider whether Bergin's Law is not a further possibility consciously explored by the Old Irish writers. The next section tries to give an answer to this question.

3.5 An overview of the alternative V orders in Old Irish

Most irregular morphosyntactic structures considered in Section 3.4 may be interpreted as the outcome of some sort of conscious change with respect to the V1 verbal complex described in the previous chapter. Tmesis I and II can result from the mere separation of the clearly distinguishable pretonic and tonic parts of the verbal complex. Tmesis III, whether a pragmatically marked structure or not, is better considered the outcome of the combination of two constructions. Other structures described in Section 3.4.2 have also been considered artificial, in this case by means of the mere change of position of the independent verbal form, or

alternatively, by means of the use of the dependent instead of the independent verbal form.

The main idea that I would like to stress in this section is that the morpho-syntactic configuration known as Bergin's Law is one of the few remaining logical possibilities resulting from the combination of the two assumable positions for the verbal complex (i.e. either regular V1 or other positions) and the opposition between independent and dependent morphology in the expression of declarative and relative clause type, as defined in Section 2.4.4. Note that Bergin's Law is restricted to a specific type of verbal complex in which there is no pretonic conjunct particle: if there is a conjunct particle such as *ni-*, *no-*, *ro-*, or *-(s)a^N-*, the irregular word order involves tmesis (i.e. Tmesis II). Of course, if such a conjunct particle is not separated from the rest of the verbal complex, the resulting syntactic structure would be left-dislocation or a truncated cleft-sentence (i.e. a cleft-sentence without initial copula).

These possibilities are in Table 3.2, which does not include Tmesis I to III. Note that, in Table 3.2, I prefer instead to talk about the 'stylistically marked' position of the verb – in line with the argument defended in Section 3.4.3 above –, and not about 'pragmatically unmarked' irregular position of the verb. Note further that the use of the dependent morphology in the V1 order can be explained in different ways, either as an irregular use observed in point (b) in Section 3.4.2 above, or as a secondary use of the dependent morphology as a relative clause type form, a use that is well attested in the language of the Glosses: see Section 4.5 (for deponent and passive simple verbs) and Section 5.3.1 (for other sporadic uses of the dependent form as the marker of relative clause type). The structures seen in point (a) of Section 3.4.2 in which an absolute (i.e. independent) declarative clause type form is preceded by a nominal constituent in accusative case also find a place in the table as types of stylistically marked structures.

Tab. 3.2: Different positions of independent and dependent forms in the expression of positive declarative and relative clause types in Old Irish

	Regular V1 position	Stylistically marked non-V1 position	Pragmatically marked non-V1 position
Independent morphology	Regular V1 (Section 3.1)	Section 3.4.2(a)	Cleft-sentence (Section 3.2) and left-dislocation (Section 3.3)
Dependent morphology	(= Leniting relative clause type, or Section 3.4.2(b))	Bergin's Law	Cleft-sentence (with dependent form in the post-focus verb; see Section 5.3.1)

Given the positional freedom that the Old Irish writers made use of in their literary compositions, the so-called Bergin's Law is just one of the further possibilities in which the verb did not appear in its regular position. In other words, the combination of dependent morphology and non-initial position that constitutes the so-called Bergin's Law is not so unconceivable as the outcome of conscious linguistic manipulation: if it was possible to put an independent form in a non-initial position for purely stylistic reasons, why not use the dependent form (which, by the way, could also be used in initial position) in the same stylistically marked position? In my view, it is not sound to deny for the structural consideration of the cases included in Bergin's Law something that we are ready to accept for virtually every other morphosyntactic irregularity considered in Section 3.4. Most probably, the main reason for this special consideration of Bergin's Law is the diachronic analysis that, from Bergin (1938: 214) himself onward, has been applied to this specific construction. However, synchronic analysis must be previous to and independent of diachronic considerations.

The position taken in this study about Bergin's Law is that it is a further way of having a stylistically marked order with a clear literary intention and with no support in real Old Irish syntax.

3.6 Concluding remarks

Much in line with the other two chapters of this introductory part, this third chapter basically offers relevant information for the analysis of the Old Irish clause types in the later parts of this study. However, throughout Part I as a whole some important decisions have been taken with respect to the verbal complex, its constituency, functional possibilities and position in the sentence. Chapter 1 dealt with the value of the linguistic evidence provided by the contemporaneous texts and introduced the grammatical category of clause typing. The character of morphosyntactic word of the verbal complex was a matter of Chapter 2, in which the main components of this morphological structure were described.

The main descriptive decision of this chapter is based on the results of the previous ones, and states that it is the situation obtained in the contemporaneous texts that will be considered in this study as the basic starting point for the study of clause types in Old Irish. Put concretely, the verbal complex, which constitutes a grammatical or morphosyntactic word in which various degrees of cohesiveness can be distinguished, regularly expresses one of six clause types, and is regularly located in the first position of the clause; this basic position of the verbal complex is not incompatible with the cross-linguistically well-known cleft-sentence and left-dislocating structures described in this chapter.

The cleft-sentence is undoubtedly a significant structure for the synchronic and diachronic analysis of clause type distinctions in Old Irish: apart from the various clause type markings in the post-focus verb depending on the nature of the focused element, it is clearly the model of the prevalent strategy of the *wh*-interrogative clause type, as established in Chapter 6. Taken as a whole, the cleft-sentence is probably less different from (or, perhaps better stated, structurally and functionally more similar to) the unmarked structure with V1 order than the left-dislocating structure. But left-dislocated constituents must also be considered later on due to their relevance in the formation of some types of subordinate clauses (Chapter 5), as well as in the formation of referential non-verbal predicates (see Chapter 10).

With respect to the previous structures, other phenomena considered in this chapter such as Bergin's Law and the various types of tmesis, which appear in texts of a decidedly literary nature, represent most probably artificial morpho-syntactic constructions created by means of positional changes and blendings of previously existing (i.e. linguistically real) forms and structures.

Part II: The Old Irish clause types

4 Declarative and relative clause types

4.1 Scope of the chapter

The declarative and relative clause types are the formally and functionally most complicated clause types in Old Irish. One fact that may help understand the extent of this statement is that these clause types make use of all the formal devices used in the Old Irish verbal complex to express clause typing. In other words, these two clause types are expressed by means of special (i.e. absolute) endings, infixes and suffixed pronouns, conjunct particles, mutations, the deuterotonic form (as opposed to the prototonic variant of the same lexical compound), and stem suppletion.

This chapter is limited to an analysis of the positive declarative and relative clause type forms of simple verbs and lexical compounds without any of the meaningful conjunct particles considered in Section 2.3.1 or the deadjectival preverbs of Section 2.3.3. In positive terms, this chapter only deals with (i) the declarative and relative absolute endings, (ii) the relative mutations (and the contrastive lack thereof), (iii) the infixes and suffixed pronominal forms, in addition to (iv) the meaningless conjunct particle *no-*.

Other conjunct particles introduced in Section 2.3.1 above such as the negative declarative (*ní-*, *nicon-*) and the negative relative (*nad-*, *nadcon-*, *nach-*) ones are also mentioned in Section 4.8.3, but especially the second ones, as well as others such as *-(s)a^N* and *cech(a)- / cach(a)-* will be considered in Chapter 5 on subordination.

The limitation to the lexical bases, i.e. to simple verbs and lexical compounds, is not only due to practical reasons. It is also based on the idea that the paradigmatic design of the forms involved is significant and can be related to the special syntactic and pragmatic conditions of the categories they express, which are basically person and clause typing. As will become evident later in Section 4.9, this chapter is about the four possible paradigms resulting from the combination of the difference between positive declarative and positive relative clause types, on the one hand, and the feature [\pm pronominal affix], on the other.

The analysis of the declarative and relative clause types in the lexical basic forms is articulated according to the formal devices stated above. Section 4.2 establishes the initial statement of the analysis on the inflectional endings, namely, that the opposition declarative vs relative clause type is the functional domain in which the well-known opposition absolute vs conjunct must be considered.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-004>

Sections 4.3 to 4.6 deal with the use and description of the (declarative and relative) absolute endings and the conjunct endings, as well as with the relationship of this difference to the expression of suffixed pronominal elements in the verbal complex: Section 4.3 inspects the declarative and relative absolute paradigms of active (simple) verbs, and Section 4.4 considers the formal consequences of the expression of pronominal affixes for the same basic type of simple verb; Section 4.5 then proceeds to describe the expression of the same clause types and affixal pronouns for basically deponent and passive verbs, and Section 4.6 rounds off the treatment of the absolute inflection and offers some absolute forms of the present indicative as well as of other stems.

Section 4.7 then considers the expression of declarative and relative clause types in lexical compounds, that is to say, the so-called relative mutations, and analyzes in detail the functional differences between relative lenition and relative nasalization, among the formal strategies used to mark a relative clause type in Old Irish. Section 4.8 discusses the various forms of infixing pronouns as a further formal device to distinguish declarative from relative clause types. Section 4.9 centers on the paradigmatic constituency of the clause types considered in this chapter and stresses the close relationship of clause typing to the category of person in Old Irish. Finally, Section 4.10 restates the main findings of the chapter and connects it to the next chapter.

4.2 The oppositions declarative vs relative clause type and absolute vs conjunct

Inasmuch as the descriptive (and diachronic) discussion about the Old Irish declarative clause type morphology has been driven mainly by the opposition between so-called absolute and conjunct endings, this chapter must begin by stating the way in which the terms absolute and conjunct are understood in this study, which – by the way – is their proper, i.e. original meaning, as well as their structural place in the Old Irish system of clause types.

The proper meaning of the terms ‘conjunct’ and ‘absolute’, i.e. as a reference to the whole form of a simple verb, is that which is directly identified with the pair dependent vs independent respectively, as stated in Section 2.4.4 above: if the form is compounded with any of the pretonic elements in Section 2.3, it is a ‘conjunct form’; if not, it counts as an ‘absolute form’; this definition can be found in Meid (1963: 4). Additionally, the terms ‘conjunct’ and ‘absolute’ are metonymically applied to two different sets of endings used in slot 5 of the Old Irish verbal complex. The endings used in verbal complexes with one (or more) pretonic element(s) of those described in Section 2.3 are termed ‘conjunct endings’, whereas

the ‘absolute endings’ are those used in the verbal complex that has no elements in slots 1 or 3, i.e. when the verb has no preverbal elements of those described in Section 2.3 above.

It is important to stress that the Old Irish formal opposition between absolute and conjunct forms (i.e. independent and dependent respectively) and endings is possible only for positive (i.e. non-negative) declarative and relative clause type forms of simple verbs. In other words, the opposition absolute vs conjunct crosscuts the opposition between forms that are marked as positive declarative clause type verbs and forms that are marked as positive relative clause type verbs. As a result, there are absolute endings corresponding to a declarative verb, when uncompounded, but the formally different endings of an uncompounded relative verb are also absolute, as already stated by Thurneysen (1946: 255).

Simple verbs without any preverbal element therefore express either declarative or relative clause type by means of specific endings. Lexical compounds, i.e. compound verbs that include at least a lexical preverb of those described in Section 2.3.2, are also marked as declarative or relative clause type verbs, but not by means of different endings. Being compound verbs, they always bear the so-called conjunct endings, and the functional distinction between relative and declarative clause type is expressed by the so-called relative mutations described in Section 2.5 (= relative verb) or by the lack of mutation (= declarative verb) in the initial phoneme of the tonic part of the deuterotonic verbal complex. This minimal distinction between declarative and relative clause type is regular in the Old Irish texts, but it requires a twofold qualification. First, the relative clause type intended is basically one in which the antecedent has the role of subject or object of the relative verb, i.e. subject or object NP_{rel} function, as stated in Section 4.7.2. The relative verbal complex expressing oblique relative clause type, as anticipated in point (iii) in Section 2.3.1, is obligatorily expressed by means of the conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*, and is left for Chapter 5. Second, the Old Irish Glosses do show some cases in which relative mutation is applied to an absolute form; this sporadic and apparently secondary use of the mutations is referred to in Section 4.7.4 below.

The consequence of the previous description is that the distinction between absolute and conjunct endings is only operative in the declarative and relative clause type forms of simple verbs. In other words, the formal opposition between absolute and conjunct endings makes sense only for the declarative and relative clause types; the other clause types expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex do not make such a formal distinction. The use of absolute endings formally different to the conjunct ones has the purpose of expressing positive declarative and relative clause types. Table 4.1 illustrates this difference for the positive 3SG active

of the simple strong verb *ceilid* ‘conceals’ (from Thurneysen’s present Class BI); the conjunct form, by itself, does not express these clause types, and this is why it is put in parentheses. Deponent verbs and passive forms are considered in Section 4.5.

Tab. 4.1: Positive declarative and relative 3SG present indicative active of *ceilid* ‘conceals’

	Positive declarative clause type	Positive relative clause type
Absolute form	<i>ceilid</i>	<i>ceiles</i>
(Conjunct form)	<i>-ceil</i>	<i>-ceil</i>

The 3SG absolute form *ceilid* expresses declarative clause type by means of the absolute declarative ending *-id*, whereas the 3SG absolute form *ceiles* expresses relative clause type by means of the absolute relative ending *-es*. The conjunct form *-ceil* expresses the 3SG by means of the bare palatalization of the final consonant (i.e. /-'kʲelʲ/), and expresses neither declarative nor relative clause type. For other accounts of the opposition absolute vs conjunct in Old Irish verbal morphology, see the discussion in Section 8.2.

The previous statement on the use of absolute and conjunct forms needs a further qualification, because some tenses and moods other than the present indicative must obligatorily be conjunct, in other words, there is no place for the absolute / conjunct opposition. In particular, there are no forms for the row of absolute forms in Table 4.1 for the imperfect indicative, past subjunctive and secondary future (or conditional) of lexically simple verbs; instead, in order to express the positive declarative and relative clause types, the lexically simple verb must take the semantically void particle *no-*. For instance, for the same simple verb *ceilid*, the positive declarative form of the 3SG imperfect indicative is *no-ceiled* ‘(s)he used to hide’ and the corresponding (leniting) relative form, *no-cheiled* ‘who used to hide’. If the simple verb has any other of the pretonic elements described in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.3, the particle *no-* is no longer necessary: e.g., with the negative declarative conjunct particle *ní-*, *ní-ceiled* ‘(s)he didn’t use to hide’.

To state it in positive terms, the opposition between absolute and conjunct endings is possible in the present indicative, present subjunctive, future and preterite corresponding to the positive declarative and relative clause type forms of simple verbs. The next section considers the whole extent of this opposition.

4.3 Declarative and relative clause type morphology of simple active verbs

4.3.1 Paradigmatic extension of the absolute positive declarative and relative active forms

If the whole paradigm of each of the four 3SG forms included in Table 4.1 is considered, a further limitation on the active absolute inflection emerges. Consider Tables 4.2 and 4.3 below. Whereas the positive declarative clause type paradigm has an absolute form for each of its six possible cells (three persons in singular and plural), the positive relative clause type paradigm has a proper absolute form only for the 3SG, 3PL and 1PL. In this sense, Watkins (1963: 25) is right in saying that the absolute (positive) relative paradigm of simple verbs is defective, but this does not mean that the remaining persons in the relative paradigm are not expressed. For these persons, the semantically void conjunct particle *no-* comes again to the rescue, if no other conjunct particle in the list given in Section 2.3.1 is used: in other words, *no-* is used for the 1SG and the 2nd persons of the positive relative clause type forms of simple verbs. For the relative use of this particle *no-*, see Strachan (1901: 283–284), and Stokes (1901: 470). The resulting paradigm of the positive relative clause type of simple verbs is of a mixed nature, perhaps a case of paradigmatic heteroclis, in the general sense of Stump (2006: 306). See Section 4.4.1 below for another paradigm with this mixed configuration.

Tab. 4.2: Positive declarative and relative present indicative active of BI (strong) *ceilid* ‘conceals’

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	(Conjunct)	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	<i>cilu</i>	(<i>-ciul</i>)	→	<i>no-chiul</i>
2SG	<i>c(e)ili</i>	(<i>-cil</i>)	→	<i>no-chil</i>
3SG	<i>ceilid</i>	(<i>-ceil</i>)	<i>ceiles</i>	(<i>-ceil</i>)
1PL	<i>celm(a)i</i>	(<i>-celam</i>)	<i>celm(a)e</i>	(<i>-celam</i>)
2PL	<i>ceilte</i>	(<i>-ce(i)lid</i>)	→	<i>no-che(i)lid</i>
3PL	<i>cel(a)it</i>	(<i>-celat</i>)	<i>celt(a)e</i>	(<i>-celat</i>)

The complete positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms are exemplified in Table 4.2 with the strong verb *ceilid* ‘conceals’. As in Table 4.1, the conjunct forms are also added in parentheses in order to compare them with the absolute forms, but it must be borne in mind that the conjunct forms do not express declarative or relative clause type by themselves. The relative compound forms

have relative lenition, though they could also be marked with relative nasalization; these two relative mutations are dealt with in Section 4.7 below.

Most of the active absolute and conjunct forms of the simple verb *ceilid* included in Table 4.2 are not actually attested in the Old Irish texts, but they can be deduced from the pattern Thurneysen (1946: 360) provides for Class BI. Note that, in this class, the conjunct singular forms involve a change in the stem in slot 4, and not a segmental marker. For passive and deponent verbs, see Section 4.5.

Table 4.2 also shows that Class BI systematically differentiates the inflections of the absolute declarative and conjunct forms, though there is some variation in this respect: (a) the absolute declarative 1SG form may have the endings *-u* (as in Table 4.2) and *-im(m)*, the latter appearing in the examples in (32) below; (b) the 1SG and 2SG conjunct forms are sometimes expressed by the absolute ones: e.g. 1SG Wb 8c3 *forchanim* vs Wb 10a13 *forchun*, both relative forms ‘that I teach’, from the lexical compound *for-cain*; 2SG Ml 64a4 *nadeclainnisiu* ‘that you do not investigate’ (with *-eclainni-* instead of expected conjunct *-eclainn*, of *as-gleinn*), *Thes. ii 255.14 arafóemi* ‘which you receive’ (instead of expected conjunct *-foím*, of the compound *ar-foím*). This use of absolute instead of the conjunct ending in the 1SG and 2SG is surely due to the pattern of other present classes such as the regular and productive present Class AI, an example of which is given in Table 4.3, based on Thurneysen (1946: 359). The special behavior of the 1st and 2nd persons will appear again later. The relative 2SG form in this table appears in example (33b) below, in which *nocari* involves relative nasalization.

Tab. 4.3: Positive declarative and relative present indicative active of AI (weak) *caraid* ‘loves’

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	(Conjunct)	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	<i>car(a)im(m)</i>	(<i>-car(a)im(m)</i>)	→	<i>no-char(a)im(m)</i>
2SG	<i>car(a)i</i>	(<i>-car(a)i</i>)	→	<i>no-char(a)i</i>
3SG	<i>car(a)id</i>	(<i>-cara</i>)	<i>caras</i>	(<i>-cara</i>)
1PL	<i>carmai</i>	(<i>-caram</i>)	<i>carm(a)e</i>	(<i>-caram</i>)
2PL	<i>carth(a)e</i>	(<i>-car(a)id</i>)	→	<i>no-char(a)id</i>
3PL	<i>car(a)it</i>	(<i>-carat</i>)	<i>cart(a)e</i>	(<i>-carat</i>)

The same fluctuation in the 1SG ending is found in the weak AII present (i.e. (*·*)*léicim* or (*·*)*léiciu*, with 2SG (*·*)*léici*), as well as in the strong BII (i.e. (*·*)*gaibim* or (*·*)*gaibiu*, with 2SG (*·*)*gaibi*). For more details, see McCone (1997a: 67–70).

In sum, as a general feature of every paradigm that allows absolute inflection for simple verbs, the 1SG and the 2nd persons do not use a different ending in order to express positive relative clause type. This difference is instead marked

‘This is what I pray’.

(33) a. *caresiu* (Ml 43a21)

car-e-siu

love/PRES.SUBJ-2SG.SUBJ.ACT.DECL-NA.2SG

‘you (sg.) may love’.

b. *léic uáit innatuari nocari* (Wb 6c8)

léic uá-it inna-tuar-i

leave/IMPV.2SG.ACT from-2SG ART.ACC.PL-food-ACC.PL.F

no.^Ncar-i

PART.REL/love/PRES.IND-2SG.IND.ACT

‘cast from you the foods which you love’.

(34) a. *Aliter saigid inplete ...* (Wb 23c11)

Aliter saig-id inplete

In other words refer/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL *inplete*

‘In other words, it goes with *inplete ...*’.

b. *ished ón saigessom* (Wb 22a3)

is-hed ón saig-es-som

COP.PRES.IND.DECL.3SG-3SG.N DIST refer/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL-NA.3SG.M

‘This is what he aims at’.

(35) a. *... húare ro creitset ardlathi inbetho cretfed cách iarum* (Wb 1a3)

húare ro.^Ncreit-s-et ard-lath-i

because PERF.REL/believe-PRET.ACT-3PL high-prince-NOM.PL.F

in-beth-o cret-f-ed

ART.GEN.SG.M-world-GEN.SG.M believe-FUT-3SG.ACT.DECL

cách iarum

each/NOM.SG.M then

‘... because the chief princes of the world have believed, every one will then believe’.

b. *bid firian cach oén creitfess hí crist* (Wb 4d21)

bi-d-firian cach oén

COP.FUT-3SG.DECL-just/NOM.SG.M each/NOM.SG.M one/NOM.SG.M

creit-f-ess hí^N crist

believe-FUT-3SG.ACT.REL in Christ

paradigmatic limits of the suffixing strategy. Section 4.4.2 offers some representative examples of simple verbs with suffixed pronouns and, on the basis of the two previous sections, Section 4.4.3 considers the restrictions of the suffixing strategy from a general perspective. The basic use of the infixes of Classes A/B and C in the expression of declarative vs relative clause types is considered in Section 4.8 in this chapter. The basic issues of the use of the affixal pronouns have been stated already in Section 2.2.1. For a comprehensive description of the primary syntactic use, I refer to Chapter 10, where the secondary uses of the Old Irish affixal pronouns are also considered.

4.4.1 Suffixed vs infixed pronouns, absolute vs conjunct forms and clause types

Roughly speaking, pronominal suffixes are attached to simple verbs, i.e. verbs that do not have the pretonic element of those described in Section 2.3 above, and pronominal infixes to the verbal complexes that have one of those preverbal elements. However, this must now be defined more accurately, in the sense that the suffixed forms are structurally and functionally limited as possible forms of the verbal complex. The following six descriptive statements, based on Breatnach (1977) and Cowgill (1987), must be considered. See Section 4.4.2 below for examples.

(i) Breatnach's (1977: 85) initial statement that "[t]he suffixed pronouns in Old Irish could only be used with the absolute forms of the simple verb ..." can be improved by saying that, in Old Irish, the forms of the simple verbs that take suffixed pronouns *are* absolute forms according to the basic meaning of the term 'absolute' given in Section 4.2 above. This interpretation of the suffixed verbal forms as absolute forms is reinforced by the remarkable structural similarity of their paradigm (see Table 4.4 below) with that of the absolute relative forms observed in Section 4.3.1 above.

(ii) Furthermore, simple verbs bearing a suffixed pronoun, which have been considered absolute, are regularly positive declarative clause type verbs.¹⁹ As observed in Section 8.4 below, the negative declarative and the remaining clause

¹⁹ In practical terms, and referring to the other clause type considered in this chapter, relative clause type is incompatible with suffixed pronouns in Old Irish. The form *Blathm. 1013 boithum*, which is often translated as 'that I had' (3SG preterite of the substantive verb + 1SG suffix, lit. 'it

types (with the exception of the responsive, which constitutively bears no affixal pronouns in either slot 2 or 6) only take infixal pronouns in Old Irish. This inherently declarative character of the forms with pronominal suffixes may well be considered a case of ‘position morpheme’, i.e. a morpheme that conveys a specific meaning on the basis of the position it occupies in a given morphological structure.²⁰

(iii) Suffixed pronouns are only used with active verbs, and this includes deponent verbs; i.e. pronominal suffixes are excluded from the passive paradigm, in which only pronominal infixes are used, as stated in Section 2.2.1 above. Passive verbs are considered in Section 4.5.1 below.

(iv) In accordance with their characterization as absolute forms, verbs with suffixed pronouns are only possible for the paradigms that have been stated above in Section 4.3.1 as susceptible to having absolute forms, i.e. present indicative, present subjunctive, future and preterite active.

(v) Even when the conditions stated in (iii) and (iv) are met, not every form of the declarative clause type paradigm of a simple verb may combine with a suffixed pronoun: only the 1PL, and the 3rd persons of a simple verb (in later texts, also the 1SG of the future) take a suffixed pronoun in Old Irish; the 1PL and the 3PL only take the suffixed 3SG m/n. *-it* form. The remaining persons of every simple verb must obligatorily infix whichever affixal pronoun with the aid of the semantically void conjunct particle *no-* if no other conjunct particle of those seen in Section 2.3.1 is used.²¹

(vi) The limitations (iii) to (v) state where suffixation is possible, but it does not seem to be always obligatory. Though the number of relevant forms is not very numerous, the pronominal 3SG f. can also appear as infixal: Ml 51b27 *nos-nesrassaigedar* ‘he makes it void’ [no-s^N-e(s)rassaig-edar], the 3SG present indicative from the simple deponent *érassaigidir* ‘makes void, invalidates’, vs Ml 102a15 *itius* ‘he eats it’ [ith-(i)th^I-us], from *ithid* ‘(s)he eats’; note that, in both cases, the 3SG f. affix is translated as an inanimate entity. Apparently, the 3SG m./n. pronoun must be suffixed if the above conditions are given. This is why Cowgill (1987: 1)

was to me’, cf. Section 9.3.4), is considered by McCone (1997a: 15) a ‘poetic survival’; an anonymous reviewer suggests that it could also be a parenthetical expression without direct syntactic relation to the previous noun.

20 This ‘position morpheme’ is to be identified with Crysmann and Bonami’s (2016: 345) type that is conditioned by a feature (in this case, the declarative ending), rather than expressing a feature.

21 The *bí-* forms of the substantive verb anteposes *ro-* instead of *no-* (Thurneysen 1946: 476) when it has to express an infix: *rom·bia* ‘I shall have’ (see Section 9.3.4 on this expression of possession).

considers that the form Ml 86d16 *namber* [n(o)-a^N-ber^I], from the simple verb *beirid* and translated in the *Thes.* as a declarative clause type form (i.e. ‘he applies it’, masculine in Old Irish), is better interpreted as an imperative form (i.e. ‘apply it!’), in which pronominal infixation is obligatory (see Section 7.3).

As Breatnach (1977: 101–104) shows, suffixation is a declining strategy during the Old Irish period even in those paradigmatic places in which it appears as more firmly established, i.e. in the 3SG.

Table 4.4 includes the assumable forms of the verb *caraid* ‘loves’ used for the combination of the six possible subject forms in the present indicative tense with the 3SG n. pronominal affix. Again, some of the forms are assumed on the basis of parallel formations. The lacking combinations with infixed pronoun have no parallel in the language of the glosses. The forms with infixed pronoun must be analyzed as [n(o)-a^L-car-], according to Section 2.6(d).

Tab. 4.4: Positive declarative clause type verb with 3SG n. pronominal affix of the simple verb *caraid* ‘loves’

	With suffixed pronoun	With infixed pronoun
1SG ‘I love it’	→	<i>na-char(a)im(m)</i>
2SG ‘you love it’	→	<i>na-char(a)i</i>
3SG ‘(s)he loves it’	<i>cairth(a)i</i>	←
1PL ‘we love it’	<i>carmit</i>	←
2PL ‘you love it’	→	<i>na-char(a)id</i>
3PL ‘they love it’	<i>cairtit</i>	←

The structural similarity between, on the one hand, the paradigm of the declarative clause type forms with 3SG n. affixal pronoun in Table 4.4 and, on the other, the paradigm of the absolute positive relative clause type form of a simple verb, observed above in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, is thus perfectly visible: both are mixed paradigms that have an absolute form in the 3rd persons and in the 1PL, whereas the remaining cells are expressed by means of a compound form with the semantically void conjunct particle *no-*. To be sure, these active paradigms are not the only mixed paradigms in Old Irish that include both absolute and compound forms: the passive paradigm of simple verbs has only two absolute forms (the 3rd persons), as observed in Section 4.5.1 below. However, the coincidence in the specific forms which can have an absolute form (1PL and 3rd persons) points to some sort of structural link between the relative paradigm without pronominal affix and the declarative paradigm with pronominal affix of simple active verbs.

This combination of 1PL subject plus 3SG object, which only takes the 3SG m./n. suffix *-(i)t* (e.g. *guidmit*), is very remarkable because it is clearly extended

from forms in which the subject is the 3PL (e.g. *bertit*), a form which is discussed in Section 10.4.5. The interesting aspect of the 1PL form *guidmit* is that, in spite of the declining character of suffixation in Old Irish, it represents a case in which this strategy of pronominal affixation in the verbal complex displays a certain productivity. One may therefore ask why specifically this combination of 1PL and 3SG m./n. is created and, as suggested in Section 4.9.1, this can receive a good explanation if the parallel design of the paradigm of positive relative forms of simple verbs just observed is taken into account.

Now, if every possible combination of verbal person with affixal pronoun is considered for a simple verb inflected as a positive declarative verb, only a limited set of those combinations can be expressed by means of the suffixing strategy in Old Irish, namely, those corresponding to the shaded cells in Table 4.5. The cells marked with \emptyset are considered impossible combinations in Old Irish; see Griffith (2008: 56 fn.2). The combinations of the unmarked cells are obligatorily expressed by means of the infixing strategy. Note that Table 4.5 includes the combination of 1SG subject + 3SG object, in spite of its later character.

The 3SG is the person that participates in every suffixed form, either as the object or as the subject of the verb (or, of course, as both). The combinations /1SG subject + 3SG object/ and /1PL subject + 3SG object/ in the future only take the 3SG m./n. suffix *-(i)t*, the same as the *-(i)t* attached to the 1PL present. At this point, the important issue is the formal and structural consequences of the existence of those forms. With the exception of those verbal 1st persons with *-(i)t*, only the 3rd persons make use of the suffixing strategy in order to incorporate an affixal pronoun, and even here it must be noted that 3PL verbs are fairly uncommon.

Tab. 4.5: Allowed combinations of simple verb and suffixed pronoun in Old Irish

		Object					
		1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
Subject	1SG				\emptyset		
	2SG					\emptyset	
	3SG						
	1PL	\emptyset					
	2PL		\emptyset				
	3PL						

The limitation in the Old Irish verb forms with suffixed pronouns illustrated in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 is reminiscent of the case of the Hungarian combination of subject and object markers described by Haspelmath (2000: 657), though the Old

Irish case is different in two main respects. First, the very existence of the paradigm of verb with suffixed pronoun is undisputable in Old Irish, in contrast to the Hungarian case in which only one possible combination, 1SG subject with 2SG object, has a specific ‘monolectic’ expression, whereas the other combinations are expressed by means of periphrastic expressions with tonic pronouns. Second, the Old Irish strategy used to express the combinations that make no use of the suffixing strategy is not properly a periphrastic expression, but a form of the verbal complex that uses a different morphological strategy.

4.4.2 Some examples of suffixed forms

Quite a few of the attested verbal complexes with suffixed pronoun collected by Breatnach (1977) constitute the expression of possession in which that pronominal form indicating the possessor is combined with the simple form of the substantive verb (i.e. ‘I have’ is etymologically ‘there is to me’). See Section 9.3.4 for more details on the distribution of these forms. This expression provides one of the few cases for the combination of verb in 3SG with a suffixed 2PL pronoun in Old Irish: e.g. *tathuib* ‘you (pl.) have’ quoted below. See Breatnach (1977: 83). For the rest, the 2PL affixal pronoun is infixal, as in e.g. Wb 27d9 *nobcara huili* ‘he loves you all’, from *caraid* ‘loves’. For the forms of the suffixed pronouns considered here, it is necessary to recall the morphological processes considered in Section 2.6 above.

The following examples of (positive) declarative verbal complexes with suffixed pronouns are arranged according to Table 4.5, and include cases in which the 3SG m./n. *-(i)t* attached to 1st persons has become meaningless. The first pronominal reference is that in slot 5 (expressing the subject and the possessee) and the second the one in slot 6 (expressing the object and the possessor): 1SG + 3SG n.: TBF 335 *ragatsa* ‘I will go’ (suppletive future of *téit*); 3SG + 1SG: LU 8285 *noithium cruth caín* ‘fair form makes me know’ (*noíð*); 3SG + 2SG: AM §2 *noithiut búaid ngoire* ‘the virtue of dutifulness makes you known’; 3SG + 3SG f.: *itius*, quoted in the previous section; 3SG + 3SG m. *leicsi* ‘he let him go’ in (56a) (preterite of *léicid* ‘leaves’); 3SG + 3SG n.: *beirthi* ‘he refers it’ in example (24) (*beirid*); 3SG + 1PL: *taitiunn* ‘we have’ in example (127) (substantive verb); 3SG + 2PL: Rawl. 88b51 *tathuib* ‘you have’ (substantive verb); 3SG + 3PL: *sluinnsius leig libru* ‘he made books of Law known’, quoted at length in example (30) (preterite of *sluindid*); 1PL + 3SG n.: Wb 15d18 *guidmit* ‘we pray (it)’ (*guidid*), see Sections 4.9.1 and 10.4.5 for

this form; 3PL + 3SG n.: Wb 13a16 *bertit alaili* ‘some take it’ (*beirid*), see again Section 10.4.5. Note that some of the forms are taken from texts other than the Glosses, and that the combination 1SG + 3SG n. appears in later forms.

As stated above, the remaining combinations of simple verb with affixal pronoun involve the infixing strategy with the aid of *no-* if no other conjunct particle is used: 1SG + 2SG: Ml 55a5 *not erdarcugub* ‘I will celebrate you’ (*airdircigidir*); 1SG + 3SG: Wb 3c6 *nasamlur* ‘I compare it’ (*samlathir*); 1SG + 2PL: Wb 25c29 *nobguidimse* ‘I pray you’ (*guidid*); 1SG + 3PL: Wb 5c7 *noscarimse* ‘I love them’ (*caraid*); 1PL + 3PL: Wb 9c10 *nosmessammar* ‘we shall judge them’ (future of *midithir*); 2PL + 3SG n.: Wb 15a7 *nachomalnidsi* ‘you fulfil it’ (*comalnathir*); 3PL + 1SG: Ml 140c1 *nummeratsa* ‘they will reveal me’ (*marnaid*); 3PL + 2PL: Wb 7b21 *nobguidet* ‘they beseech you’ (*guidid*). Other combinations are attested in lexical compounds.

The combination of an affixal pronoun with an active (or deponent) verb with correferential subject expresses reflexivity, for which see Irslinger (2014: 179–180). From the simple *móidid* ‘boasts (himself)’: 1SG + 1SG: Wb 14c18 *nom móidim* ‘I boast myself’; 1PL + 1PL: Wb 2d9 *nonmóidemni*; 3PL + 3PL: Wb 17c5 *nosmóidet*; 2SG + 2SG: Wb 2b12 *indit móide* ‘in which you may pride yourself’; 3SG + 3SG in Wb 2b4 *conách moidea* ‘so that no one may pride himself’. The unattested 2PL + 2PL combination **no-b-móidid* ‘you boast yourselves’ can be assumed in view of Wb 8b2 *nob irpaid* [no-b-irp-id] ‘you shall trust in yourselves’, present subjunctive of *erbaid*.

4.4.3 Economy and iconicity of the suffixing strategy in the Old Irish verbal complex

Leaving aside the innovative combination of 1PL subject plus 3SG m./n. in forms such as *guidmit*, which – as suggested in Section 4.9.1 below – may be related to the similar paradigmatic design of the forms with suffixed 3SG (i.e. Table 4.4) and of the positive relative absolute forms (i.e. Tables 4.2 and 4.3) observed in Section 4.4.1, a reason for the general restriction in suffixation observed in Table 4.5 may well be the formal deviation that, in synchronic Old Irish, represents the suffixed form with respect to the declarative one without any object pronominal affix, i.e. *beirthi* ‘he refers it’ in (24) with respect to *beirid* ‘(s)he brings, refers’ respectively. A further and perhaps more important reason noted by McCone (2006: 143) is that the infixing strategy keeps apart the two personal markers, the (subject) inflectional ending in slot 5 and the (object) pronominal affix in slot 2, especially when

they could be fused by the effect of phonetic changes.²² This idea conforms to the preference of inflectional person markers to appear in separated positions noted by Enrique-Arias (2002: 14–15). Provided that every possible combination of person and suffixed pronoun existed once, something that cannot be taken for granted, one may assume that many of those possible suffixed (declarative) forms have been eliminated simply by the formal problem they posed, either too great of a difference with respect to or a complete loss of formal difference with the bare declarative form.

For a situation such as that in Table 4.4, in which various morphological strategies are included in one and the same paradigm, Du Bois' (1985: 358–359) idea of competing motivations, in particular the competition between iconicity and economy, seems fitting. The absolute forms of the Old Irish suffixing paradigm are more synthetic, and to that extent more economic; by contrast, the infixing strategy is more analytic and therefore requires a more complex articulation (in this case, the use of pretonic slots in the verbal complex), but it is also more iconic in line with McCone's and Enrique-Arias' observations.

Taking into account this formal argument, it is tempting to assume that the well-balanced difference between the declarative form *noíð* 'makes know' and the form with suffixed pronoun *noíthium / noíthiut* 'makes me / you know', quoted in the previous section, has helped maintain the latter. This formal factor has had perhaps an influence on the preservation of the possessive predicate *táithium ...* 'I have ...' (from '... is to me', or 'there is ... to me') and so on, but it is clear that, in this case, the frequency of this grammaticalized expression must have played a role.

The limitations in the use of the suffixing strategy in the Old Irish verbal complex seems to be determined, at least partly, by purely formal factors. As suggested in Section 4.3.1, the parallel limitation of the absolute relative paradigm can also be due, at least partly, to similar reasons of economy. This parallelism will be further considered in Section 4.9 below.

²² In fact, as argued in Section 10.4.5, the innovative 3SG m./n. suffix form *-(i)t* mentioned in the two previous sections is best explained as due to the lack of distinctivity between the expected outcome of the combination of the suffix form *-i* with a subject 3PL form and the one with a subject 3SG form. In line with Breatnach's (1977: 100) observations, one may assume that, for a verb such as e.g. *car(a)id* 'loves', the combination of 1SG subject and 3SG m./n. object would be something like **carm(a)i* 'I love him / it', which is the form of the absolute declarative 1PL without any pronoun (i.e. 'we love', see Table 4.3); or that the combination of 2SG subject and 3SG m./n. object would be something like **car(a)i* 'you love him / it', which is the (absolute declarative and conjunct) form of the 2SG without pronoun (i.e. 'you love', see again Table 4.3).

4.5 Declarative and relative clause type in simple passive and deponent verbs

The basic inflectional feature of the Old Irish passive verbs was observed in Section 2.2.1, and this section is concerned with the forms and paradigmatic design of the declarative and relative clause type forms of passive (Section 4.5.1) and deponent (Section 4.5.2) simple verbs. The shape of these two paradigms will be compared to those observed hitherto in this chapter for the active verbs, but this is not their only relevant aspect, since the passive paradigm, which represents a productive pattern, shows a remarkable structural similarity to the cleft-sentence.

4.5.1 The passive paradigm

The inflectional feature of the positive passive paradigm introduced in Section 2.2.1 above is that, with respect to the absolute active (and deponent) paradigms, it reduces the range of possible absolute forms, since a simple passive verb can be inflected as absolute (for either the positive declarative or relative clause types) only in the 3rd persons. The passive 1st and 2nd persons are always expressed by means of compound forms that include the infixed pronoun otherwise referring to the object of the clause (if combined with an active or deponent verb), as the expression of the grammatical subject of the passive verb, followed by the conjunct 3SG form. For the expression of these passive 1st and 2nd persons in positive declarative and relative clause types, and if there is no other conjunct particle, the conjunct particle *no-* must be used, as in example (38b) below. Needless to say, this infixing strategy for the passive non-3rd persons is also used with lexical compounds. The suffixing strategy is completely ruled out for the 1st and 2nd persons of passive paradigms.

In accordance with the restriction noted in Section 4.3.1 above for relative active 1st and 2nd person verbs, which can only have an object antecedent, passive 1st and 2nd person verbs are not possible in restrictive relative clauses in which the antecedent has subject NP_{rel} function (something like e.g. **The man that I am brought home*); see Section 4.7.2 for this notion of NP_{rel} function. This is not to say that passive 1st and 2nd person verbs do not appear in Old Irish in subordinate clauses. In fact, they appear in all other types of subordinate clauses, included restrictive relatives with an antecedent in oblique NP_{rel} function. In this case, the passive 1st and 2nd persons can be expressed by means of the Class C

infix pronouns presented, and according to the tendencies stated in Section 4.8 below.

As for the 3rd persons, a systematic feature of the Old Irish passive paradigm is the formal identity of conjunct (3SG *·carthar*, 3PL *·cartar*) and absolute positive relative forms (3SG *carthar*, 3PL *cartar*) in the non-preterital tenses and moods. In the preterital forms, the rule is different: absolute relative and declarative forms are exactly the same, as in the examples in (41) below. In the eminently non-narrative Glosses, perfect forms are very frequent and this involves the preterite stems being mostly marked by the preverbal element *ro-* considered in Sections 1.5.2 and 2.3.1, so that we have very few attestations for absolute passive preterite forms (see Thurneysen 1946: 440, McCone 1997a: 94–95).

The resulting passive paradigm, considered by Ahlqvist (1990: 286) as ‘asymmetrical’, is illustrated in Table 4.6 with the present indicative of *caraid*, the declarative forms of which are listed in the *Auraicept na nÉces* (Ahlqvist 1983: 50). The positive declarative and relative passive paradigms of simple verbs are therefore mixed paradigms, much like the active relative (Tables 4.2 and 4.3) and the suffixed (Table 4.4) paradigms in the previous sections, though the distribution of the absolute and compound forms is not exactly the same.

Tab. 4.6: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish non-preterite passive (present indicative forms)

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	Conjunct	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	→	<i>no-m-charthar</i>	→	<i>no-^N-dom-charthar</i>
2SG	→	<i>no-t-charthar</i>	→	<i>no-^N-dot-charthar</i>
3SG	<i>carth(a)ir</i>	<i>(·carthar)</i>	<i>carthar</i>	<i>(·carthar)</i>
1PL	→	<i>no-n-carthar</i>	→	<i>no-^N-don-carthar</i>
2PL	→	<i>no-b-carthar</i>	→	<i>no-^N-dob-carthar</i>
3PL	<i>cart(a)ir</i>	<i>(·cartar)</i>	<i>cartar</i>	<i>(·cartar)</i>

The examples in (38) to (41) offer some minimal pairs of passive forms. First, (38) illustrates the systematic identity between the absolute 3SG relative form *lín̄tar* (which refers to the *calicem daemoniorum* ‘the calix of the demons’ of the Latin text) and the conjunct form *·lín̄tar* of the 1PL [no-n·lín-t(h)ar-ni] in the non-preterital forms, both of the present indicative of *lín̄aid* ‘fulfils’. The other three pairs involve minimal oppositions between absolute declarative and relative clause type forms of passive verbs: the forms in (39) are the 3SG present indicative from *beirid* ‘brings’, which is a strong verb with a 3SG passive ending *-(a)ir*, *-ar* that is different from that of weak present stems like that of *caraid* in the previous table.

Those in (40) are the 3SG of the *f*-future from *iccaid* ‘saves’. The examples in (41), with the 3SG preterite passive from the strong verb *renaid* ‘sells’, illustrate the systematic identity of the absolute declarative and relative clause type forms in the passive preterite.

(38) a. *línar lán difin foraltóir demne* (Wb 11b13)

<i>lín-tar</i>	<i>lán</i>	<i>di-fín</i>
fill/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS.REL	full/NOM.SG.N	of-wine/DAT.SG.N
<i>for-altóir</i>	<i>demn-e</i>	
over-altar/ACC.SG.F	demon-GEN.PL.M	

‘which is filled full of wine on an altar of demons’.

b. *nonlínarni* (Ml 18c3)

no-n·lín-tar-ni
 PART-1PL/DECL-fill/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS-NA.1PL
 ‘we are filled’.

(39) a. *berir dano frilaa brátha* (Wb 29a28)

<i>ber-ir</i>	<i>dano</i>
bring/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS.DECL	then
<i>fri-laa</i>	<i>bráth-a</i>
towards-day/ACC.SG.N	doom-GEN.SG.M

‘Reference is made, then, to Doomsday’

b. ... *arniepur frib innalmsin berar dohierusalem* (Wb 16d7)

<i>ar-ni-e-pur</i>	<i>fri-b</i>	
for-NEG.DECL·PV-say/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT	towards-2PL	
<i>inn(a)-alms-in</i>	<i>ber-ar</i>	<i>do-hierusalem</i>
ART.ACC.SG.F-alms-ACC.SG.F	bring/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS.REL	to-Jerusalem

‘... for I do not mention to you the alms that is taken to Jerusalem’.

(40) a. *madudesta ní dibar niris íccfidir per aduentum nostrum ...* (Wb 25a30)

<i>ma^L</i>	<i>du-d^L-es-ta</i>	<i>ní</i>
if	PV-3SG.N/REL·PV-lack/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	something/NOM.SG.N
<i>di-bar^N-iris</i>	<i>ícc-f-idir</i>	
of-POSS.2PL-faith/DAT.SG.F	save-FUT-3SG.PASS.DECL	

per aduentum nostrum
 by our arrival
 ‘if aught is lacking in your faith, it will be made good by our arrival ...’.

b. *bieid nach dréct diib híc-fider ...* (Wb 4d6)

bie-id	nach	dréct
SUBSTV/FUT-3SG.ACT.DECL	some/NOM.SG.N	part/NOM.SG.N
di-ib	híc-f-ider	
of-3PL	save-FUT-3SG.PASS.REL	

‘There will be some portion of them that will be saved ...’.

(41) a. ... *ríthæ intechsin fricolmán* (*Theas.* ii 240.2)

ríth-æ	in-tech-sin
sell/PRET.PASS-3SG.DECL	ART.NOM.SG.M-horse-DIST

fri-colmán
towards-Colman/ACC.SG
‘... that horse was sold to Colman’.

b. *Digéni cummen cétaig ríthæ friéladach ...* (*Theas.* ii 239.20–240.1)

Di-géni	cummen	cétaig
PV-DECL/make/PRET.ACT.3SG	Cumman/NOM.SG	mantle/ACC.SG.F

ríth-æ fri-éladach
sell/PRET.PASS-3SG.REL towards-Éladach/ACC.SG
‘Cumman made a mantle which was sold to Éladach ...’.

In practice, the passive paradigm in non-preterital stems has at most (i.e. in basically simple verbs) four forms for slots [(-) 4 - 5], i.e. the absolute declarative 3SG *carth(a)ir* ‘(s)he is loved’ / 3PL *cart(a)ir* ‘they are loved’, with final /-r^l/, as well as the absolute relative and conjunct 3SG (-)*carthar* / 3PL (-)*cartar*, with /-r/. The passive preterite has also four forms, but the distribution is different, with the same form for absolute declarative and relative clause type forms: again from *renaid*, 3SG *ríthæ* ‘it was sold’ and ‘that was sold’, and 3PL *ríthai* ‘they were sold’ and ‘that were sold’, as in (41), and the two conjunct forms, 3SG *-ríth* and 3PL *-rítha*.

The distribution of the 3rd person forms in the passive paradigm, i.e. 3SG for every form except the 3PL, which has its own form, is exactly the same as that of the copula forms that are used to introduce the cleft-sentence, as observed above in Section 3.2.2. The coincidence in this pattern seems to be rather significant in view of the fact that the copula forms in the cleft-sentence usually combine with the tonic personal pronoun followed by a 3SG relative verbal form, except for the 3PL, which is also followed by a 3PL relative verb. This similarity, already noted by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 111), and García-Castillero (2001–02), is further

considered below in Section 4.9, and is perhaps related to the function that passives have as a clause-internal information packaging option.²³

4.5.2 The ‘ex-deponent’ character of the Old Irish deponent verbs

In some respects, the Old Irish deponent verbs depart from the notion of deponency established according to the Latin model, in which the endings that regularly express passive diathesis are used in some specific verbs that have no such passive value: e.g. the Latin deponent *fatur* ‘says’ has exactly the same ending as the passive *datur* ‘is given’, from the Latin verb *dare*, the active form of which is *dat* ‘gives’. These Latin deponent verbs are only rarely used in the passive value.

Tab. 4.7a: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish simple deponent verb *suidigidir* ‘places’: active forms of the present indicative

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	(Conjunct)	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	<i>suidigiur</i>	(<i>-suidigiur</i>)	→	<i>no-suidigiur</i>
2SG	<i>suidigther</i>	(<i>-suidigther</i>)	→	<i>no-suidigther</i>
3SG	<i>suidigidir</i>	(<i>-suidigider</i>)	<i>suidigider</i>	(<i>-suidigider</i>)
1PL	<i>suidigmir</i>	(<i>-suidigmer</i>)	<i>suidigmer</i>	(<i>-suidigmer</i>)
2PL	<i>suidigthe</i>	(<i>-suidigid</i>)	→	<i>no-suidigid</i>
3PL	<i>suidigitir</i>	(<i>-suidigiter</i>)	<i>suidigiter</i>	(<i>-suidigiter</i>)

By contrast, the Old Irish deponent verbs have most often different passive forms except in the *f*-future, and these passive forms are frequent. The active and passive paradigms of these verbs are as follows. On the one hand, the active forms of simple deponent verbs have a declarative clause type paradigm with six different absolute declarative forms, and three (the 3rd persons and the 1PL) absolute relative forms; see Table 4.7a, in which the paradigm is similar to that of the weak

²³ Foley (2007: 422–423) states that, with respect to their active counterparts, passive verbs typically demote the agent of the transitive action (backgrounding function), and can also be used to promote the object of the transitive action (foregrounding function). In line with the description in Section 3.2 above, the cleft-sentence typically serves to promote a component (the focused element), which appears within the clause in the allosentential unmarked V1 order. The clause-external packaging option considered by Foley (2007: 442–446) which is relevant for Old Irish is left-dislocation, as stated in Section 3.3.

active verbs observed above in Section 4.3.1 in which the declarative absolute and conjunct forms have the same sequence [4 - 5] in the 1SG and 2SG forms.

Tab. 4.7b: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the Old Irish simple deponent verb *suidigidir* ‘places’: passive forms of the present indicative

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	Conjunct	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	→	<i>nom·suidigther</i>	→	<i>no-^N·dom·suidigther</i>
2SG	→	<i>not·suidigther</i>	→	<i>no-^N·dot·suidigther</i>
3SG	<i>suidigthir</i>	<i>(·suidigther)</i>	<i>suidigther</i>	<i>(·suidigther)</i>
1PL	→	<i>non·suidigther</i>	→	<i>no-^N·don·suidigther</i>
2PL	→	<i>nob·suidigther</i>	→	<i>no-^N·dob·suidigther</i>
3PL	<i>suidigtir</i>	<i>(·suidigter)</i>	<i>suidigter</i>	<i>(·suidigter)</i>

On the other, the passive paradigm of simple deponents has the same design as the other passives, i.e., with two single persons in the sequence [4 - 5], the 3SG and 3PL; see Table 4.7b. The observations on the conjunct forms in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 and Table 4.6 apply to the conjunct forms of these tables.

The passive and deponent 3rd persons are most often distinguished by the presence or absence of a vowel between the stem and the ending, a difference that is regular in the deponent denominal verbs *-(a)igidir*, e.g. *suidigidir* in Tables 4.7a,b, which constitute a numerous group of the Old Irish deponents: side by side the deponent (i.e. active) 3SG *suidigidir*, 3PL *suidigitir*, the passive ones are 3SG *suidigthir*, 3PL *suidigtir*. In the *f*-future, the form with predesinential vowel *suidigfidir* is both ‘(s)he will place’ and ‘(s)he will be placed’; see, for the passive form in this *f*-future, example (40) above. These *f*-future forms are therefore the only truly deponent forms, since – as already stated – deponent and passive are otherwise different, albeit minimally. This is why the term ‘ex-deponent’ has been proposed in García-Castillero (2017c) for this special situation in which a lexically determined set of verbs make use of specific desinences that are clearly related to passive ones, even though Old Irish turns out to make a quite consistent formal distinction between active and passive.

4.6 Formal features of the Old Irish absolute inflection

The previous sections established the main distributional issues of the opposition absolute / conjunct. Whereas the schema of passive paradigm given in Section 4.5.1 applies to every stem of the Old Irish conjugation, i.e., for the non-pret-

erital and preterital stems, the active forms display a certain variability. This section, which rounds off the treatment on the basically simple verbs, offers a comprehensive presentation of the absolute declarative endings and, something that is less frequent in the literature, of the absolute relative endings.

4.6.1 Absolute declarative inflection

It was observed above in Section 4.3.1 that the endings (slot 5) of some persons in the absolute declarative paradigm are the same as those used in the corresponding conjunct forms. This lack of distinction has been observed for the 1SG and 2SG in the present indicative active of weak classes. In the active paradigm of the *ā*-subjunctive, the reduplicated, *ē*-, *s*-, and *f*-futures, the 2SG person has the same ending for the declarative absolute and conjunct forms, whereas the absolute declarative paradigm of the active *s*-subjunctive differentiates the six persons from the corresponding conjunct forms. According to the extant evidence, the Old Irish deponent verbs have the same ending for the 1SG and 2SG conjunct and absolute forms in the present indicative, as illustrated in Table 4.7a above, in the *ā*- and *s*-subjunctives as well as in the *s*- and *f*-futures.

Tab. 4.8: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the *s*-preterite active of *caraid* ‘loves’

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	(Conjunct)	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	<i>carsu</i>	(<i>·carus</i>)	→	<i>no-charus</i>
2SG	<i>cars(a)i</i>	(<i>·car(a)is</i>)	→	<i>no-char(a)is</i>
3SG	<i>car(a)is</i>	(<i>·car</i>)	<i>caras</i>	(<i>·car</i>)
1PL	<i>carsimmi</i>	(<i>·carsam</i>)	<i>carsamme</i>	(<i>·carsam</i>)
2PL	?	(<i>·cars(a)id</i>)	→	<i>no-chars(a)id</i>
3PL	<i>cars(a)it</i>	(<i>·carsat</i>)	<i>carsaite</i>	(<i>·carsat</i>)

The preterite classes behave differently as regards their absolute declarative clause type inflection. On the one hand, the productive *s*-preterite distinguishes all the absolute declarative clause type forms from their conjunct counterparts. Table 4.8 includes the corresponding paradigm of the verb *caraid* ‘loves’, mostly reconstructed on the basis of other verbs. The absolute inflection of the *t*-preterite is scarcely attested for non-3rd persons.

On the other, Table 4.9 offers a case of suffixless preterite, which formally distinguishes between absolute declarative clause type forms and conjunct forms

only in the 1PL and 3PL forms, and this is most probably the outcome of a secondary innovation in the Old Irish period, as observed by McCone (1997a: 73).

Tab. 4.9: Positive declarative and relative clause type paradigms of the suffixless preterite active of *cainid* ‘sings’

	Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
	Absolute	(Conjunct)	Absolute	Conjunct
1SG	<i>cechan</i>	(· <i>cechan</i>)	→	<i>no-chechan</i>
2SG	<i>cechan</i>	(· <i>cechan</i>)	→	<i>no-chechan</i>
3SG	<i>cechain</i>	(· <i>cechain</i>)	<i>cechnae</i>	(· <i>cechain</i>)
1PL	<i>cechnammar/ir</i>	(· <i>cechnammar</i>)	<i>cechnammar</i>	(· <i>cechnammar</i>)
2PL	?	(· <i>cechnaid</i>)	→	<i>no-chechnaid</i>
3PL	<i>cechnatar/ir</i>	(· <i>cechnatar</i>)	<i>cechnatar</i>	(· <i>cechnatar</i>)

The present indicative of the verbs ‘to go’ and of the copula are exceptional. The former does not show in its 3SG present indicative the usual declarative clause ending *-(a)id* seen in the previous forms *ceilid* and *caraid*, but an irregular form *téit* ‘(s)he goes’. For the copula, see Section 9.4.3.

4.6.2 Absolute relative inflection

The absolute relative 3SG active ends usually in non-palatal *-s*, as in the present indicative forms *ceiles* ‘who conceals’, *caras* ‘who loves’, quoted in Section 4.3.1, or *saiges* ‘what he seeks’ in example (34b), as well as in the *ā*-subjunctive, *f*-future (e.g. *creitfess* in (35b)), *ē*-future (cf. Ml 94b7 *bæras*), and reduplicated *s*-future; the absolute declarative 3SG form of these tenses and moods ends in *-id*. In the case of the *s*-subjunctive, *s*-future, and *s*-preterite, there is also a relative absolute form in *-s*, but this time the lack of palatal character is the sole formal difference from the declarative form: e.g. the absolute relative 3SG of the *s*-subjunctive is Ml 39b3 (*ñ*-)ges (cf. the absolute declarative *geis*, of *guidid* ‘prays’; for *ñ*-, see Section 4.7.4); the absolute relative 3SG of the *s*-future is *giges* ‘who shall supplicate’, in example (85c), also of *guidid* ‘prays’; the absolute relative 3SG of the *s*-preterite is Wb 13d22 *gabas*, of *gaibid* ‘takes’ (or *caras* ‘who loved’ or ‘whom (s)he loved’, in Table 4.8 above). The relative 3SG present indicative of the copula *as* (cf. the declarative form *is*) is formally to be included in this group, though this is an unstressed (pretonic) form. See Section 9.4.1 for these forms of the copula.

With respect to the previous rule, the absolute relative 3SG present indicative forms of the verb *téit* ‘to go’ (i.e. *téte* ‘who goes’, cf. *dete*, i.e. ^N*téte*, in example

(73)), and the substantive verb (i.e. *f(e)ile*, *f(e)il*, see Section 9.3.2) are synchronically irregular. The absolute relative 3SG of the suffixless preterite also ends in *-e*, like *cechnae* in Table 4.9: e.g. Ml 127d3 *luide* ‘who went’, preterite of *téit* ‘goes’, *Thes. ii 242.11 boie* ‘that was’, preterite of the substantive verb. For more details, see Thurneysen (1946: 364), McCone (1997a: 66).

The absolute relative 3PL active form of the present indicative, present subjunctive, future, and preterite ends in *-(i)te*: cf. present indicative *bertae* in example (37b), *ā*-subjunctive Wb 9c12 *berte* ‘who may give’, *f*-future Wb14c4 *cretfite* ‘who will believe’, reduplicated *s*-future Wb 25b16 *bebté* ‘who will die’.

The absolute relative 1PL active form ends in *-me*, contrasting with the final *-mi* of the absolute declarative clause type form: present indicative *pridchimme* in (36b), *ā*-subjunctive Ml 18d9 *techtmae*, *s*-subjunctive Wb 4a27 *gesme* ‘which we may ask’, *f*-future Ml 14d8 *léicfimme*. See Thurneysen (1946: 363–364), McCone (1997a: 65).

The absolute relative deponent forms (3rd persons and 1PL) regularly imply the corresponding absolute declarative clause deponent ending without palatalization: e.g. 3SG Ml 35d22 *labrathar* ‘that he says’ and 1PL Ml 31b23 *labramarni* ‘that we say’, both present indicative of *labraithir*. As a feature of both deponent verbs and passive forms stated in Section 4.5 above, these absolute relative forms are the same as the conjunct forms. In general terms, the deponent inflection is poorly attested for stems other than the present indicative.

4.7 Declarative and relative clause type morphology in lexical compounds

In lexical compounds, the positive relative clause type is marked by means of relative mutations, i.e. either the lenition or the nasalization, in the first phoneme of the tonic part of the deuterotonic variant of the lexical compound described in Section 2.4.2 above. The positive declarative clause type is characterized by the lack of any mutation effect in the same place of the same deuterotonic form; this is one of the uses of the deuterotonic shape of lexical compounds, as noted in Section 2.4.4. The nature of the mutated sounds and their graphic expression were dealt with in Section 2.5. In both declarative and relative deuterotonic forms of lexical compounds, the endings are always the conjunct ones, according to the stipulation in Section 4.3.1 above.

Mutations are not only due to relative clause type marking, as anticipated in Section 2.5.3 above,²⁴ and the relative mutations are not the sole relative clause type marker. This clause type can also be expressed by absolute relative endings (Sections 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6.2), Class C infixes (Section 4.8), specific subordinating conjunct particles considered in Section 5.4, as well as the sporadic use of the prototonic form of lexical compounds (see Section 5.3.1). These markers can appear alone or in a specific combination.

Though this chapter is mainly concerned with the expression of the basic opposition between positive declarative and relative clause types in lexical units, whether simple verbs or lexical compounds, the selection of examples in Section 4.7.1 also includes one pair with negative conjunct particles, since the resulting verbal complexes also show the effects of relative mutations. The main problem of relative lenition and nasalization, when used as the sole marker in restrictive relative clauses, is their function, a point that is addressed in Sections 4.7.2 and 4.7.3. Section 4.7.4 considers the use of relative mutations in simple verbs.

4.7.1 Some examples of relative clause type verb forms from lexical compounds

The examples in (42) to (48) constitute minimal pairs in which the sole difference is the opposition between declarative and relative clause type morphology. Like other sets of examples given in this chapter, and with the exception of (48), in which the two forms are in the same gloss, the (a) example illustrates the declarative, and the (b) one the relative clause type form. The relative forms in (42) to (44) are of the leniting type, and those in (45) to (48) of the nasalizing type. With the exception of the negative forms in (45), all the other forms in this section express positive polarity.

The forms in (42) are both the 3SG present indicative active of *in-coissig* '(s)he / it indicates', and the relative clause type form is included in a cleft-sentence

²⁴ Both mutations are also constitutive parts in the expression of infixes, see Section 2.5; the conjunct particle *ro-*, when pretonic, causes lenition of the tonic part if it is preceded by a further conjunct particle, which marks the declarative or relative character of the verb. In negative copular clauses like Ml 92d13 *nídat n-escmana* 'they are not impure', the (unstressed) 3PL of the negative copula (*nídat-*) causes nasalization in the initial of the (stressed) word that comes after; the negative element *ní-* suffices in this case to state the declarative character of the verb (see Section 9.4.3 for the paradigm of the copula).

- (47) a. *forchain .i. doaithminedar do dia inpopul ...* (Ml 136c11)
 for.^Lcain .i. do·aith-min-edar
 PV·REL/teach/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT i.e. PV·DECL/PV-recall/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT
 do-dia in-popul
 to-God/ACC.SG.M ART.NOM.SG.M-people/NOM.SG.M
 ‘which teaches, i.e. the people reminds God ...’.
- b. *ní derb linn tra in senchas canone dunaith menadar isintitul so* (Ml 52)
 ní-derb li-nn tra
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-certain/NOM.SG.N with-1PL then
 in-senchas canon-e
 ART.NOM.SG.M-tradition/NOM.SG.M Scripture-GEN.SG.F
 du.^N-aith-men-adar i^N-sin-titul-so
 PV·REL-PV-recall/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT in-ART.DAT.SG.M-title/DAT.SG.M-PROX
 ‘We are not certain as to the story of Scripture that he calls to mind in this superscription’.
- (48) ... *combi óinchorp pectho asmberar et asberar corp dondlúim máirsin ...*
 (Wb 9d5)
 co^N-bi-óin^L-corp pecth-o
 so that-COP.PRES.IND.3SG-one-body/NOM.SG.M sin-GEN.SG.M
 as.^N-ber-ar et as·ber-ar
 PV·REL-say/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS and PV·DECL/say/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS
 corp do-nd-lúim máir-sin
 body/NOM.SG.M to-ART.DAT.SG.F-great/DAT.SG.F mass/DAT.SG.F-DIST
 ‘... so that it is one body of sin what is said, and it is said ‘body’ to that great mass ...’.

4.7.2 Functional domains of the Old Irish relative mutations

The Old Irish relative mutations each have a functional domain in which they are consistently used, whereas they seem to be in competition in the expression of some other functions. This section deals with the former, and leaves the latter for the next one. Moreover, this section also mentions other verbal complexes characterized as relative apart from those marked with (a) relative lenition and (b) relative nasalization, namely, those introduced by the (c) oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-* and (d) by the free-choice indefinite conjunct particle *cech(a)- / cach(a)-*. The relative forms (a) to (c) and the absolute relative verbal

complexes considered in the previous sections introduce relative clauses that do not include their antecedent or head, whereas the verbal complex of the (d) type includes the head of the relative clause, so that the conjunct particle *cech(a)- / cach(a)-* must be translated as ‘who- / whichever that ...’. See Section 5.4.3 for this conjunct particle.

On the one hand, relative lenition is regularly used when the antecedent counts as the subject of the relative clause, i.e. when the antecedent has subject NP_{rel} function, as e.g. *inchosaig* in example (42b) above. As observed by McCone (1980: 12–17), lenition is also the most frequent relative mutation when a neuter antecedent has object NP_{rel} function, like e.g. *adchobrat* in (43b) above.

On the other, relative nasalization is regularly used in the verbal complexes introduced by the temporal subordinating conjunctions *inta(i)n* ‘when’, *a^N* ‘when’, *céin* ‘while’, *las(s)e* ‘while’ considered in Section 5.5.1. To different degrees, adverbial clauses introduced by *(h)óre* ‘because’ and *amal* ‘as’ as well as complement clauses have a verb with either nasalized relative or declarative morphology. This variation is considered in the next chapter. In addition, the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* seen in Section 5.4.2 below is characterized by the nasalizing effect and, though this is not a case of autonomous mutation (see Section 2.5.3 for this notion), it shows a completely regular association between oblique NP_{rel} function and nasalization. This general notion of relative nasalization is dealt with in Section 5.7.1 below.

The genitival relation, i.e. when the antecedent counts as the possessor of a noun included in the relative (e.g. *To the brother whose mind is weak*), has no dedicated marker in Old Irish. With the meaning of the English example just quoted, the Old Irish expression Wb 10c1 ... *donbráthir híressach as énírt menme*, lit. ‘... to the faithful brother that the mind is weak’ involves the relative form of the copula *as-*, which must be of the leniting type, because the nasalizing form is expected as **as nénirt*. See Thurneysen (1946: 321–322) for more details about this type of relative clause.

With the exception of the complement clauses illustrated in Section 5.3.2 below, which involve a syntactically different type of subordinate clause, and leaving aside for now the relative clause with m./f. sg. object antecedent, which is treated in the next section, the uses of relative nasalization referred to above apparently coincide in that the antecedent is a peripheral or oblique argument of the relative verb, that is to say, in that it is neither its subject nor – if semantically

possible – its object.²⁵ The use of relative nasalization in the verb of a cleft-sentence that focuses on an adjective or the verbal predicate in the manner observed in Section 3.2.3 above agrees with this characterization. This basic difference has also been recognized by Pedersen (1913: 215–216), who distinguishes between ‘proper’ and ‘improper’ relative clauses, and by Lambert (1992: 256–257).

4.7.3 Relative mutations after m./f. sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function

The previous section stated that relative lenition is clearly related to the subject NP_{rel} function of any antecedent and to the object NP_{rel} function of neuter antecedents, whereas the oblique NP_{rel} function is expressed by the nasalizing conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*. Relative nasalization is constantly used in verbs after some adverbial subordinating conjunctions. This section focuses on the situation in which a m./f. sg. antecedent has object NP_{rel} function, a situation in which there is a remarkable variation in the relative mutation. Apparently, the object antecedent lies between the referred two poles of subject and oblique, as stated by Lambert (1992: 257): “Ainsi le domaine de l’objet direct aurait été envahi séparément par deux marques relatives possibles, soit celle du sujet, soit celle du prédicat ou de l’objet indirect” [‘Thus, the domain of the direct object would have been occupied by two possible relative markers, whether that of the subject or that of the predicate or of the indirect object’].

McCone (1980: 18–21) further observes that this specific use of relative nasalization is more frequent in Ml than in Wb, which is interpreted by him in terms of a progressive extension of the nasalizing relative mutation during the Old Irish period, and thereby as proof of a relatively recent origin in the prehistory of the Old Irish language. Though in general purely numerical arguments like this must be treated with prudence, as Lambert (1992: 255) reminds us, McCone’s diachronic interpretation is a plausible idea, since the use of mutations with simple verbs, as observed in Section 4.7.4 below, also seems to be an ongoing process.²⁶

As for the variation between relative nasalization and lenition after m./f. sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function, I propose the following explanation. The

²⁵ This functional definition of the Old Irish relative nasalization encompasses the case in which “the antecedent is the verbal noun of the verb of the relative clause,” a use that Thurneysen (1946: 317) illustrates with examples of *figura etymologica* such as Ml 52 *iarsint soirad sin rondsóer* ‘after that deliverance wherewith he delivered him’ and Wb 3b23 *aforcital forndobcanar* ‘the teaching by which you are taught’. See again Section 5.7.1.

²⁶ Nevertheless, there is variation within the same gloss between relative nasalization and lenition after the same antecedent: see e.g. Wb 30c12.

use of relative nasalization after a m./f. sg. noun with object NP_{rel} function is more frequent when that antecedent makes up a ‘tautophrasal’ constituent with the relative verb. The term ‘tautophrasal’ is parallel to others such as ‘tautosyllabic’, and refers to the situation in which the nominal antecedent and the relative verb are included in the same phrasal structure, i.e. when both constitute an NP. For instance, the expression *The man that you see there* in the clause *The man that you see there is the king* constitutes an NP in which *The man* and the relative clause are included. In line with Collins’ (1991: 37–38) observations, the ‘tautophrasal’ antecedent involves a situation neatly different from and to some extent opposed to the case in which the noun represents the focused constituent in the cleft-sentence, in which case the m./f. sg. noun with object NP_{rel} function appears with both leniting and nasalizing relative verb. This correlation can be observed in Table 4.10, which is based on the collection of forms provided by McCone (1980).²⁷ Whereas relative lenition is equally used in relative verbs included in both cleft-sentences and tautophrasal structures, relative nasalization

27 Two examples given by McCone (i.e. Wb 14c30 and Ml 75c9) are not included in this list of active verbs, due to the fact that the only antecedent of the relative verb is a tonic pronoun; such pronominal forms are focused constituents by nature and cannot form an NP with the following verb; see Section 10.2.1. The following list only considers cases in which the relative verb is preceded by a m./f. sg. noun.

A1: (m.) Wb 6a8, Wb 17c11, Wb 33b13, Ml 21d4, Ml 25b5, Ml 53c14, Ml 56a13, Ml 98b9, Ml 120c7, Ml 137d5; (f.) Wb 9d25, Wb 12c13(2x), Wb 12c46, Wb 13c21, Wb 20c20, Wb 25c22, Wb 30c12, Ml 40a15, Ml 59a7, Sg 26b13, Sg 203b4. **A2:** (m.) Wb 22c2, Ml 30c3, Ml 36c21, Ml 37b12, Ml 42c2, Ml 45b15–16, Ml 67c2, Ml 102b5, Ml 127d14, Ml 137b7, Ml 145b6, Sg 45b1, Sg 53a10; (f.) Wb 12d17, Ml 17c6, Ml 25d11, Ml 35a8, Ml 53a5, Ml 77c5, Ml 88a4, Ml 103c12, Ml 126b4a, Ml 126c1, Sg 28a1(2x), Sg 209b26. **B1:** (m.) Wb 5b42, Wb 5d27, Ml 15a2, Ml 22c1, Ml 24d4, Ml 30d25, Ml 74d4, Ml 77b6, Ml 94d4; (f.) Wb 3d3, Wb 8d21, Wb 9d5, Wb 13c10, Wb 13c24, Wb 30c12, Ml 63b9, Ml 92a17, Ml 92b10, Ml 101a5, Ml 111d4. **B2:** (m.) Wb 3d10, Wb 5b1, Ml 30c3, Ml 35c33, Ml 44a23, Ml 51c9, Ml 52, Ml 56d5, Ml 57b4, Ml 77d11, Ml 82d11(2x), Ml 102a15, Ml 107c16, Ml 107d4, Ml 111d3, Ml 114b11, Ml 138a4; (f.) Wb 5c20, Wb 14b15(2x), Ml 23b7, Ml 38c7, Ml 45c9, Ml 46d10, Ml 51b27, Ml 55a8, Ml 62c5(2x), Ml 74d13, Ml 87a7, Ml 100d5, Ml 111c13, Ml 116d3, Ml 127a5, Ml 129b4, Ml 131c5, Sg 27b15, Sg 151a3.

The case in Ml 88a4 *dumbir* (according to the edition of Strachan and Stokes) is counted as A2, however. Note that the structures in Ml 77b6 (*donadbat*) and Ml 94d4 (*domberae*) are interpreted as a cleft-sentence, i.e. as B1, and are therefore parallel to the examples (151a,b) in Section 10.2.5. As noted in Section 2.5.2 above, the spelling of the Old Irish mutations is not systematic in the Glosses, and some of the forms included in that list could be taken as doubtful. In this regard, I follow McCone’s interpretation. To quote two examples among others: Ml 24d4 *ro-crochsat* (B1) is given by McCone as nasalizing, since the graphically possible lenition is not marked; Sg 26b13 *fardīngrat* (A1) is given as leniting, since the graphically possible nasalization is not marked. Even if those forms (or some of them) should have to be taken as actually leniting (with graphical omission), the outcome would be essentially the same: the quantities of A1, A2

is noticeably more frequent in the second case, as in examples (46b) and (47b) above; as already stated, this is not an exceptionless rule, and relative nasalization is sometimes used also in cleft-sentences, as in (48) above.

Tab. 4.10: The distribution of relative lenition and nasalization in the verb after a m./f. sg. nominal constituent with object NP_{rel} function

Verbal complex marked	1. in a cleft-sentence	2. in tautophrasal use
A. with relative lenition	22 (= m. 10x, f. 12x)	26 (= m. 13x, f. 13x)
B. with relative nasalization	20 (= m. 9x, f. 11x)	39 (= m. 18x, f. 21x)

Especially for the case in which the antecedent of the relative verb is not the focused element in a cleft-sentence (i.e. for tautophrasal relative verbs), relative lenition and nasalization correspond to the nominative and accusative cases of a nominal paradigm. The verbal complex formed with the conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$, which obligatorily combines with prepositions, represents the oblique case of that noun-like paradigm of the relative verbal complexes. The fact that this oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$, which inherently has a nasalizing effect, is practically never used in the post-focus verb of the cleft-sentence, as stated in Section 3.2.3 above, is in line with the observed tendency to use bare relative nasalization in the verbal complex after m./f. sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function not included in a cleft-sentence.²⁸

This variation between relative nasalization and lenition has also been addressed by Lambert (1992), who observes that m./f. sg. antecedents with *nach* ‘some, any’, *nech* ‘some-, anybody’, or with *cech cach* ‘every, each’ with object NP_{rel} function are regularly followed by a nasalizing relative verb; by contrast,

and B1 being approximately the same, the correlation of relative nasalization and tautophrasal m./f. sg. antecedent (i.e. B2) is approximately twice as frequent as the other correlations.

After m./f. pl. antecedents, there is not such a numerical difference in the use of nasalizing relative verbs (19 cases) in comparison to relativizing relative verbs (14 cases); apart from the fact that those cases are percentually less relevant, the correlation stated for the m./f. sg. is not observable here.

28 Note that the relative nasalization in the relative clauses quoted in the previous footnote, which appear with active verbs, are tendentially included in tautophrasal NPs (i.e. they tend to avoid cleft-sentences), while the cleft-sentence displays a noticeable paradigmatic parallelism with passive verbs, as noted above in Section 4.5.1. Of course, this is not to say that cleft-sentences cannot have active verbs, nor that passive verbs cannot have relative nasalization: the important aspect of the previous observation is that the cleft-sentence seems to have had an impact in the structure of the Old Irish passive paradigm, and that, as proposed in Section 5.7.3, relative nasalization seems to have been originated in left-dislocated structures.

when the antecedent with object NP_{rel} function is the light head *intí aní* ‘the one ...’, the relative verb which comes after is most often of the leniting type. Such a difference is interpreted by Lambert (1992: 237) in terms of an opposition between non-restrictive (= nasalization) vs restrictive relative (= lenition): “*tous les antécédents du type *nech*, ‘quiconque’, ou *nach* + subst., ‘tout N’, sont suivies d’une relative nasalisante. Il est clair que la relative nasalisante est à caractériser comme appositive ou non-restrictive (l’extension de l’antécédent étant déjà définie par *cech*, *nech* pron. ou adj.)” [‘all the antecedents of the type *nech* ‘any’, or *nach* + subst. ‘every N’ are followed by a nasalizing relative clause. It is clear that the nasalizing relative clause must be characterized as appositive or non-restrictive (the extension of the antecedent being already defined by *cech*, and pronominal or adjectival *nech*)’].*

However, and leaving aside the semantic difference between indefinites like adjectival *nach* and pronominal *nech*, on the one hand, and the definite light head *intí*, on the other, I do not see how the relative clause of, say, Ml 111d3 *nachgním dungenam ni ...* ‘every deed that we shall do ...’ must be interpreted as non-restrictive as opposed to e.g. Ml 30c3 *intí charas nech* ‘the one whom anyone loves’ or even *ingnima dungena* ‘of the deed that he will do’, in (46b), at least in the sense in which the terms ‘appositive’ (or non-restrictive) and ‘restrictive’ are usually understood.²⁹ The third example is given because one would expect the same appositive or non-restrictive value of the nasalizing relative verbal complex after antecedents other than *cech* ‘every, each’, *nach* ‘some, any’ or *nech* ‘some- / anybody’, but this is not the case. In general terms, the number of cases in which pronominal *nech* and adjectival *nach* are used as m./f. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function is actually very low, especially in comparison to the list given in the previous footnote. For the rest, Lambert’s relevant observation may be subsumed in the proposed correlation between nasalizing relative and non-clefted syntactic environment, since *cech*, *nech* and the NP introduced by *nach* are almost never used in the focused part of the cleft-sentence.

²⁹ Lehmann (1984: 264) states that “[b]estimmte Bezugs-N[ominal-]S[yntagm]en, hauptsächlich solche, die mit sogenannten Allquantoren versehen sind, erzwingen die Restriktivität des R[elativ]S[atz]es” [‘some specific relational NPs, mainly those which are provided with the so-called quantificationals, determine the restrictive character of the relative clause’]. Consider further Lehmann’s (1984: 265 fn.25) observation: “Auch mit *alle* quantifizierte R[elativ]K[onstruktion]en sind im Normalfall restriktiv, z.B. *Alle Bilder, die Dali gemalt hat, sind verrückt*. Allerdings kann man hier eine appositive Version forcieren” [‘The relative constructions that are qualified with *all* are most often restrictive as well, e.g. *All the pictures that Dali has painted are crazy*. At any rate one could force here an appositive interpretation’].

4.7.4 Relative mutations in simple verbs

Though relative mutations regularly appear in deuterotonic forms, this type of relative marking is sometimes applied to the initial sound of the absolute relative forms of simple verbs observed in Section 4.6.2 above. A certain difference may be observed here between Wb, on the one hand, and Ml and Sg, on the other, a difference that points to a change in progress during the Old Irish period.

As stated by McCone (1980: 25–27), in Wb one may find nasalization on such absolute relative verbs after subordinating conjunctions such as *inta(i)n* ‘when’, e.g. *intan m̄ b̄is ...* ‘when he is ...’ in (71a), or *céin* ‘as long as’, e.g. Wb 8b1 *céin m̄b̄iis ...* ‘as long as he is ...’, ^N*b̄is* and ^N*b̄i-is* as the absolute 3SG relative clause type form. Most probably, as noted in Section 2.5.3, this mutation is due to the direct effect of the preceding conjunction, which is not a component of the verbal complex, but constitutes a phrasal unit and, eventually, has acquired the status of a clitic element. Such effects, however, can be observed in absolute relative forms that are not preceded by a nasalizing word: a clear case is the peculiar impersonal relative form *dathar* ‘people are vexed’ [^Nta-thar] discussed in Section 9.3.5 below, where the spelling reflects the effect of relative nasalization over the initial /t-/. As Ó hUiginn (1986: 80–81 + fn.101) observes, it cannot be said that this use of the relative nasalization with simple verbs is more frequent in Ml and Sg than in Wb, because the “omission of initial relative nasalization is to be seen as nothing more than an orthographical feature.”

In Ml and Sg, nasalization sometimes appears also after an antecedent with object NP_{rel} function (e.g. Ml 76a16 *dunchach n̄gaibde* ‘to everyone whom they seize’) and lenition after a form of the light head in -*i* (e.g. Ml 24d14 *aní chanas* ‘that what it sings’); note that, in these cases, antecedent and relative verb constitute a tautophrasal unit. Nevertheless, cases without such a preceding element are also known: Sg 38a1 *theit* ‘that goes’. The lenition on the first sound of the prototonic variant of lexical compounds used as relative form, as in e.g. *donai b̄ h̄i thecm̄ongat* ‘of the things that happen’ (instead of expected **do-ecm̄ongat*), quoted in example (59c) below, is a further step in the extension of that mutation beyond its proper limits.

The introduction of nasalization and lenition in the Ml and Sg forms just quoted may well be due to the need to express in the simple forms the same functional differences observed in the previous sections, especially in Section 4.7.3, since absolute relative verbs do not distinguish by themselves these two mutations.

4.8 Declarative and relative clause type infix pronouns

The forms of the affixal pronominal arguments of the verbal complex were observed in Section 2.6 above. That there is a direct relation between these pronominal arguments and clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex has already been suggested above in Section 4.4.1, in which the inherent declarative character of verbs provided with a suffixed pronoun was pointed out. In the case of the infixes, Classes A and B express by themselves the declarative, and Class C the relative clause type, with either an active / deponent or (for the 1st and 2nd persons) passive verb.

To be more precise, Class C expresses by itself the leniting relative verbal complex, whereas relative nasalization is mostly added to the Class C infix; see examples (54b) and (58b) below. In addition, verbal complexes that bear a conjunct particle that expresses clause type by itself also take Class C infixes: these are the polar interrogative conjunct particle *in*^N- (Section 7.2) and the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a*^N- (including *i*^N- ‘in which’ and *co*^N- ‘so that’; see Section 5.4 below for these conjunct particles and Sommer 1897: 195 for the infixes). This includes the 1st and 2nd person passive verbs, which – as stated above in Section 4.5.1 – are not expected in restrictive relative clauses with subject NP_{rel} function.

As regards the use of Class C infixes as a marker of relative clause type, it should be noted that this Class C is regular when it expresses a 3rd person, as illustrated in Section 4.8.1, but only optional when it expresses a 1st or 2nd person, including those infixes expressing the grammatical subject of a passive verb; this is observed in Section 4.8.2. In this respect, the negative conjunct particles deserve a brief treatment in Section 4.8.3.

4.8.1 The distinction between Classes A/B and C in 3rd person infix pronouns

In the minimal pairs with 3rd person infixes in (49) to (51), the declarative form comes in (a), and the relative form in (b); this relative form is the one corresponding to the leniting type. The verbs in (49) are both the 3SG of the perfect of *do·gní* ‘makes’, which include the 3SG n. object pronominal reference. Those in (50) are both the 3SG of the perfect of *do·beir* ‘brings’, which include the 3SG m. object pronominal reference. Note that *darigni* in (49a) and *danuic-som* in (50a) involve [d(e)-a^l-ri-g(e)ni] and [t(o)-a^N-uc^l-som] respectively, i.e. the Class A form with the morphological process described in Section 2.6 above. The forms in (51) are both the 3SG present indicative of the verb *as·beir* ‘says’, which is characterized by the

b. *ni nachaile assidbeir* (Wb 20a10)

ni-nach-aile

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-some/NOM.SG.M-other/NOM.SG.M

ass-id^L-beir

PV-3SG.N/REL-say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

‘It is no one else that says it’.

4.8.2 The distinction between Classes A/B and C in 1st and 2nd person infixed pronouns

The examples in (52) to (54) below show cases in which a non-3rd person infixed pronoun after a lexical preverb (or after *no-*) does not have the Class C form, the expected form according to the assumable relative character of the verb; it bears instead the form used in declarative clauses, i.e. either Class A or B.

This use of the form typically used in declarative forms instead of the relative form is frequent when the Class B infixes are involved, as observed in García-Castillero (forthc.). Thus, the forms in (52) are both the 3PL of the verb *in-greinn* ‘persecutes’ including the Class B 1SG infix: the form *atamgrennat* in (52a), which constitutes the whole gloss, must be understood as a declarative form, whereas the same form in (52b) appears in a context in which (leniting) relative morphology is expected. But there are also cases in which Class A is used: the form *dum-disedsa* [to-m^L-dis-ed-sa] of example (53) is the 3SG past subjunctive of *do-díat* ‘leads’ with the Class A 1SG pronoun, in a context similar to that observed in example (49b) above, i.e. a context in which relative morphology is expected. Finally, the examples in (54) include verbal complexes introduced by the subordinating conjunction *amal* ‘as’, which is most often followed by a nasalizing relative clause type form. As observed in Section 5.6.2 below, the copula after *amal* ‘as’ can be marked as a declarative clause type form, but this is a different situation in which there are no pronominal infixes involved. The case in which *amal* introduces a verb that bears a non-3rd person infix is illustrated in (54a), in which the passive 1PL of the simple verb *nertheid* ‘strengthens’ has the Class A form; by contrast, example (54b) shows the same subordinating conjunction introducing the 3PL of *do-gní* ‘does’ with the expected Class C 3SG n. infix; the form *du^N-d-gní-at* of this example illustrates how relative nasalization appears before the Class C infix.

(52) a. *atamgrennat* (Ml 39d13)

i^N-dan-com-air-léc-e-ni
 in which-1PL/REL·PV-PV-leave/PRES.IND-2SG.ACT-NA.1PL
 ‘... the affliction into which You leave us’.

- b. *condansamailter fricech ndodcadchai* (Ml 63d7)
co^N-dan-samail-ter *fri-cech^N*
 so that-1PL/REL·compare/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS towards-every/ACC.SG.F
dodcadchai
misfortune/ACC.SG.F
 ‘so that we are compared to every infelicity’.

The form *indancomairléeni* in (55a), [*i^N-dan-com-ar(e)-léc^l-e-ni*], has the prototonic 2SG present indicative of *con-airléici* introduced by *i^N*- ‘in which’. In (55b), the form *condansamailter* [*co^N-dan-*] – instead of expected *condansamaltar* according to Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 721) – has the conjunct 1PL present indicative passive of the simple deponent *samlaitir* ‘compares’, preceded by the subordinating conjunct particle *co^N*- ‘so that’.

4.8.3 The use of the infixed pronouns after negative conjunct particles

As stated in Section 2.3.1, the presence or absence of an infixed pronoun decides the use of the conjunct particles *nad-* (without infixed pronoun), e.g. *nadcreitid* in (45b), or *nach-* (with pronoun) in the negative relative verbal complex. The forms in (56) constitute a quasi-minimal pair with the 3SG m. infix.

- (56) a. ... 7 *ni naithgeuin* 7 *leicsi* (Ml 52)
 7 *ni-(a)^N-aith-geuin*
 and NEG.DECL-3SG.M/DECL·PV-recognize/PRET.ACT.3SG
 7 *leic-s-i*
 and leave-PRET.ACT.3SG.DECL-3SG.M
 ‘... and he recognized him not and he let him go’.
- b. *connach ningeuin intí abimelech* (Ml 52)
co^N-nach-(a)^N-in-geuin
 so that-NEG.REL-3SG.M(/DECL)·PV-know/PRET.ACT.3SG
intí *abimelech*
 LHEAD/NOM.SG.M *Abimelech*
 ‘so that the aforementioned Abimelech knew him not’.

In (56a), *ni naithgeuin* [ní-(a)^N.ath^l-geun^l] is the negative declarative form of the preterite of *ad·gnin* ‘recognizes’, with the Class A infix form as per Section 2.6(e). In (56b), *connach ningeuin* [co^N-nach-(a)^N.in-geun^l] is the negative form of the preterite of *in·gnin* ‘knows’ introduced by the conjunct particle *co^N*- just observed in example (55b), with the same Class A infix form.

The conjunct particle *nach-* represents a special case in the sense that the difference between Classes A/B and C of infix pronouns, which in itself serves to differentiate between declarative and relative clause type, seems to be neutralized after it. Recall that, as noted in Section 2.6, the 3SG f. and 3PL infix pronouns take the form *-a-*, which has been classified as Class C, though it coincides with neither the Class A (*-s^N*- in 3SG f. and 3PL) nor the Class C (*-da^N*-, sometimes only *-d-* in 3SG f. and 3PL) forms. This special status of the infixes after *nach-* is surely due to the fact that the relative clause type is already expressed by the conjunct particle. But this is not the whole story.

The negative relative clause type with infix pronoun shows a remarkable formal variation already in the language of the Glosses. As observed by Thurneyssen (1946: 265–266) and Ó hUiginn (1987: 177–181), the 3SG m./n. infix after *nach-*, which is recognizable only throughout the mutation, as in *connach ningeuin* of (56b), sometimes takes the more visible Class C form *-(i)d^{N/l}*-, as in the form *nachidchualatar* of example (57), the perfect of *ro·cluinetar* ‘hears’; Section 10.4.5 deals with further cases in which the same infix is used to get a morphologically clearer form.

(57) *indí nachidchualatar* (Wb 25d14)

indí nach-id^l-cual-atar
LHEAD/NOM.PL.M NEG.REL-3SG.N/REL·hear/PRET.ACT-3PL.ACT
‘those who heard it not’.

A further variation has to do with the form of the negative conjunct particle, which – synchronically speaking – is sometimes substituted by *nad-* (that is to say, the form that initially is only used without infix pronoun) when relative nasalization is expressed. Alternatively, it can be said that in this case “the negative appears as *na-* with the following Class C infix pronoun ... being nasalized” (Ó hUiginn 1987: 178).³⁰ Thus, besides the case of *connach ningeuin* quoted in (56b) above, one can also find cases like *nand chumgat* in (58b), from *con·icc* ‘can (do)’, which counts as either [na^{-N}-d-(a)^l.com-(i)ng-at] or [na^{-N}-d^l.com-(i)ng-

³⁰ The combination of infix *-id* and negative relative preverb *nad-* is found also in Wb 15b14 *nadid chreti* ‘who does not believe it’.

at], and constitutes another quasi-minimal pair with the declarative form *níchumcamni* of (58a). The nasalizing relative character of *nand chumgat* is due to the presence of the subordinating conjunction *huare* ‘because’, which is considered in Section 5.5.1.

(58) a. ... *acht níchumcamni ón* (Wb 4a27)

acht	ní-(a) ^l ·cum-c-am-ni	ón
but	NEG.DECL-3SG.N/DECL·PV-can/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT-NA.1PL	DIST
	‘... but we cannot do that’.	

b. *huare nand chumgat* (Ml 94b3)

huare	na- ^N -d ^l ·cum-g-at
because	NEG.REL-REL-3SG.N/REL·PV-can/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT
	‘because they cannot do it’.

It seems that the use of nasalization is responsible for (or at least favors) an innovation such as the introduction of *nad-* instead of *nach-* as the negative relative conjunct particle combined with an infix, as in the case of *huare nand chumgat* ‘because they cannot do it’ in (58b). Curiously enough, nasalization also seems to play a significant role in the introduction of the mutations onto the absolute relative clause type forms observed in Section 4.7.4, an ongoing process during the Old Irish period.

4.9 Declarative and relative clause types and pronominal markers

The absolute (declarative and relative) inflection, the declarative character of the suffixed pronouns, as well as the difference between Classes A/B and C discussed at length hitherto in this chapter point to a close relationship between the expression of declarative and relative clause types and the expression of person/number in Old Irish. The relationship between these two grammatical categories expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex is the main issue of this section. For this purpose, Section 4.9.1 restates previous observations on the disposition of those two categories in the Old Irish verbal complex, and resumes the paradigms obtained in this chapter. Section 4.9.2 puts forward the notion of a ‘preferred pronominal argument structure’, on the basis of which Section 4.9.3 proceeds to analyze the Old Irish paradigms of declarative and relative clause type forms.

4.9.1 Pronominal markers and clause types

The three morphological markers of declarative and relative clause types considered in this chapter, i.e. absolute declarative and relative endings, relative mutations (or lack thereof) in the deuterotonic form of lexical compounds, and affixal pronouns, which are each combined with the meaningless conjunct particle *no-* in various ways, are related to each other. This section looks at two different views of this relationship, one in the structure of the verbal complex and the other in the structure of the resulting paradigms.

Tab. 4.11: The structural possibilities for the present indicative active and passive of an Old Irish simple verb marked as positive declarative or relative clause type verb and [\pm pronominal affix]

		Slot 1	Slot 2	Slot 4	Slot 5	Slot 6		
A c t i v e	a	With suffixed object pronoun	—	—	—	Verbal stem	Clause type & person- number 1	Person- number 2
	b	Without affixal object pronoun	—	—	—	Verbal stem	Clause type & person- number 1	—
	c	With infixal object pronoun & with <i>no-</i>	<i>no-</i>	Clause type & person- number 2	—	Verbal stem	Person- number 1	—
	d	Without infixal object pronoun & with <i>no-</i>	<i>no-</i>	—	Clause type	Verbal stem	Person- number 1	—
P a s s i v e	b	Without affixal pronoun	—	—	—	Verbal stem	Clause type & person- number	—
	c	With infixal (object) pronoun & with <i>no-</i>	<i>no-</i>	Clause type & person- number	—	Verbal stem	(Person-) number	—
	d	Without infixal (object) pronoun & with <i>no-</i>	<i>no-</i>	—	Clause type	Verbal stem	(Person-) number	—

In the first place, Table 4.11 summarizes all the positive declarative and relative paradigms of simple verbs considered in this chapter, including the obligatorily compound tenses and moods considered in Section 4.2, and shows the slots that these three sets of markers (with *no-*) occupy in the template proposed in Section 2.2.2. In active verbs, there is the possibility of having two pronominal references,

noted as ‘person-number 1’ for the subject and ‘person-number 2’ for the object; in passive verbs, there is only one such ‘person-number’. This table does not consider the negative version of these clause types introduced in Section 4.8.3 (and further considered in Section 5.4.1 below). The cells including an em dash are those which are obligatorily void on each occasion.

Table 4.11 allows for two general statements on the inflectional expression of declarative and relative clause types in simple verbs. First, ‘person-number’ is frequently associated to the expression of these two clause types in the same marker. This involves portmanteau morphemes in the case of the absolute endings considered in Sections 4.3 and 4.5, i.e. the rows marked as (b), and when the verbal complex includes an affixal pronoun expressing the object of an active verb or the subject of a passive verb, i.e. rows (a) and (c), dealt with and exemplified in Sections 4.4, 4.5 and 4.8. Relative nasalization can be added to infixal pronouns, i.e. in the (c) rows in Table 4.11, as noted in Section 4.8. However, the situation in the (d) rows in Table 4.11, which involves the use of *no-*, keeps apart clause typing and person-number. Note that Table 4.11 summarizes most of the uses of *no-* listed in point (iv) in Section 2.3.1 and observed in this chapter; it does not include the use in the imperative clause type. Note further that lexical compounds involve only rows (c) and (d) of Table 4.11, with the difference that slot 1 would be occupied by a lexical preverb.

Second, the declarative and relative clause type marking appears at either the left or the right edge of the verbal complex. In this sense, the rule in Section 2.2.2 that states the mutual exclusion of the pronominal object markers in slots 2 and 6 seems to be a specific case of a more general rule referred to the distribution of declarative and relative clause type markers, which appear at either the left or the right edge of the verbal complex. This is the contrast between strategies (a) and (b), on the one hand, and (c) and (d), on the other, in the active verbs in Table 4.11. In passive verbs, the mixed paradigm described in Section 4.5.1 involves strategies (b) and (c), which also partake in the contrast just established for active verbs. As a situation that departs from this tendency, relative mutations are sometimes applied to (and therefore are compatible with) absolute relative forms, i.e. the strategy in the (b) rows in Table 4.11: as clearly shown in Section 4.7.4, this use of relative mutations is clearly an ongoing process in Old Irish, and it is far from being systematic.

In addition to the general observation that the expression of the Old Irish declarative and relative clause type forms is closely related to the expression of the category of person, it also seems that the latter interacts with the former in a specific manner. Reference is made to the various situations in which 1st and 2nd person markers do not make a clause type distinction that is regularly expressed

in the 3rd person markers. On the one hand, as observed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.5.2, the absolute declarative 1SG and 2SG endings (slot 5) of some active verbs and of quite a number of deponent verbs are the same as the conjunct ones. Second, as observed in Section 4.8.2, Class A/B infixes expressing 1st and 2nd persons (i.e. slot 2) are often used in cases in which the Class C forms are expected, something that is not allowed for 3rd person infixes.

The second main point of this section is the paradigmatic outcome of the combination of the feature [\pm pronominal affix] with the pair (positive) declarative and relative clause types, which is illustrated in Table 4.12 for both active and passive forms of basically simple verbs. In the active forms, this combination results in four separate paradigms. The paradigm that combines declarative clause type and [$-$ pronominal affix] is always absolute (see Section 4.3.1), and the one that combines relative clause type and [$+$ pronominal affix] is constantly compound (see Section 4.8). The two other combinations, i.e. declarative and [$+$ pronominal affix] (in this case, the 3SG n.), on the one hand, and relative and [$-$ pronominal affix], on the other, have a mixed paradigm that has the same distribution of absolute and compound forms: as observed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1, the absolute forms are restricted to the 3rd persons and the 1PL, whereas the 1SG (exception made of some future forms of the later language) and the 2nd persons must be compound. In passive forms of basically simple verbs, the same combination actually results in two paradigms, the declarative and the relative, which are of a mixed character.

Tab. 4.12: Present indicative active and passive of the simple BI (strong) *ceilid* ‘conceals’: positive declarative / relative clause type and [\pm pronominal affix]

		Positive declarative clause type		Positive relative clause type	
		[$-$ pron]	[$+$ pron]	[$-$ pron]	[$+$ pron]
Active	1SG	<i>cilu</i>	<i>na·chiul</i>	<i>no·chiul</i>	<i>nond·chiul</i>
	2SG	<i>c(e)ili</i>	<i>na·chil</i>	<i>no·chil</i>	<i>nond·chil</i>
	3SG	<i>ceilid</i>	<i>ceilthi</i>	<i>ceiles</i>	<i>no(n)d·cheil</i>
	1PL	<i>celm(a)i</i>	<i>celmit</i>	<i>celm(a)e</i>	<i>nond·chelam</i>
	2PL	<i>ceilte</i>	<i>na·che(i)lid</i>	<i>no·che(i)lid</i>	<i>nond·che(i)lid</i>
	3PL	<i>cel(a)it</i>	<i>celtit</i>	<i>celt(a)e</i>	<i>no(n)d·chelat</i>
Passive	1SG	→	<i>nom·chelar</i>	→	<i>nondam·chelar</i>
	2SG	→	<i>not·chelar</i>	→	<i>nondat·chelar</i>
	3SG	<i>cel(a)ir</i>	←	<i>celar</i>	←
	1PL	→	<i>non·chelar</i>	→	<i>nondan·chelar</i>
	2PL	→	<i>nob·chelar</i>	→	<i>nondab·chelar</i>
	3PL	<i>celt(a)ir</i>	←	<i>celtar</i>	←

The previous sections have advanced some reasons that may have played a role in the structural configuration of the paradigms in Table 4.12. There may be purely formal reasons in line with the general observations in Section 4.4.3 on the declarative suffixed forms, but the interplay of the declarative and relative clause types with the category of person, as well as with pragmatically marked structures such as the cleft-sentence have surely played a role.

This is clearly the case of the passive verbs. As noted in Section 4.5.1, passive verbs with a 1st or 2nd person subject are not expected in a restrictive relative verb, and a passive relative form such as *nondam-chelar* in Table 4.12, with 1SG subject, is used in subordinate clauses other than restrictive relatives, which are marked with relative nasalization. The two passive paradigms of Table 4.12 are based on the 3rd person forms, i.e. the obligatory compound forms of the type *nom-chelar* ‘I am hidden’ or *nom-charthar* ‘I am loved’ are built up on the 3SG, with the exception of the 3PL. The parallel distribution of the copula and post-focus verb of the allosentential cleft-sentence observed in Section 4.5.1 above is probably an important factor in the creation of this innovative pattern of the Old Irish passive paradigm.

As for the active paradigms in Table 4.12, in Section 4.3.1 above I have referred to the fact that an active verb with 1st or 2nd person subject in a restrictive relative clause can only have an antecedent with object NP_{rel} function. In view of the assumable reduced use of 1st and 2nd persons in relative clauses, the lack of specific absolute relative endings for these persons (with the exception of the 1PL) may well be due to merely economical reasons. Note also that relative forms such as *nond-chiul* in Table 4.12, with 1SG subject and 3SG n. object, are only of the nasalizing type used in subordinate clauses other than restrictive relatives. As directly related to this, a relative verb preceded by an antecedent with object NP_{rel} function is not expected to have an object, so that the two mixed active paradigms in Table 4.12 stand in a sort of complementary distribution when the relative paradigm has an object antecedent. This complementary distribution may be the reason for the parallel pattern of these two paradigms noted in Section 4.4.1.

In line with the structural similarity in the distribution of 3SG and 3PL in the copula and post-focus verb of the cleft-sentence and the passive paradigm just mentioned, it is worth noting that the active declarative [+pronominal affix] and the relative [-pronominal affix] paradigms are structurally connected in the sense that the cleft-sentence that contains the latter after a pronominal stressed 3SG n. object involves the former as the corresponding allosentential variant. For example, the allosentential variant of the cleft-sentence *ished inso noguidimm* ‘this is what I pray’ in (32b) would be **na-guidimm* ‘I pray it’ (i.e. both forms must take *no-*), and the one of *ished ón saigessom* ‘this is what he aims at’ in (34b)

would be **saichthi* ‘he aims at it’ (i.e., both are absolute forms). This is the specific manner in which these two mixed active paradigms included in Table 4.12 stand in complementary distribution. The diachronic assumption is that this allosentential relationship has played a role in their parallel distribution of absolute and compound forms, so that innovative absolute 1PL forms with suffixed 3SG n. such as *guidmit* ‘we pray (it)’, the form mentioned in Section 4.4.1 and further considered in Section 10.4.5, may well be due to the existence of an absolute 1PL relative counterpart such as *guidme*, which is attested in Wb 4a27 in a temporal clause. This absolute relative 1PL ending *-me* is chronologically earlier: see e.g. Thurneysen (1946: 364). In other words, such an allosentential relationship between declarative form with 3SG n. affix and the relative without pronominal affix would therefore explain why specifically the 1PL, but not other persons, adopted such a suffix.

4.9.2 A preferred pronominal argument structure

Especially in the case of the passive verbs of simple verbs, the different morphological strategy to express the 1st and 2nd persons points to the idea that the parallel marking of the categories of person (and number), on the one hand, and clause typing, on the other, are not a matter of chance, and represent a case in which a given paradigmatic arrangement can be taken as evidence for (or, alternatively, can be considered the consequence of) specific pronominal argument configurations for both declarative and relative clause types.

This idea of specific argument configurations is in line with Du Bois’ (1987) notion of Preferred Argument Structure, which states that there is tendentially only one lexical NP per clause, in the syntactic function of intransitive subject or transitive object and with the pragmatic value of new information. In fact, the Old Irish use of the 1st and 2nd person infixes as object of a transitive verb and subject of a passive verb is quite reminiscent of the association of these functions in Du Bois’ principle. In a similar way, I suggest that there is a preferred combination of core pronominal arguments for a given morphosyntactic structure of clausal level, and that this may have consequences for the morphological and paradigmatic configuration of clause types in Old Irish. With respect to Du Bois’ proposal, the preferred pronominal argument structure invoked here differs in two essential aspects.

First, the arguments considered in this case are the pronominal references included in the verbal predicate. These pronominal references are different in nature and behavior to the lexical NPs considered by Du Bois. On the one hand,

pronominal references also involve the 1st and 2nd persons, not included in Du Bois' (1987: 835) principle. On the other, the 3rd person pronominal references are used precisely to anaphorically refer to the 'absent' lexical NP. In Old Irish, the expression of the subject of active verbs (the one in slot 5) is mandatory, whereas the presence of a pronominal object marker most often implies the lack of the corresponding lexical NP in the clause; see Section 10.4 for 'redundant' or 'unnecessary' pronominal affixes. By their very topical nature, pronominal references are neutral to the distinction between given and new information, as stated by Du Bois (1985: 356); however, these pronominal references are sensitive to the difference between focused or not focused, and this is in line with the allosentential relationship of passive verbs with cleft-sentences suggested in Section 4.5.1 above and also considered in the previous section.

Second, the intended preferred pronominal structure is closely related to illocutionary force, much in the way of Haspelmath's (2008: 191–193) notion of 'complementary expected association', which refers among other things to the usual combination of 2nd person and imperative clause type. In the case of this association, it seems that the illocutionary force of the imperative explains the privileged status of the 2nd persons in the corresponding clause type. My proposal works with basically the same idea of a relationship between declarative and relative clause types and a specific configuration of pronominal references in the verbal complex.

4.9.3 The preferred pronominal argument structure and the Old Irish clause types

Whereas Section 4.9.1 established some limitations in the combination of clause type, in particular of the relative clause type, and the category of person, this section proposes a preferred pronominal argument structure for clause types. I suggest that the declarative clause type version of a transitive verb typically has two core arguments, whether pronominal or lexical. In Old Irish, if the object argument is of a pronominal nature, then it will obligatorily appear within the structure of the verbal complex, as stated in Section 2.2.1 above. By contrast, the corresponding relative version of the same transitive verb has only one core argument in its structure, whether the subject or the object. Similarly, passive verbs have one core argument in declarative and none in leniting relative clauses. In Old Irish terms, a (transitive) verbal complex that has two pronominal references is then more easily non-relative, whereas the relative version of the same

verb will have only one pronominal reference in its structure. This nicely accounts for a number of facts observed in this chapter.

To begin with, there is the inherently declarative character of the verbs with a suffix object, which involve the presence of two pronominal arguments. Of course, other clause types can also have two arguments, even relative verbal complexes that have an antecedent with oblique NP_{rel} function. However, the prediction is that the declarative clause type is that in which the two pronominal arguments are more frequent, even more than in the imperative. This may explain the declarative nature of the suffixed forms.

Similarly, a 1st and 2nd person passive verb usually implies a declarative clause type or, at least, a non-relative clause type. As noted above, the fact that the syntactic subject of a passive verb is semantically a patient makes possible the use of the marker of transitive object in the passive paradigm, as if it were a neutralized expression of both roles.

The inherently declarative (or non-relative) character of the 1st and 2nd persons in passive verbs is probably to be assumed also in active verbs. The reason is basically the same as in the previous point, namely, that the verbal complexes that have a 1st or 2nd person are less prone to appear in restrictive relative clauses. This could be the reason for the lack of formal differentiation of some 1st and 2nd person endings in slot 5, and for the use of the Class A/B 1st and 2nd person infixes instead of the expected Class C of relative clauses in slot 2, as if these persons would tend to appear in declarative clauses.

4.10 Summary and prospect

This chapter has focused on the marking of positive declarative and relative clause types in simple verbs or in lexical compounds by means of (i) absolute declarative and absolute relative endings, (ii) relative mutations and their contrastive lack as marker of declarative clause type, (iii) affixal pronouns, as well as (iv) the semantically void conjunct particle *no-*. The main ideas that emerge from the previous presentation are offered in turn.

(i) Apart from the set of absolute declarative active endings observed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.6.1, there are also some absolute relative active endings (Section 4.6.2) that sometimes vary according to tense. The absolute endings appear in simple verbs with the structure [4 - 5] and constitute a complete paradigm in the case of the positive declarative paradigm of active verbs. The positive relative paradigm of active verbs is of a mixed nature: it only has absolute forms for 1PL and 3rd persons, and the other persons must be compound, i.e. [1 - 4 - 5], with the

particle *no-* and the corresponding relative mutation. The passive paradigm observed in Section 4.5.1 is also mixed: only the 3rd persons have absolute forms, and 1st and 2nd persons are always compounded. The active conjunct endings are indifferent to clause type distinctions, in the sense that they are used in the remaining clause types, with the exception of the imperative 2SG and 3SG forms. In the deponent and passive paradigms of simple verbs, the 1PL (only for the deponent) and the 3rd person conjunct forms are the same as the absolute relative forms, a systematic feature that is worth remembering here.

(ii) The positive relative and declarative clause type forms of lexical compounds require the deuterotonic form, which involves a minimal articulation as [1 (- 3) - 4 - 5]. In this structure, the relative clause type character is marked by the relative mutations, which apply, if phonologically possible, to the first sound of the tonic part of the verbal complex, i.e. the first sound of the element(s) in slot 3, if occupied, or of the element in slot 4. The declarative clause type is marked by the absence of such mutation. As stated in Sections 4.7.2 and 4.7.3, relative lenition marks subject NP_{rel} function of any antecedent and (mostly) object NP_{rel} function of a neuter antecedent, whereas relative nasalization (tententially) marks object NP_{rel} function of a m./f. sg. tautophrasal antecedent.

This distinction between nasalization and lenition has spread over the simple absolute relative forms, on the one hand, and to the negative conjunct particle combined with the Class C infix pronouns, on the other. See Sections 4.7.4 and 4.8.3 respectively.

The two previous observations on absolute and deuterotonic forms suffice to understand why their characterization as ‘independent’ forms with respect to the pair conjunct and prototonic form (which are dubbed ‘dependent’) is valid in the declarative and relative clause types, as anticipated in Section 2.4.4 above. In other words, the absolute forms of simple verbs and the deuterotonic variant of a lexical compound express these two Old Irish clause types, whereas the corresponding conjunct and prototonic versions (with some exceptions seen in the next chapter, Section 5.3.1) cannot express by themselves those two clause types and need a conjunct particle to do so.

(iii) Affixal pronouns are important for the distinction between declarative and relative clause types in Old Irish. The very fact that an Old Irish simple verb takes a suffixed pronoun in slot 6 implies that it is a positive declarative clause type form. However, the suffixing pattern is not always available and more than a half of the possible combinations of subject and pronominal object in a positive declarative clause type must be expressed by means of a deuterotonic verbal complex with the conjunct particle *no-* in slot 1. As for infix pronouns, it has been shown that the sole opposition between Class A/B, on the one hand, and Class C

of infixes, on the other, distinguishes declarative from relative clause type in a deuterotonic verbal complex.

In the paradigmatic constituency of the positive declarative and relative clause type forms of simple and lexical compound verbs, one cannot exclude the involvement of mere phonotactic factors, as suggested in Section 4.4.3 for the limitations of the suffixing strategy, but it seems that the mixed shape of some of the paradigms of simple verbs turns out to be significant in the sense that they reveal the effect of pragmatic, syntactic, and paradigmatic conditions of a more or less general character, as suggested in Section 4.9.

In this sense, I proposed a pronominal version of Du Bois' notion of Preferred Argument Structure as a principle that may explain some aspects in the configuration of those declarative and relative paradigms such as the inherently declarative character of the suffixed forms in active verbs and of the 1st and 2nd persons passive verbs. In line with this observation, the paradigmatic similarity between the passive paradigm and the copula forms used to introduce the cleft-sentence, as observed in Section 4.5.1, suggests that the cleft-sentence has some influence on the paradigmatic shape of some specific verbal complexes in Old Irish. As suggested in Section 4.9.1, the involvement of the cleft-sentence is perhaps also the reason for the same distribution in the paradigm of the active positive declarative clause type plus 3SG n. affix, on the one hand, and the paradigm of the relative clause type with no pronominal affix, on the other hand, of simple verbs. A further aspect in which the cleft-sentence has proven to be relevant (even though in a negative manner) is the use of relative nasalization after *m./f.* sg. object antecedents, which – as observed in Section 4.7.3 – shows a clear tendency to appear when there is no cleft-sentence. This interaction of clause types with pragmatically marked structures is a recurrent topic in the next chapters.

The subordinate clauses considered in this chapter are basically the restrictive relative clauses, and only those in which the antecedent has object or subject NP_{rel} function, and the declarative clause type form has been taken as the bare oppositional form of the relative clause type form and considered in its basic use in main clauses. However, the Old Irish declarative forms can be used in some types of subordinate clauses and, as already mentioned at some places of this chapter, there are more relative verbal complexes and, in general, more subordinate clauses than the ones considered in this chapter. The next chapter on subordination in Old Irish basically provides a wider description of the use the declarative and – in particular – of the relative clause types.

5 Subordination in Old Irish

5.1 Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to analyze the use of the declarative and relative clause type forms in the expression of subordination in Old Irish. This is tantamount to saying that this chapter offers a quite comprehensive treatment of subordination in Old Irish, because non-finite forms such as infinitives and participles have a restricted and rather nominal use. Due also to its main purpose, a further limitation of this chapter is that it does not offer an exhaustive study of every subordinating conjunction.

As stated above in Section 1.7.2, the main vs subordinate clause distinction, which is basically a syntactic distinction, partly coincides with the distinctions based on the pragmatic notion of illocutionary force, and this is especially clear in the case of the relative clause type, which is the proper expression of subordination. In Old Irish, however, there are some subordinate clauses that make use of declarative verbs.

The previous chapter analyzed only the declarative and relative clause type forms of the simple and lexical compound verbs, but left unattended a number of aspects related to those two clause types. These are the other verbal complexes that express relative clause type (in this case, basically the one with the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N-$), the other functions of relative nasalization, and the already mentioned use of the declarative clause type form in some specific subordinate clauses, where this clause type form sometimes alternates with relative clause type marking.

In keeping with the main semasiological orientation of this study, this chapter begins with a classification of the formal strategies used in the expression of subordination in Old Irish, which are introduced in Section 5.2 and described in Sections 5.3 to 5.5. As a major issue of this chapter, this formal classification is then confronted in Section 5.6 to the semantic types of subordinate clauses, in order to find some significant patterns that may explain why some specific strategies are used for some specific types of subordinate clauses; also in this section, some cases of variation of clause type morphology after some frequent subordinating conjunctions will be analyzed. Section 5.7 offers a general interpretation of relative nasalization in Old Irish and defends the idea that it is a relatively recent innovation in Old Irish. Section 5.8 briefly considers the aforementioned use of the non-finite verbal forms in Old Irish. Section 5.9 closes the chapter.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-005>

5.2 Formal strategies of subordination in Old Irish

This chapter considers five morphosyntactic strategies of subordination in Old Irish. The criteria used to define them are, first, the form of the verbal complex and, second, the presence or absence of a subordinating conjunction external to the structure of the verbal complex. As for the form of the verbal complex, the first main opposition is decided by the distinction between the dependent (i.e. prototonic / conjunct) (= Type I) or independent (deuterotonic / absolute) (= Types II to V) character of the verbal complex. This is the morphological notion of (in)dependency introduced in Section 2.4.4 above.

Types II to V include verbal complexes that are morphologically independent but syntactically dependent. In this sense, I further consider whether the verbal complex suffices by itself to express the subordinate character (i.e. Types II and III), or an additional and independent subordinating conjunction, not properly included in the verbal complex, is required (i.e. Types IV and V). The difference between Types II and III is that in the former the subordination marker is one of the markers of relative clause type observed in the previous chapter, i.e. relative absolute endings, relative mutations, and Class C infix pronouns, whereas in the latter the basic verb adopts the conjunct or prototonic form and is preceded by a pretonic (string of) element(s) that mark(s) the subordinate character. Finally, Types IV and V imply both a subordinating conjunction outside the structure of the verbal complex, but differ in that Type IV makes use of relative clause type morphology, whereas Type V entails declarative clause type morphology in the verbal complex. The resulting list of formal strategies used in Old Irish to express subordination is the following:

- Type I: Dependent form (prototonic or conjunct)
- Type II: Independent form with relative morphology
- Type III: Independent form = [Conjunct particle + dependent form]
 - Type IIIa: [Negative conjunct particle + dependent form]
 - Type IIIb: [Oblique relative conjunct particle -(s)a^N. + dependent form]
 - Type IIIc: [Subordinating conjunct particle + dependent form]
 - Type IIId: Incorporated independent conjunction
- Type IV: [Subordinating conjunction + relative verb]
- Type V: [Subordinating conjunction + declarative verb]

Sections 5.3 to 5.5 are devoted to the analysis and illustration of the morphosyntactic strategies used in the verbs of the subordinate clauses. Section 5.3 encompasses the strategies that consist of the use of the bare lexical element without the addition of any conjunct particle or subordinating conjunction, i.e. Types I and II. Section 5.4 deals with the various possibilities in which the subordinated

character is due to one or more conjunct particles in the preverbal slot 1 of the Old Irish verbal complex, i.e. Type III. Finally, Section 5.5 considers those cases in which there is an independent subordinating conjunction, i.e. Types IV and V.

5.3 Dependent and independent relative verbal complex

This section considers the cases in which subordination is expressed in Old Irish solely by morphological modifications applied to the verbal lexical basis, whether simple or compound. This involves the relative verbal complex considered in the previous chapter, which counts as Type II in the classification of this chapter; however, as already mentioned in Section 2.4.4, Old Irish also uses the morphologically dependent form of the verb as a way of expressing relative clause character. This strategy, dubbed as Type I, is far from being a well-established pattern in Old Irish, but it cannot be omitted from this overview.

5.3.1 Type I: Dependent form as the marker of relative clause type

In the Old Irish Glosses, frequent lexical compounds with the deuterotonic structure CV·VC(-) tend to express the leniting relative clause type by means of the (descriptively at least) prototonic form; see Sections 1.3.2 and 2.4.2 above. Clear examples of this tendency are *tadbat* in (59a) and *tairci* in (59b), 3SG present indicative of *do-adbat* and *do-airci* respectively, both with the function of the leniting relative clause type form, as opposed to the deuterotonic forms *do-adbat* and *do-airci*, which tend to be used as the declarative clause type form. In (59c), *thecmōngat* is the prototonic 3PL present indicative of *do-ecmaing* with additional relative lenition. For these forms, see García-Castillero (2015a: 92, 94).

(59) a. *ised tadbat 7 foilsigedar intitil* (Ml 74d13)

is-ed		t-ad-bat
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.N		PV-PV-show/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
7	foilsig-edar	in-titul
and	declare/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL	ART.NOM.SG.M-title/NOM.SG.M

‘It’s this what the title shows and makes manifest’.

b. *isferr limsa didiu aní tairci inbríg móir sin duibsi* (Wb 12c31)

is-ferr		li-m-sa
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-good/COMP		with-1SG-NA.1SG

didiu aní t-air-c-i
 then LHEAD/NOM.SG.N PV-PV-produce/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT
 in-bríg móir-sin du-ib-si
 ART.ACC.SG.F-force/ACC.SG.F big/ACC.SG.F-DIST to-2PL-NA.2PL
 'I prefer, then, that which produces that great privilege to you'.

c. *donaib hí thecmoingat* (Sg 2a10)

do-naibhí ^lt-e-cm-oing-at
 of-LHEAD/DAT.PL REL/PV-PV-PV-happen/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT
 'of the things that happen'.

The same tendency to equate prototonic form and leniting relative clause has been observed by Thurneysen (1946: 28–29, 314) and Pedersen (1913: 248) in a few lexical compounds with a different deuterotonic shape. The forms *thórñther* in (60a) and *todlaigersa* in (60b) correspond to lexical compounds with the basic deuterotonic form CV·CV-: the former, i.e. [^lto-(f̂)o-r(i)nd-ther],³¹ is the 3SG present indicative passive of *do·foirndea*, *·toirndea* 'signifies', and the latter is the 1SG present indicative of the deponent verb *do·tluchethar* 'asks'.

(60) a. *islán di neuch thórñther* (Sg 59b18)

is-lán di neuch
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-full/NOM.SG.M of whatever/DAT.SG.N
^lt-ó-rñ-ther
 REL/PV-PV-denote/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS
 'it is full of whatever is denoted'.

b. *ciafiu todlaigersa* (Ml 38c22)

cia-fiu to-dlaig-er-sa
 WH-fitting PV-ask/PRES.SUBJ-1SG.SUBJ.ACT-NA.1SG
 'how I beseech'.

As suggested in García-Castillero (2015a: 97–99), the use of the prototonic variant in those forms may well be due to the presence of an element such as *nech* in

³¹ This analysis is only an attempt to display the components of the verbal complex as well as the changes implied by the form attested. The expected 3SG passive form was *(-)tórantar, see García-Castillero (2017c: 129), and the prototonic form *tornd-* (i.e. slots 3 and 4) has been taken from the corresponding prototonic active form (-)toirnd-, a change similar to that considered in García-Castillero (2017d: 199–200).

(60a) or *ciafiu* in (60b), which occupy a functional position similar to that of other conjunct particles such as the relative *-(s)a^N*- considered in the next section or the *wh*-interrogative *ce*- seen in Section 6.3.2, but that must still be considered as external to the structure of the verbal complex. Similar elements are also *aní* in (59b) and *donaib hí* in (59c), both forms of the light head *intí aní*, but those verbs with the basic deuterotonic shape CV·VC(-) do not need such antecedents, as in the case of *tadbat* in (59a), which is the post focus verb of a cleft-sentence.

Bearing in mind the structural similarity between prototonic and conjunct, which are (morphologically) dependent forms in the sense suggested in Section 2.4.4 above, I contend that the manuscript reading Ml 21c3 *intan tét* is a further case of the trend dealt with in this section. The form *tét* is the conjunct form of the verb *téit* ‘goes’ that should appear after a pretonic element (e.g. *ní-tét* ‘does not go’ or *do-tét* ‘comes’). The expected, i.e. the regular form in that situation, however, is the absolute relative form *téte* observed in Section 4.6.2 above, which is the form proposed by Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 717) and edited by Strachan (1949: 136) for that gloss, according to the rule established in Section 5.5.1 below.

Though the previous relative forms are only sporadic in the Old Irish Glosses, I assume that they represent a linguistically effective attempt to mark relative character, and they are therefore in line with the rule stated in Section 4.5 above for (ex-)deponent and passive non-preterital 3rd persons of simple verbs, according to which the conjunct form is the same as the absolute relative form. An example thereof is the 3SG absolute relative form *foilsigedar* in (59a), which is also the corresponding conjunct form of the simple (ex-)deponent *foilsigidir* ‘declares’. For passive verbs, see (38) above, with the absolute relative 3SG form *línar* and the conjunct form *-línar* of the 1PL passive form *nonlínarni*, from the simple active *línaid* ‘fulfils’.

The use of the dependent forms to express relative clause type represents an iconic use of dependent morphology to express syntactic dependency. As just noted, this principle regularly applies to non-preterital passive and (ex-)deponent verbs and only tentatively to active verbs.

5.3.2 Type II: Independent form with relative morphology

The verbal complex implied in this subordinating strategy was explained at length in the previous chapter, and involves, for basically simple verbs, the mixed paradigm observed in Section 4.3.1 which has both absolute relative forms and compound relative forms with *no*-, and for basically compound verbs, the

Note that, in example (62), the copular predicate introduced by *bid-* ‘it will be’ is preceded by the left-dislocated constituent *mo-fáilte-se* ‘my joy’.

5.4 Subordinating conjunct particle (or particle chain)

The common denominator of Type III is that the marker of subordination is a constitutive part of the verbal complex located in slot 1; the lexical basis of the verb, whether simple or compound, appears then in conjunct or prototonic form. The four subtypes distinguished within this general type depend partly on the nature of the pretonic element, but also on the process leading to the establishment of the subordinating pretonic elements, much in line with the observations in Section 2.8 above about the accumulation of different elements in slot 1 of the verbal complex. Section 5.4.1 considers the case in which the conjunct particle is the bare negative relative; Section 5.4.2 inspects the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N-$, whereas the grammaticalized avatars of this particle are left for Section 5.4.3, and those two sections include the combination with the negative particle in the same slot 1. Finally, Section 5.4.4 considers the possibility of the incorporation of an (independent) subordinating conjunction when the verbal complex already has (an)other conjunct particle(s).

5.4.1 Type IIIa: [Negative conjunct particle + dependent form]

The verbal complexes in which the negative conjunct particles *nad-* or *nach-* mark the subordinated character, two particles introduced in Section 2.3.1 and exemplified in Section 4.8.3 above, belong to this section. The verbal complex *nachidchualatar* ‘who (pl.) heard it not’ in example (57) above expresses a restrictive relative clause. In example (63) below, the form of the substantive verb *nadmbí*, which has relative nasalization (i.e. *nad^Nbí*), expresses complementation, as the negative form corresponding to the example in (61) given in the previous section.

- (63) ... *asbeir immurgu nadmbí ciall la nech disluindi dliged remdeicsen* (Ml 50d1)
- | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| as·beir | | immurgu | nad ^N ·bí |
| PV·DECL/say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT | | however | NEG.REL·REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT |
| ciall | la·nech | | di ^(L) sluind·i |
| sense/NOM.SG.F | with-somebody/ACC.SG.M | | PV·REL/deny/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT |
| dliged | | rem·deics·en | |
| reason/ACC.SG.N | | pre-looking-GEN.SG.F | |

‘... he says, however, that there is no sense for anyone who denies the rule of Providence’.

5.4.2 Type IIIb: [Oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*- + dependent form]

The conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*- already mentioned in Section 4.7.2, which is always preceded by a preposition, is used to form an oblique relative verbal complex, i.e. a relative verb in which the antecedent has oblique NP_{rel} function (say, *The man with which we speak*). This relative verb formed with *-(s)a^N*- as well as the leniting and nasalizing relative verbal complexes, which express subject and object NP_{rel} function respectively in the specific manner stated in Section 4.7.3, constitute a sort of nominal paradigm of relative verbs in Old Irish, for which I refer to García-Castillero (2018: 45–47). The examples in (64) and (65) offer various verbal complexes in which this conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*- is assumed to be used.

(64) a. *ished torbe nammáa tra aratabarr labrad ilbelre ...* (Wb 12d29)
 is-hed torbe nammáa tra
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.N profit/NOM.SG.N only then
 ar-a^N-to-bar-r labrad
 for-OBL.REL·PV-give/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS speaking/NOM.SG.M
 il-belre
 many-language/GEN.PL.N
 ‘this, then, is the only profit for which speaking many languages is given, ...’.

b. ... *indfiugor fuandrogab infaith* (Ml 45a3)
 ind-fiugor
 ART.NOM.SG.F-figure/NOM.SG.F
 fu-a^N-d^L-ro-gab
 under-OBL.REL-3SG.N/REL·PERF-utter/PRET.ACT.3SG
 in-faith
 ART.NOM.SG.M-prophet/NOM.SG.M
 ‘... the figure in accordance with which the prophet uttered it’.

c. *arnifil ceneel nabelre isinbiuth dinadricthe nech* (Wb 28b1)
 ar-ni-fil ceneel
 for-NEG.DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG race/ACC.SG.N

na belre i^N-sin-biuth
 nor language/ACC.SG.N in-ART.DAT.SG.M-world/DAT.SG.M
 di-(a^N)nad-r-íc-the nech
 of-(OBL.REL-)NEG.REL.PERF-save/SUBJ-3SG.IMP.F.PASS somebody/NOM.SG.M
 ‘for there is neither race nor nation in the world of which some one shall
 not have saved’.

d. *ishé loc inatreba* (Wb 27d26)

is-hé loc
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M place/NOM.SG.M
 i^N-a(d)-treb-a
 in which·PV-dwell/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT
 ‘this is the place wherein he dwells’.

e. *...cidarafodaim int ais firian innafochaidi* (Ml 55d11)

cid ar-a^N-fo-daim
 WH.SG.N for-OBL.REL·PV-endure/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 int-ais firian
 ART.NOM.SG.M-folk/NOM.SG.M righteous/NOM.SG.M
 inna-fochaid-i
 ART.ACC.PL-tribulation-ACC.PL.F
 ‘...why do the righteous folk endure tribulations?’ (lit. ‘what (is it) for
 which the righteous folk endure ...?’).

The relative verbal complex *aratobarr* [ar-(s)a^N-to-ber-(a)r] ‘for which ... is given’ in (64a) is made up of the preposition *ar-* ‘for’, the particle *-(s)a^N* and the prototonic form of the 3SG present indicative passive of *do-beir*. In (64b), *fuandrogab* [fo-(s)a^N-d^L-ro-gab] contains the preposition *fo-* ‘under’, *-(s)a^N*, the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^L*-, and the prototonic form of the 3SG perfect active of *gaibid*. The form *dinadricthe* [di-((s)a^N)-nad-r(o)-íc-the] in example (64c) contains the preposition *di-* ‘of, from’, the elided particle *-(s)a^N*-, the negative relative conjunct particle *nad-*, and the conjunct form of the 3SG past subjunctive passive of *iccaid*; this form illustrates the combination with the negative preverb, in which case the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* is not visible. The same ‘elision’ has probably happened in the functionally parallel conjunct particle *i^N* ‘in which’, based on the preposition *i^N* ‘in’ and exemplified in (64d) with *inatreba* [i^N-ad-treba], which has the prototonic 3SG present indicative active of *ad-treba*; another example of this *i^N*- is in (55a). Note that all these relative verbs constitute a tautophrasal unit with their respective antecedents, in the sense of Section 4.7.3 above; this type of

relative verb is very rarely used after focused elements in the cleft-sentence, as noted in Section 3.2.3 above.

This oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - is used regularly when a *wh*-pronoun depends on a preposition, as in *cidarafodaim* [cid ar-(s)a^N·fo-dam^l] in example (64e). More examples of this structure are given in the next chapter on *wh*-interrogative clause types.

When combined with the preposition *ó/uá* ‘from’, the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - is visible in *Wb*, as in the form *hoarícc* [o-(s)a^N·r(o)-ícc] of (65a), the 3SG perfect of *íccaid*. In *ML*, however, this combination seems to have lost the *-a-* of the oblique relative conjunct particle: in (65b), the form *honeroimer* [o^N·ar(e)-fo-em-ar] contains the prototonic variant of the 3SG passive *·eroim-er* of the verb *ar·foim*. Note that the gloss in (65b) also contains the bare relative form *ar-a·foim* ‘who receives’ of the same lexical compound, with *ara-* / *are-* as the pretonic form of the lexical preverb *ar-* in a relative clause type form. The *ML* combination of *ó/uá* ‘from’ with the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - therefore represents an argument in favor of the interpretation of general Old Irish *i^N*- ‘in which’ as a combination of the preposition *i^N*- ‘in’ with the particle $-(s)a^N$ -, where the latter has been elided.

(65) a. *fudumne indfíss hoarícc dia ácenele ñdoine ...* (*Wb* 5c16)

fudumne	ind-físs	
depth/NOM.SG.F	ART.GEN.SG.N-knowing/GEN.SG.N	
ho-a ^N ·r-ícc		dia
from-OBL.REL·PERF-save/PRET.ACT.3SG		God/NOM.SG.M
á ^N ·cenele ^N		doine
ART.ACC.SG.N-race/ACC.SG.N		man/GEN.PL.M
‘the depth of the knowledge whereby God has saved the race of men...’.		

b. *is laigiu didiu intí arafoim· indaas intí honeroimer* (*ML* 17c7)

is-laig-iu	didiu	intí
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-small-COMP	then	LHEAD/NOM.SG.M
ar-a ^N ·fo-im	in- ^N ·ta-as	
PV-REL·PV-receive/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	than-REL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL	
intí	ho ^N ·er-o-im-er	
LHEAD/NOM.SG.M	from which·PV-PV-receive/PRES.IND-3SG.IND.PASS	
‘he then who receives is less than he from whom it is received’.		

A similar tendency to delete the *-a-* of the conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - may be suspected in some specific cases of other combinations of preposition with the same

particle. The manuscript reading of Ml 55c1 *diluid* ‘when [David] went’ (instead of edited *dialuid*) could be interpreted in this manner, though – due to its grammaticalized character – this element *di(a)*^N. ‘when’ belongs more to the next section. Similarly, for Sg 188a31 *diatabir* ‘to whom he gives’, Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: ii 181) note that the “first *a* is written under the line”, as if it would have been initially forgotten by the glossator. The same can be suspected in the case of Sg 66b10 *diandapir* ‘of which you speak so’, quoted in (159c) in reference to the use of the Class C infixed pronoun, for which Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: ii 121) note that “the *a* of *diand* is written above *i*”. Finally, consider Sg 202b3 ... *frismbiat* ‘... with which they are’, to be compared to Ml 47d8 ... *frisambi* ... ‘... against whom there is ...’.

5.4.3 Type IIIc: [Subordinating conjunct particle + dependent form]

Some of the combinations of preposition with the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a*^N described in the previous section give way to conjunct particles expressing various kinds of adverbial clauses. In (66a), *dia*^N ‘if, when’ is added to the conjunct 1PL present subjunctive of *comalnaithir* ‘fulfils’; see McQuillan (2002: 153–154). In (66b), *ara*^N ‘in order that’ is combined with the prototonic 1PL present subjunctive form of *fo-loing* ‘endures’. The form *co*^N ‘till’, ‘so that’³² is considered on a par with the forms based on the conjunct particle *-(s)a*^N; like the particle *i*^N ‘in which’ seen in the previous section, it seems to have elided the form of this conjunct particle. In (66c), *co*^N takes the prototonic form of the 3SG subjunctive active of *do-gní*, and in (66d) it is combined with the negative particle, i.e. *co*^N-*na-fitir* (3SG of *ro-fitir*); this conjunct particle also appears in examples (55b) and (56b). The forms *ara*^N and *co*^N can also be used to introduce complement clauses, a use that is clear in (66b); see Ó hUiginn (1998: 123–125).

(66) a. *diacomalnammar apridchimme* ... (Wb 15d27)

dia^N-*comaln*-*ammar* *a*^N-*pridch*-*imme*
 if-fulfil/PRES.SUBJ-1PL.ACT LHEAD/ACC.SG.N-preach/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL
 ‘if we fulfil what we preach, ...’.

³² This conjunct particle is formally and semantically similar to the conjunction *co*^L, which is followed by a declarative clause type verb, and therefore belongs to Type V, analyzed in Section 5.5.2 below. See Thurneysen’s (1946: 554–556) observations on both subordinating markers. A remarkable difference between them is that *co*^N is virtually the only one that is combined with the copula. A thorough investigation of this issue lies beyond the scope of this study.

b. *gigestesi dia linn arafulsam ar fochidi* (Wb 14c2a)

giges-te-si	dia	li-nn
beseech/FUT-2PL.ACT.DECL-NA.2PL	God/ACC.SG.M	with-1PL
ara ^N .fu-ls-am	ar-fochid-i	
so that·PV-endure/PRES.SUBJ-1PL.ACT	POSS.1PL-suffering-ACC.PL.F	

‘you will beseech God for us that we may endure our sufferings’.

c. *condena degním* (Ml 20a14)

co ^N .de-n-a	de(g)-gním
so that·PV-make/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT	good-deed/ACC.SG.M

‘so that he should do a good deed’.

d. *conafitir nech diæcnib indomuin* (Wb 8b4)

co ^N .na-fit-ir	nech
so that-NEG.REL.find/PERF.ACT-3SG.ACT	anybody/NOM.SG.M
di-æcn-ib	in-domuin
of-wise man-DAT.PL.M	ART.GEN.SG.M-world/GEN.SG.M

‘so that none of the wise men of the world knows’.

The expression used to introduce the NP Standard of comparison involves in Old Irish a relative clause introduced by a preposition and a nasalizing relative form of the stem (*·*)*tá*(*·*) of the substantive verb. See Section 9.3.5 for this paradigm and the various strategies involved therein: one of these strategies belongs to this type.

The free-choice indefinite conjunct particle *cech(a)- / cach(a)-* ‘which-, whoever, all that’, in the examples of (67), may be classified in this type of subordinating strategy. As stated in Section 4.7.2, the verbal complex formed with this free-choice indefinite conjunct particle introduces by itself a headed relative clause, in contrast to the other relative verbal complexes. In (67a), *cecha^N·dermai* includes in *·dermai* [*·de-r(o)-gni*] the prototonic 3SG perfective subjunctive of *do·gní*. In (67b), *cacha-orr* has in *-orr* the conjunct 3SG present subjunctive of *oirgaid*. Thurneysen (1946: 289) states that *cech(a)- / cach(a)-* refers only to the object of the verb, but this can be given rather as a tendency, in view of example (67c), where *cech¹·t-ucai* includes *cech-* in the function of subject of the prototonic form *·tucai*, the suppletive perfect form of *do·beir* ‘brings’, and the Class A 3SG n. infix. This conjunct particle is most directly related to the adjectival unstressed form *cech / cach* ‘each, every, all’ (e.g. Wb 2a22 *ocech cenélu serbe* ‘of every kind of bitterness’). See further examples in *DIL s.u. cach, cech* (IIb,c).

(67) a. ... *ni airmim cecha ndernai do fertaib* (*Thes.* ii 338.25)

ni·air·m·im

NEG.DECL·PV-count/PRES.IND-1SG.IND.ACT

cecha^N·de·r·nai

do·fert·aib

whichever·PV-PERF-make/PRET.ACT.3SG

of-miracle-DAT.PL.M

‘... I do not count all the miracles that [Brigit] has wrought’ (lit. ‘all what she has made of miracles’).

b. *cosmail leiss cacha orr im cara fá æscare* (*Sg* 12b7)

cosmail

le·iss

cacha·orr

similar/NOM.SG.M

with-3SG.M

whichever-slay/PRES.SUBJ.3SG.ACT

im·cara

fá

æscare

COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG.POLINT -friend/NOM.SG.M

or

enemy/NOM.SG.M

‘alike to him whichever he may slay, whether friend or foe’.

c. *nī boances cech thucai* (*Thes.* ii 347.4)

nī·bo·ances

NEG.DECL-COP.PRET.3SG-hurt/NOM.SG

cech^L·t·ucaí

whoever-3SG.N/DECL·PV-bring/PERF.ACT.3SG

‘It was no hurt whoever brought it’.

5.4.4 Type III_d: Incorporated independent conjunction

The proclitic temporal conjunction a^N ‘when’, which is regularly followed by a nasalizing relative form and is thereby differentiated from the homonymous light head a^N ‘that (which...)’ observed in e.g. (66a), always followed by a leniting relative form, is not part of the structure of the verbal complex, and this is why it is considered morphologically independent. However, this proclitic conjunction a^N ‘when’ is attached to the following verbal form, whether simple or compound. An argument that speaks for this interpretation is that a^N ‘when’ appears often assimilated into the consonant of the pretonic conjunct particle *ro* giving thus *arru-* (Thurneysen 1946: 552), as illustrated in (68), in which *-ru·culigestar* is the nasalizing relative 3SG perfect form of the deponent *culigidir* ‘profanes’.

(68) *arruculigestar .i. sechis arrunillestar* (*Ml* 63a14) a^N ·ru· a^N culig-es-tar

.i.

when-PERF·REL/profane-PRET.ACT-3SG.ACT

i.e.

The examples in (70) show how the concessive conjunction *cía^l* ‘though’ (properly, its formal variant *ce^l*) is used in the same way as *ma^l*. In the form *cena pridchidsi* [*ce^l-n(o)-a^l-pridch-id^l-si*] of (70a), *-a^l-* is the Class A 3SG n. infix combined with the conjunct particle *no-* and the conjunct 2PL present indicative of *pridchaid*; see again Section 5.5.1 for the infix. In (70b), *cerusamaltar* has the conjunct 3SG present subjunctive passive of the deponent *samlait^hir*. Note the value of *cía^l* as marker of complement clause in (70b).

(70) a. *nidignemni cena pridchidsi* (Wb 15d6)

ni·di·gne·m·ni

NEG.DECL·PV-make/FUT-1PL.ACT-NA.1PL

ce^l-n-a^(l)·pridch-id-si

though-PART-3SG.N/DECL·preach/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT-NA.2PL

‘we will not do, though you preach it’.

b. *ishuisse cerusamaltar fricrist ...* (Wb 34a4)

is·huisse

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-right/NOM.SG.N

ce^l-ru·samal-tar

fri·crist

though-PERF·DECL/compare/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.PASS towards-Christ

‘it is right that he be compared to Christ ...’.

The basic idea is that those independent subordinating conjunctions cannot occupy slot 1 by themselves, but apparently can more easily be attached to it when that slot is already occupied by a conjunct particle.

This tendency can be compared to that of the Old Irish conjunct particle *ro-*, which – as stated in Section 1.5.2 – is frequently externalized to slot 1 when it already has a conjunct particle, as probably *manirochoscasom* in (69c), if this is to be interpreted as [*ma^l-ni-ro^lco(m)-s(e)c-a-som*]. Forms like this could be added to the cases with three conjunct particles considered in Section 2.8 above. A clear case of externalized *ro* in slot 1 is Wb 18d9 *niroimdibed* ‘had not been circumcised’ [*ni-ro-im(m)-di-b-ed*], instead of **nirimdibed* **[ni-r(o)-im(m)-di-b-ed]*, with *ro-* in the tonic part of the verbal complex. See, for more forms, García-Castillero (2013a: 134–137). The cases observed in this section and the case of *ro-* just mentioned both point to the idea that slot 1 may attract various elements to its position, from either its left or right parts.

5.5 Subordinating conjunction

5.5.1 Type IV: [Subordinating conjunction + relative verb]

Several subordinating conjunctions consist of a (more or less) grammaticalized noun or demonstrative form followed by a relative verb, which is marked with nasalization on most occasions. Due to their grammaticalized character, these conjunctions seem to have lost part of their phonological independency, though they are almost always spelled as a separate word.

The frequent conjunction *inta(i)n* ‘when’ regularly has relative nasalization in the verb that comes after. In (71a), the absolute relative form *m̃bís* is the consuetudinal 3SG present form of the substantive verb and illustrates the case of a simple verb that includes relative nasalization in line with Section 4.7.4 above. When the verb after this conjunction has a pretonic element, then it regularly shows relative nasalization in the first sound of the tonic part, as in (71b), in which *do^Nber-am* is the 1PL present indicative of *do-beir*. In (71c), another temporal conjunction, *las(s)e* ‘while’, is also followed by a verb marked with relative nasalization, *ar̃ndamfuirset* [ar(e)-^N-dam-fo-r(ig)sⁱ-et], the 3PL present subjunctive of *ar-fuirig* ‘delays, holds back’, with the Class C 1SG infix *-dam-*.³³

(71) a. *istrémuin immurgu intain m̃bís hísiu* (Wb 17b3)

is-trémuin		immurgu
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-weak/NOM.SG.M		however
intain	^N -bí-s	hísiu
when	REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL	here
‘he is weak, however, when he is here’.		

b. *intan domberam armenmain intiu colleir* (Ml 21a8)

intan	do ^N -ber-am		
when	PV-REL-give/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT		
ar ^N -menm-ain	int-iu	colleir	
POSS.1PL-mind-ACC.SG.M	in-3PL/ACC	diligently	
‘when we give our mind to them diligently’.			

c. *lase ar̃ndamfuirset* (Ml 114c11)

³³ For other temporal conjunctions such as *céin* ‘while’, which are not exemplified here, see the lists of Ó hUiginn (1986: 36–48).

lase ar-^N-dam-fui-rs-et
 while PV-REL-1SG/REL·PV-detain/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.ACT
 ‘when / while they shall detain me’.

Since it is important for the later argument, the causal conjunction (*h*)*óre* ‘because’ is illustrated in (72a) with the copula, i.e. *as*-^N*amairessach*, and in (72b) with another verb, i.e. *do*-^N*adbat*, the nasalizing relative 3SG present indicative of the verb *do-adbat* ‘shows’ also quoted in example (59a) above.³⁴ Finally, the example in (73) shows the combination of *amal* ‘as’ with ^N*téte*, the absolute relative 3SG form of *téit* ‘goes’ quoted in Section 4.6.2 above.³⁵

(72) a. *hóre as namairessach fodúacair* (Wb 11b24)

hóre *as*-^N-*amairessach*
 because COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL-unfaithful/NOM.SG.M
fo-d^l-úa-cair
 PV-3SG.N/REL·PV-proclaim/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 ‘because it is an unfaithful one who proclaims it’.

b. *hóre donadbat pecthu ...* (Wb 3c21)

hóre *do*-^N-*ad-bat* *pecth-u*
 because PV·REL-PV-show/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT *sin*-ACC.PL.M
 ‘because it manifests sins ...’.

(73) *amal dete cechisque coitchenn* (Ml 93b12–13)

amal ^N*tet-e* *cech*
as REL/go/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL *any*/NOM.SG.M
uisque *coitchenn*
water/NOM.SG.M *common*/NOM.SG.M
 ‘as any common water goes’.

These two conjunctions, (*h*)*óre* and *amal*, are also followed by a declarative clause type verb on a significant number of occasions, as observed in the next section.

As a specific feature of the language of the Old Irish Glosses that must be included in this section, the subordinating conjunctions *ma*^l (also *má*^l) ‘if’ and *cía*^l (also *ce*^l, *cí*^l) ‘though’ imply the meaningless use of the Class C 3SG n. infix

³⁴ For further causal conjunctions such as *arindí* ‘because’, see Ó hUiginn (1986: 58–63).

³⁵ For other, less frequent manner conjunctions, see Ó hUiginn (1986: 48–58).

verb *feruēre* ‘to boil’, with an object pronoun, whereas a referential 3rd person pronoun with a passive verb such as *-canar* in (74c) is not possible in Old Irish, unless it is triggered by some element such as the concessive subordinating conjunction. This use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* in the verbal complex after *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cíá^l* ‘though’ is also considered in Section 5.6.2, in Section 9.3.3 with the substantive verb, and its diachronic origin is discussed in Section 10.4.3.

5.5.2 Type V: [Subordinating conjunction + declarative verb]

Other subordinating conjunctions, finally, are followed by a main (mostly declarative) clause type verbal complex. As observed in Section 5.4.4, these independent conjunctions and the verbal complex apparently constitute a tighter unit when the latter has a conjunct particle, i.e. Type III_d. For reasons of space, not every conjunction of this type is considered here: for forms like *(h)ó^l* ‘since’, and *co^l* ‘so that’, I refer to Thurneysen (1946: 555).

The conjunction *ar* (less frequently *air*), with explicative meaning ‘for, because, since’, has a weak subordinating force in the Glosses, in which it often appears as the first word of the gloss, as in the examples of (75). See Hertz (1930: 124–137) for more details. The main (mostly declarative) clause type morphology is the rule: in (75a), it is the 3SG present indicative form of the copula, and in (75b), the same form of *do·ecmalla*.

(75) a. *arismiad mór indapstalacht* (Wb 13b5)

ar	is-miad	mór
for	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-honour/NOM.SG.F	great/NOM.SG.F
ind-apstalacht		
ART.NOM.SG.F-apostleship/NOM.SG.F		
‘for a great honor is the apostleship’.		

b. *ardoecmalla inmertrech cuicce pecthu indlína dodaaidea* (Wb 9d5)

ar	do-e-cm-all-a	
for	PV·DECL/PV·PV-gather/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT	
in-mertrech	cuicc-e	pecth-u
ART.NOM.SG.F-harlot/NOM.SG.F	to-3SG.F	sin-ACC.PL.M
ind-lín-a	do-da-aid-l-ea	
ART.GEN.SG.M-multitude-GEN.SG.M	PV-3SG.F/REL·PV-visit/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT	
‘For the harlot gathers unto her the sins of those that visit her’.		

Conjunctions such as (*h*)*óre* ‘because’ and *amal* ‘as’, which have been observed in the previous section in combination with a nasalizing relative clause type form, also take a verb with declarative clause type morphology. In the case of (*h*)*óre* ‘because’, this usually happens when the verb is the copula, as in (76a,b), and the substantive verb, as in (76c). After *amal* ‘as’, an important factor seems to be the use of subjunctive mood in the verb, as in (77). As noted by Strachan (1898/99: 67–68), the 1st and 2nd persons of the copula after (*h*)*óre* always have declarative morphology, as in (76b), which is part of example (3), though it must be said that this is only attested in four Wb glosses. For the case of the substantive verb in (76c), see Strachan (1898/99: 53). An example with another verb is (76d), where the relative form would have been *no*ⁿ*pridchim*. This variation between declarative and relative morphology after (*h*)*óre* and *amal* ‘as’ is analyzed in more detail in Section 5.6.2 below.

(76) a. *hóre ismórad dagnímo dogní* (Wb 6a8)

<i>hóre</i>	<i>is-mórad</i>	
because	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-magnifying/NOM.SG.M	
<i>dag-gnīm-o</i>	<i>do-^lgní</i>	
well-doing-GEN.SG.M	PV-REL/make/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	

‘because it is a magnifying of well-doing which he does’.

b. *hore ammicorp crist* (Wb 12b12)

<i>hore</i>	<i>ammi-corp</i>	<i>crist</i>
because	COP.PRES.IND.1PL.DECL-body/NOM.SG.M	Christ

‘because we are Christ’s body’.

c. *hóre atá crist in mé* (Wb 19a19)

<i>hóre</i>	<i>a(d)·tá</i>	<i>crist</i>	<i>in mé</i>
because	PV-DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	Christ	in me

‘because Christ is *in me*’.

d. *hore pridchim soscele dogentib* (Wb 5c6)

<i>hore</i>	<i>pridch-im</i>
because	preach/PRES.IND-1SG.IND.ACT.DECL
<i>soscele</i>	<i>do-gent-ib</i>
Gospel/ACC.SG.N	to-Gentile-DAT.PL.M

‘because I preach (the) gospel to Gentiles’.

(77) *amal ní cuimsin hifrecndirc anasberinn per epistolas* (Wb 17b1)

amal	ni-cuim-s-in	hi-frechndirc
as	NEG.DECL·PV-can/PRES.SUBJ-1SG.IMP.F.ACT	in-presence/DAT.SG.M
a ^N -as- ^L ber-inn		<i>per epistolas</i>
LHEAD/ACC.SG.N-PV·REL/say/PRES.IND-1SG.IMP.F.ACT		

‘as though I could not do in (your) presence what I said *per epistolas*’.

The form *resiu* ‘before’ seems to be followed more consistently by a declarative clause verb form, as in (78a), in which the 3PL perfective past subjunctive *ro·gab-tis* shows no relative nasalization. But verbs marked as relative are also known, as in (78b,c):³⁶ in (78b), *ad-^Lceth* is the leniting relative 3SG past subjunctive of *ad-cí* ‘sees’, and in (78c), *do-^Ndichs-itis* is the nasalizing relative 3PL perfective past subjunctive of *do-tét* ‘comes’. Strokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 100,354) consider that the relative marking of these two MI forms is “irregular,” but they do not confine the manuscript forms to the *apparatus criticus*.

(78) a. *resiu rogabtis tír tairnġeri* (MI 123a1)

resiu	ro·gab-tis
before	PERF·DECL/take/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.IMP.F.ACT
tír	tairnġeri
land/ACC.SG.N	promise/GEN.SG.N

‘before they took the Land of Promise’.

b. ... *risiu adcheth druailned legtha* (MI 38c9)

risiu	ad- ^L ce-th
before	PV·REL/see/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMP.F.ACT
druailned	legth-a
decay/ACC.SG.M	melting-GEN.SG.M

‘... before He saw the corruption of dissolution’.

c. ... *cidresiu dondichsitis as indoiri* (MI 104c5)

cid	resiu	do- ^N -dichs-itis
even	before	PV·REL-come/PERF.SUBJ-3PL.IMP.F.ACT
a-sin-doiri		
from-ART.DAT.SG.F-captivity/DAT.SG.F		

‘..., even before they came out of the Captivity’.

36 Not to mention of course other cases in which the clause type is not clear for some reason. In cases such as Wb 29d23 *robġé*, Wb 29d23 *risíu robeimmis*, with forms of the substantive verb, declarative and leniting relative clause types cannot be distinguished, as stated in Section 2.5.2.

Finally, special mention should be made of the conjunctions *cía^l* ‘though, if’ and *ma^l* ‘if’, already observed in Section 5.5.1 above. This section deals with the cases in which they are followed by a verbal complex with declarative clause type morphology. Basically *cía^l* serves to introduce a concessive clause, as illustrated in the two forms of (79a), i.e. in *ciasbera* and *ciadugneid*, but it also expresses secondarily complementation, very frequently after copular predicates with the meaning ‘it is adequate’ or something similar: see for this use Thurneysen (1946: 562), Ó hUiginn (1991), McQuillan (2002: 86–94). Example (79b), in which *ci(a) as·ber-at* functions as complement clause in the role of subject of the preceding verb *ní-s^N·ain*, gives us the opportunity to see how concessive *cía^l* becomes a marker of complement clauses: the sentence can still be understood as ‘it will not protect them, though they say ...’. This example (79b) is also remarkable because it has three declarative clause type verbs one after another: apart from *ní-s^N·ain* and *ci(a) as·ber-at*, *níntánicc* [ní-n·t(o)-ánicc] must be interpreted as in direct reported speech.

(79) a. *ciasbera nech ropia nem ciadugneid narétusa nipafír* (Wb 22b23)

<i>ci^l</i>	<i>as·ber-a</i>	<i>nech</i>
though	PV·DECL/say/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT	anybody/NOM.SG.M
<i>ro-b·bi-a</i>	<i>nem</i>	
PART-2PL/DECL·SUBSTV/FUT-3SG.ACT	heaven/ACC.SG.N	
<i>cia^l</i>	<i>du·gne-id</i>	
though	PV·DECL/make/PRES.SUBJ-2PL.ACT	
<i>na-rét-u-sa</i>	<i>ni-pa-fír</i>	
ART.ACC.PL-thing-ACC.PL.M-PROX	NEG.DECL-COP.FUT.3SG-true/NOM.SG.N	

‘though anyone say you shall have heaven though you do these things, it will not be true’.

b. *nísnain ciasberat níntánicc recht*

<i>ní-s^N·ain</i>	
NEG.DECL-3PL/DECL·protect/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	
<i>ci^l</i>	<i>as·ber-at</i>
though	PV·DECL/say/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.ACT
<i>ní-n·t-ánicc</i>	<i>recht</i>
NEG.DECL-1PL/DECL·PV-come/PERF.ACT.3SG	law/NOM.SG.M

‘it will not protect them that they say ‘the Law has not come to us’.’

The conditional conjunction *ma^l* exemplified in (80) is formally and syntactically close to the concessive *cía^l*. In (80a), *ma^l* is combined with *-imroimsid* [im(m)·ro-

m(i)(d)s^l-id], the 2PL present subjunctive of *imm-ruimdethar* ‘sins’, and in (80b), with the 3PL present subjunctive passive of *marbaid* ‘slays’.

(80) a. ... *maimroimsid nidilgibther duib* (Wb 33b8)

ma ^l	im·roi·ms·id		
if	PV·DECL/PV·sin/PRES.SUBJ-2PL.ACT		
ni·dí·lg·ib·ther		du·ib	
NEG.DECL·PV·forgive-FUT-3SG.PASS		to-2PL	

‘..., if you should sin, you will not be forgiven’ (perhaps better ‘..., it will be not forgiven to you’).

b. ... *mamarbitir facta carnis* (Wb 4a13)

ma ^l	marb·itir	<i>facta</i>	<i>carnis</i>
if	slay/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.PASS.DECL	the facts	of the flesh

‘..., if the facts of the flesh be slain’.

When *ma^l* and *cía^l* are combined with the present indicative of the copula, they take a special form, different from the other subordinating conjunctions hitherto observed: 3SG *ciasu*- ‘though (s)he / it is’, *ma(s)su*- ‘if (s)he / it is’, 3PL *cetu*-, *matu*- (Thurneysen 1946: 484). For these and other forms of the present indicative of the copula in combination with these conjunctions, see Section 9.4.7.

5.6 Form and function in Old Irish subordination

5.6.1 Morphological and syntactic (in)dependency in Old Irish subordination

This section proceeds to see which of the three main types of subordinate clauses, i.e. relative, adverbial and complement clauses, in the vertical axis in Table 5.1, are expressed by means of which of the five formal strategies analyzed in the previous sections, i.e. the horizontal axis in Table 5.1. The shaded cells in this table are those in which a type of subordinate clause is expressed by a formal strategy, though it is not explicitly named in that cell of the table.

Note that Table 5.1 includes the formal strategies used to express complementation, namely, bare relative nasalization (i.e. Type IIb, Section 5.3.2), the conjunct particles *ara^N*- and *co^N*- (Type IIIc, Section 5.4.3), the conjunction *cía^l* (in particular, Type V, Section 5.5.2). A possibility not included in this table is the use of a declarative clause type form in clauses that semantically must be considered as complement clauses, as illustrated in example (62) in Section 5.3.2 above.

Tab. 5.1: Formal strategies and subordinate types in Old Irish

	I	IIa	IIb	IIIb	IIIc	III d	IV	V
Relative				-(s)a ^N -				
Complement					ara ^N , co ^N -			cía ^L ‘that’
Temporal						ar-ro- ←	a ^N ‘when’	
					dia ^N - ‘when’ (preterite)		inta(i)n ‘when’	ó ^L ‘since’
							céin(e) ‘so long as’	resíu ‘before’
							lasse ‘while’	
							íarsindí ‘after’	
Consecutive- final					ara ^N - ‘so that’ co ^N - ‘so that’			
						co-ni- ←		co ^L ‘so that’
Manner								amal ‘as’
Causal								(h)óre ‘because’
Concessive						ci-ni- ←		cía ^L ‘though’
Conditional					dia ^N - ‘if’	ma-ni- ←		ma ^L ‘if’
Explicative						?ar-ni- ←		a(i)r ‘for’

Table 5.1 includes only the most frequent conjunctions, those which have been exemplified in the previous sections, and it does not reflect the semantic fluctuation of some conjunctions (e.g. the conjunction (h)óre, initially ‘since’, but already ‘because’ in Old Irish). Nevertheless, it reveals some important features about the relationship between form and meaning in the expression of subordination in Old Irish, in particular, about the use of the declarative and relative clause types described in the previous chapter.

Old Irish provides a nice illustration of the widely assumed gradational nature of subordination, in the sense that some specific types of subordinate clauses are more subordinated than others. This gradual notion of subordination has been assumed, among others, by Croft (2001: 320–322), Cristofaro (2003: 20), and Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang (2007: 237), who refer to this idea as the ‘coordination-subordination continuum’. The dichotomy /parataxis vs hypotaxis/ has also been frequently adduced in the treatment of this idea. In fact, Ó hUiginn (1986, 1998) uses consistently the term parataxis for those subordinate verbs that use declarative clause verb morphology, i.e. Type V in the formal classification of this chapter. However, an Old Irish expression like *mamarbitir* ‘if they be slain’, to quote the form in example (80b) above, should not be considered as paratactical due to the presence of the subordinating conjunction. In my view, the term ‘parataxis’ may be applied to the case in which a declarative clause type form is not introduced by a subordinating conjunction, as in example (62) above.

The notion of subordination is defined in this work in terms of syntactic (in)dependency, in the sense of e.g. Hengeveld's (1998: 338–341) distinction between syntactically independent and dependent verb forms. Hengeveld (1998: 339) defines the syntactically 'independent' verb form as "one which may be used in main clauses," and the syntactically 'dependent' verb form as "one which is used in subordinate constructions only." This notion of syntactic (in)dependency must be distinguished from that of morphological (in)dependency considered in 2.4.4 for the Old Irish verb. However, Section 5.3.1 above offered some cases in which morphologically dependent forms are used to express syntactic dependency. This is the iconic basis of Type I above. As has become clear in Chapter 4, the morphologically independent declarative and relative clause type forms can be interpreted as syntactically independent and dependent forms respectively, and the use of each of these two forms in Types II to V nicely matches the aforementioned gradational character of subordination of the three main semantic types of subordinate clauses.

As for the types of subordinates, complement clauses represent a good case of main clause-like subordinates in which the 'main clause phenomena' described by Green (1976) are more consistently found. Consider again example (62) above, in which a clause that can be interpreted as a complement clause has a declarative clause type verb with no subordinating marker, and with a left-dislocated topical constituent. Among the subordinating strategies considered in this chapter, Type V also provides clear cases of main clause-like subordinates. As observed in the next section, the declarative clause type morphology in the 3sg copula after the causal conjunction (*h*)*óre* 'because' is clearly more frequent when this copula introduces a cleft-sentence. This focusing structure, as stated in Section 3.2.2 above, is not expected in a restrictive relative clause: whereas a clause such as *He says it here* can appear in a relative clause such as *The thing that he says here*, the same seems to be impossible with *It's here where he says it*. In my opinion, the cleft-sentence represents a further 'main clause phenomenon' that can be paired with the emphasis that Green (1976: 392–393) sees as similar or close to an assertion. In this sense, it is worth remembering Auer's (1998: 301) implication between the pragmatically assertive character of a given clause and its syntactically more independent character.³⁷

³⁷ Though applied to the Germanic V2 phenomenon, this has also been assumed more recently by Migdalski (2010: 336) in the so-called 'Assertion Hypothesis', which says that "[t]he more asserted (the less presupposed) the complement is, the more compatible it is with V2 (and other root phenomena)." See Section 5.6.2 for more details about this Germanic phenomenon. Subordination therefore conveys the lack of assertiveness, in line with the general statement in Section

On the other pole of the scale, the most subordinated clauses, the restrictive relative ones, are expressed by Types I, II, and III. However, there are some differences between the strategies implying relative morphology in independent verbal forms, i.e. between the strategies in Types II and III. First, lenition is consistently used to mark relatives in which a core argument of the verb is anteposed, whereas relative nasalization is only tendentially used to mark a relative verb after a tautophrasal *m./f. sg. antecedent with object NP_{rel} function*.

Relative nasalization is much more consistently used in adverbial subordinates, as is clear by simply looking at the meanings expressed by Type IV in Table 5.1 above. In the case of really frequent subordinating conjunctions such as *inta(i)n* ‘when’ quoted in Section 5.5.1, which is used in approximately two hundred cases in the Glosses, the use of relative nasalization in the verbal complex is virtually exceptionless. Given the less subordinate character of adverbial clauses with respect to relative clauses, as expressly stated by Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang (2007: 238), it seems that relative nasalization may be associated to a less subordinate character.

Additionally, the less subordinate character of adverbial subordinates can be observed in the use of declarative clause type marking in some Old Irish cases. The alternation of declarative and nasalizing relative clause morphology in not a few adverbial subordinates is a frequent phenomenon which will be inspected in the next section.

Being clear therefore that, leaving aside Type I above, the syntactically most dependent and independent forms are the leniting relative and the declarative clause type forms respectively, it seems that the nasalizing relative clause type form represents an intermediate degree of syntactic dependency, in view of its strong association with adverbial subordinate clauses. This special position occupied by relative nasalization is the issue of Section 5.7.

5.6.2 On the variation between relative and declarative clause type forms in subordinate clauses

Before proceeding to inspect the wide range of functions expressed by relative nasalization, attention must be paid to the three situations observed above in

1.7.2 above and with Cristofaro’s (2003: 29–35) proposal; nevertheless, the possibility of using a cleft-sentence in some subordinate clauses makes of them a somewhat more assertive, or at least more main clause-like subordinate clause than a relative clause in which this use cannot be observed.

which declarative and relative clause type marking vary in one and the same subordinate clause, to wit, (i) after causal and modal conjunctions (*h*)óire ‘because’ and *amal* ‘as’, (ii) after the concessive and conditional conjunctions *cía*^l ‘though’ and *ma*^l ‘if’, and (iii) in the expression of complement clauses. These are considered here in turn.

(i) Some frequent subordinating conjunctions such as (*h*)óire ‘because’ and *amal* ‘as’ show variation between the morphosyntactic strategies implied in Types IV and V, that is to say, they can be followed by either a nasalizing relative or declarative clause verbal complex.

Ó hUiginn (1986: 63) suggests that this variation is due to the incomplete extension of relative nasalization. Nevertheless, and though such a diachronic interpretation may be acceptable in general terms, it is not necessarily true in every case. The percentages offered by Ó hUiginn (1986: 46–47) for (*h*)óire plus nasalizing relative verbal complex are: 39% (42 instances) of the cases of Wb, 77% (56 instances) of Ml, and 72% (36 instances) of Sg. However, *amal* plus nasalizing relative verbal complex is used in the 75% of Wb, in the 66% of Ml, and in the 71% of Sg (see Ó hUiginn 1986: 56–58). Especially in the case of *amal*, the figures do not lead unequivocally to the conclusion that relative nasalization is used in Ml and Sg more frequently than in Wb. The involvement of other factors should also be considered.

In this sense, Thurneysen (1946: 319–320) has already observed that verbs other than the copula most often have a nasalizing relative form after (*h*)óire ‘because’; after this conjunction, the copula often shows declarative clause type morphology. This can be clearly observed in the data offered by Ó hUiginn (1986: 46–47) for (*h*)óire, after which the copula has declarative morphology in the 78% (20x) of the cases in Wb, in the 41% (14x) in Ml and in the 46% (13x) in Sg.

As briefly noted by Strachan (1949: 138), the decisive factor in the use of declarative morphology in the copula after (*h*)óire, however, is its use as introductory verb of the cleft-sentence. In other words, the copula after (*h*)óire more frequently has relative morphology when it introduces a simple copular clause. Consider Table 5.2,³⁸ which is based on Ó hUiginn’s (1986: 38–40) collection of

38 A1: Wb 4c23, Wb 5b16, Wb 5b27, Wb 6a8, Wb 6a30, Wb 7d2, Wb 9c14, Wb 12b6, Wb 12d7, Wb 13b9, Wb 13d26, Wb 15a16, Wb 15c23, Wb 16a17, Wb 16d14, Wb 17c23, Wb 22c17, Wb 23d21, Wb 32c15, Wb 33b1, Wb 10c3, Wb 24b26, Ml 14a9, Ml 17c7, Ml 24d9, Ml 35c23, Ml 37a10, Ml 50d7, Ml 51c26, Ml 55d19, Ml 56b15, Ml 66d4, Ml 83d9, Ml 116a11, Sg 18a6, Sg 20b8, Sg 52b1, Sg 66b9, Sg 74b8, Sg 139a3, Sg 197a11, Sg 205b2, Sg 209b10, Sg 197a2. **A2:** Wb 1b22, Wb 11a10, Wb 11b24, Wb 15b24, Ml 25c5, Ml 48c19, Ml 101c6–7, Ml 115b4, Ml 142d1, Ml 46d10, Ml 136c11, Sg 117a1, Sg 138a4, Sg 46b10, Sg 196a1. **B1:** Wb 2c19, Wb 5d5, Wb 6a18, Wb 7c3, Wb 10c13, Wb 11c16, Wb 12b8, Wb 16c13, Wb 27c4, Wb 30b17, Wb 12a21, Wb 33b4, Ml 23b7, Ml 55d11, Sg 71a17, Sg 140b3, Sg 215a2.

forms, and includes the cases of indicative 3rd person ‘simple verb’, i.e. the ‘absolute’ forms considered in Section 9.4.3, as well as those “with negative particle”; 1st and 2nd persons, which cannot constitutively introduce a cleft-sentence, are not considered in the table. The basic reason for such a distribution is that the cleft-sentence is a more assertive structure and, therefore, favors the more assertive declarative clause type form.

Tab. 5.2: Declarative and nasalizing relative marking in the 3rd person indicative copula after (*h*)*óre* ‘because’

Copula introducing		1. with declarative morphology	2. with relative morphology
a cleft-sentence	A	44 = Wb 22x, Ml 12x, Sg 10x	15 = Wb 4x, Ml 7x, Sg 4x
a copular clause	B	17 = Wb 12x, Ml 2x, Sg 3x	34 = Wb 10x, Ml 13x, Sg 11x

The distribution of nasalizing relative and declarative clause type marking in the copula form after *amal* ‘as’ in the language of the Glosses is determined by the mood of the verb. Table 5.3,³⁹ which is also based on the collection of forms provided by Ó hUiginn (1986: 48–50), includes only the 3rd persons of the copula,

B2: Wb 17b29, Wb 17d20, Wb 25a23, Wb 33c2, Wb 4c8, Wb 5b12, Wb 24b20, Wb 7b13, Wb 30a7, Wb 33a20, Ml 15d9, Ml 21c3, Ml 31b24, Ml 37a10, Ml 54a5, Ml 94c8, Ml 136b4, Ml 18d18, Ml 2b6, Ml 18d20, Ml 37a10, Ml 59a14, Ml 138c9, Sg 18a1, Sg 38a1, Sg 41b3, Sg 48b5, Sg 115a2, Sg 120a1, Sg 159a3, Sg 163b7, Sg 180b2, Sg 197a2, Sg 64a11.

It is worth noting that the general distribution of the possibilities considered in Table 5.2 is also found in each of the three collections of glosses. Note further that A1, A2 and B2 in Table 5.2 are attested in one and the same gloss, i.e. in Ml 37a10; A1 and B2 are both in Sg 197a2.

39 A1: Wb 5d26, Wb 10c12, Wb 26a7, Wb 19b6, Wb 23b18, Wb 24d21, Wb 28d17, Wb 32a8, Wb 32a17, Ml 2a6, Ml 18d5, Ml 20b18, Ml 23c9, Ml 24c15, Ml 25a12, Ml 30d27, Ml 32a5, Ml 32a25, Ml 34b11, Ml 35c25, Ml 35c27, Ml 36c21, Ml 37b22, Ml 37d19, Ml 40d17, Ml 42c19, Ml 44a19, Ml 44b8, Ml 46a23, Ml 48b3, Ml 49a11 (2x), Ml 49d11, Ml 51b15, Ml 54d10, Ml 61b17, Ml 62c2, Ml 63b9, Ml 63d2 (2x), Ml 68b2, Ml 68b3, Ml 68c11, Ml 74a1, Ml 74a2, Ml 75a2–3, Ml 78b14, Ml 80a2, Ml 84c9, Ml 88c12, Ml 90a14, Ml 92d11, Ml 101d12, Ml 118b3, Ml 128a5, Ml 129c12, Ml 130d15, Ml 131d12, Ml 136a1, Sg 2a6, Sg 9b11, Sg 31b22, Sg 33a18, Sg 188a26, Sg 192b4, Sg 217b15. **B1:** Wb 6a30, Wb 14c17, Ml 2d2, Ml 27b13, Ml 33b3, Ml 38a5, Ml 38d15–16, Ml 54a22, Ml 54a34, Ml 56c11, Ml 116a10, Ml 145c4. **B2:** Wb 3b3(?), Wb 7b2, Wb 8c12, Wb 11c14, Wb 15b7, Wb 16a14, Wb 19b12, Wb 22a24, Wb 22c13, Wb 22c14, Wb 23a21, Wb 28b2, Wb 30b23, Wb 31d17(2x), Wb 32b4, Ml 17b2, Ml 17b3, Ml 20d7, Ml 22d13, Ml 26b10, Ml 27b13(?), Ml 31a3, Ml 31a12, Ml 31d7, Ml 32b1, Ml 33b9, Ml 40b9(3x), Ml 44c1, Ml 51d2, Ml 53d10, Ml 55a13, Ml 56a13, Ml 57c12(2x), Ml 60b16, Ml 61b28, Ml 75b7, Ml 77d3, Ml 79b5, Ml 84a4(2x), Ml 85b11, Ml 86b5, Ml 89c10, Ml 90b10, Ml 90b11, Ml 92c5, Ml 94b7, Ml 104b5, Ml 106a5, Ml 108c14, Ml 109a1, Ml 109d9, Ml 111a5, Ml 111c17, Ml 113b4, Ml 118d13, Ml 120c4, Ml 120d5, Ml 133b7(2x), Ml 137c13(?), Ml 140c5, Sg 9b11, Sg 145b4, Sg 150a1, Sg 220a5, Sg 222b8. The combinations A1 and B2 are both attested in Sg 9b11.

which constitute a numerous and homogeneous group of forms. In contrast to the previous case with (*h*)*óire*, the same tendency can be observed with verbs other than the copula, the example of (77) above with the (past) subjunctive form *amal ni cuimsin* ‘as though I could not do’ being a representative case.

Tab. 5.3: Declarative and nasalizing relative marking in the 3rd person copula after *amal* ‘as’

Copula in	1. with declarative morphology	2. with relative morphology
(past) subjunctive mood	A 66 = Wb 9x, Ml 50x, Sg 7x	0 = Wb 0x, Ml 0x, Sg 0x
indicative mood	B 12 = Wb 2x, Ml 10x, Sg 0x	71 = Wb 16x, Ml 50x, Sg 5x

The copula forms in (past) subjunctive mood regularly display declarative morphology after *amal*, as in example (81a) below, whereas the copula forms in indicative mood have a clear tendency to show nasalizing relative morphology, as in (81b), in which *asnóindia* must be analyzed as [as-^N-óin-dia]. Note that, though the conjunction *amal* is much more frequently found in Ml, the general trend can also be observed in the figures of each of the three collections of Glosses.

(81) a. *atcoisged amal bid hifrecndairc nobeth* (Ml 24c15)

a-t^N·coi-sg-ed amal
 PV-3SG.M/DECL-PV-indicate/PRES.IND-3SG.IMPF.ACT as
 bi-d·hi^N-frecndairc
 COP.PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMPF.DECL-in-present/DAT.SG.N
 no·be-th
 PART·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMPF.ACT
 ‘he used to point him out as though it were present that he was’.

b. *amal asnóindia omnium adcobra ícc omnium* (Wb 28b2)

amal as-^N-óin-dia *omnium*
 as COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL-one-God/NOM.SG.M of all
 ad·cobr-a ícc *omnium*
 PV·DECL/desire/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT salvation/ACC.SG.F of all
 ‘as He is the one God of all, He desires the salvation of all’.

This complementary distribution of declarative subjunctive form and (nasalizing) relative indicative form after the conjunction *amal* has been explained by Ó hUiginn (1986: 57 fn. 33) as follows: “In such clauses, ..., subordination is expressed by use of the past subjunctive alone without any extra marker.” In fact,

the same tendency has been noted by Nordström (2010: 209–217) in German and Italian, in which the subjunctive can be used in complement subordinate clauses. In the German example of (82a), omission of *dass* can be accepted because of the subjunctive form *müsse*, whereas this is not acceptable in (82b) with the indicative *muss*. The same seems to be the case in Italian, in which “after non-factive predicates, *che* can be deleted provided that the complement clause is in the subjunctive,” as in (83a); by contrast, (83b) shows that the same elision is not possible when the verb appears in indicative form.

(82) a. *Er sagt, er müsse nach Hause*

Er	sag-t,	er	müss-e	nach	Hause
3SG.M	say/PRES.IND-3SG	3SG.M	must/PRES.SUBJ-3SG	to	house

‘He says he must go home’.

b. *Er sagt, dass er nach Hause muss*(83) a. *Mario crede (che) sia partito*

Mario	cred-e	(che)	sia
Mario	believe/PRES-3SG.IND	(that)	COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG

part-it-o
leave-PRT.PRET-MASC.SG
‘Mario believes that he left’.

b. *Mario credeva *(che) aveva telefonato*

Mario	cred-eva	*(che)	av-eva	telefon-ato
Mario	believe-IMPF.3SG	*(that)	have-IMPF.3SG	call-PART.PRET

‘Mario believed that he had called’.

In other Germanic languages such as English and Swedish, the subordinating conjunction equivalent to English *that* can be omitted under similar circumstances. In English, this can be observed after verbs of cognition and communication (e.g. *I think it’s a good idea*, *She said they’d had a wonderful holiday*), but it seems to be less easy after factive predicates, that is to say, “when the proposition is presupposed to be true” (e.g. *He does not like *(that) the taxes are to be raised*). Swedish *att* ‘that’ tends to be elided after “speculative [i.e. *hoppas* ‘to hope’, *tro* ‘to believe’, *tycka* ‘to think’] and reportative [*säga* ‘to say’] predicates.”

Bearing in mind that Nordström (2010: 205–209) is proposing that the English subordinating conjunction *that* and equivalents (she uses the notation THAT) represent a lexicalized marker of “Realis modality,” as opposed to parallel markers

of Irrealis such as IF and WHETHER, Nordström's (2010: 216) interpretation of these facts is that "the declarative complementizer can only be omitted when the clause is marked as Irrealis (by the subjunctive)." The Old Irish phenomenon, in line with Ó hUiginn's explanation, is basically the same.

(ii) The use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-*, that is to say, of a relative clause type marker, in the indicative verb after the concessive and conditional conjunctions *cía^l* 'though' and *ma^l* 'if' is to be explained in the same manner as the use of relative morphology in the indicative copula after *amal* 'as'. This use of the infix *-d^l-* was illustrated in Section 5.5.1, and Section 5.5.2 gave examples in which the declarative verbs after *cía^l* 'though' and *ma^l* 'if' appear with subjunctive mood. It is true that this requirement for the use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* is hierarchically secondary with respect to the use of another pronominal affix, in other words, that the Class C infix *-d^l-* only appears if the verbal complex after *ma^l* or *cía^l* does not take a semantically justified pronominal affix. Nevertheless, whatever the origin and the development which led to the introduction of this infix *-d^l-* after *ma^l* 'if' and *cía^l* 'though' in the language of the Glosses, a point to be considered in Section 10.4.3, the association of a marker of syntactic dependency with the indicative (but not with the subjunctive) mood after a subordinating conjunction receives a good explanation from the perspective just considered for *amal* 'as' in the previous point of this section.

(iii) The verb in complement clauses, as stated above in Section 5.3.2, can be marked by either relative nasalization or declarative clause type form. Ó hUiginn (1998: 128–129) notes in this sense that "parataxis [i.e. declarative clause type form with no subordinating conjunction] is more likely to occur in copular subordinate clauses, a feature that is also associated with the use of parataxis in the other clause types in which the nasalizing relative may be used."⁴⁰

These three cases of variation in the use of relative morphology certainly suggest the existence of changes in progress in the Old Irish period. Of course, the direction of such a change depends on whether this relative marking was originally regular with those three types of subordinates. The fact, observed by Ó hUiginn,⁴¹ that relative nasalization as a marker of complement clauses is more

⁴⁰ Ó hUiginn (1998: 128): "In the Würzburg Glosses 37 of the 58 paratactic clauses I have collected contain the copula, while of the 29 paratactic noun clauses collected from Milan no fewer than 23 contain the copula. In the St Gall corpus ten of the twelve paratactic clauses have the copula as their verb."

⁴¹ Ó hUiginn (1998: 128 fn.17): "While the use of parataxis is pronounced in copula clauses, the nasalizing relative is nevertheless the dominant construction in these clauses in MI (62 examples v. 23 of parataxis) and Sg (29 examples v. 8 of parataxis). Parataxis, however, dominates in Wb (37 examples v. 33 of nasalizing relative)."

frequently used in Ml and Sg than in Wb rather points to the idea of a secondary extension of this relative marking during the Old Irish period, but this is not necessarily the same for adverbial clauses. In this type of subordinates, relative nasalization alternates with the declarative clause type form due to the assertive character of the structures concerned or, as a further possibility, due to the interaction with the subjunctive mood as a marker of subordinated character.

5.7 Relative nasalization: Functional definition and diachrony

The gradational nature of subordination has a clear illustration in Old Irish: relative lenition involves a more subordinated clause than relative nasalization, which – on its behalf – is included in subordinate clauses that are less main clause-like than those subordinate clauses that have declarative morphology in their verbal complexes. However, relative nasalization is involved in quite a number of subordinate types, and this section tries to make sense of them. Section 5.7.1 offers a comprehensive description, and Section 5.7.3 and 5.7.3 propose a diachronic explanation of this set of functions.

5.7.1 The functions of relative nasalization in Old Irish

The following list of subordinate clauses and structures in which relative nasalization is used is partly adapted from those of Thurneysen (1946: 316–318) and Acquaviva (1990: 706–710):

- (a) Verbs of relative clauses with a (mostly tautophrasal) m./f. sg. antecedent with object NP_{rel} function (Section 4.7.3).
- (b) Post-focus verbs in cleft-sentences with a focused adverbial constituent, or with a focused verbal noun (Section 3.2.3).
- (c) Verbs of relative clauses in which the antecedent is the verbal predicate in form of a verbal noun (Sections 3.2.3 and 4.7.2) or the nominal predicate (Sections 9.3.5 and 9.3.6).
- (d) Relative verbal complex introduced by the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - (Section 5.4.2).⁴²

⁴² The verbal complex in which this oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - takes part is usually not considered in this list of verbs pertaining to subordinate clauses that include nasalization. Certainly, this is not a case of ‘autonomous mutation’, in the sense established in point (iv) in Section 2.5.3 above. As noted in point (iii) in the same section, the nasalization of $-(s)a^N$ - is to be considered the proper effect of this conjunct particle. However, this conjunct particle serves

- (e) Verbs of adverbial clauses introduced by a^N ‘when’, *inta(i)n* ‘when’ (Section 5.5.1).
- (f) Verbs of adverbial clauses introduced by *(h)óre* ‘because’, *amal* ‘as’ (Sections 5.5.1 and 5.6.2).
- (g) Verbs of complement clauses (Sections 5.3.2 and 5.6.2).

The so-called relative nasalization is used, either tendentially or regularly, either autonomous or not, in all three general types of subordinate clauses. It is excluded, however, from the relative clause in which the antecedent has subject NP_{rel} function, a subordinate clause for which lenition is the regular relative (autonomous) mutation.

Recall that the use of relative nasalization in (a) is only tendential: this relative marking competes with lenition and is favored by the tautophrasal character of the m./f. sg. antecedent with object NP_{rel} function. The use of relative nasalization in (b) is more regular. As observed in the previous section, in (f) there is variation of relative nasalization and declarative clause type morphology. In (g), as noted in Section 5.3.2, there are other possible subordinating markers, and bare declarative morphology is also found. It is in the verbal complexes of the structures (d) and (e) in which nasalization is consistently used and in which, consequently, the origin of this type of relative marking is most probably to be sought.

In view of the apparently heterogeneous set of uses and of the various degrees of regularity that these uses have, the functional description of relative nasalization should take into consideration the possibility of imperfect extensions or partial withdrawals from a nuclear functional domain. Provided that these movements from or within that basic functional domain may be justified, such a dynamic approach to the problem of the function of the Old Irish relative nasalization has the great advantage of accounting for a number of diverging functions.

The hypothesis put forward in this section is that relative nasalization is a relatively late innovation, in line with McCone’s (2006: 249–250) general argument. In particular, I assume that it was an original feature of both the conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$, i.e. (d) in the previous list, and adverbial clauses such as those introduced by *inta(i)n* ‘when’, i.e. (e) in the previous list, and that this relative marking has spread to other types of subordinate clauses on the basis of some common features. The development of this hypothesis proceeds through the fol-

to form a relative verbal complex with a specific place in an assumable paradigm of relative verbal complexes, as argued in Section 4.7.3 above, so that its nasalizing effect is directly related to the function of relative clause type marking.

lowing steps: (i) The polygenetic origin of relative nasalization and its main features; (ii) the extension to complement clauses and the dubious situation of adverbial clauses introduced by conjunctions such as (*h*)*óre* ‘because’; and (iii) the extension to restrictive relative clauses. Step (i) is addressed Section 5.7.2. Steps (ii) and (iii) are considered in Section 5.7.3.

5.7.2 The original domain of relative nasalization

Both formally and functionally, the Old Irish relative clauses introduced by the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - and the adverbial clauses introduced by the conjunction *inta(i)n* ‘when’ differ in some respects. In addition to the functional difference evidenced in their denomination, the obvious difference on the formal side is the morphosyntactic strategy concerned, namely Type IIIb in the former and Type IV in the latter. These differences are directly related to their different diachronic origin.

On the one hand, as surmised by Thurneysen (1946: 298–299), Watkins (1963: 25), Lambert (1992: 231), the conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - is surely derived from the same demonstrative element **sam* that has given rise to the light head a^N , a nominative / accusative singular neuter demonstrative that exclusively heads relative clauses with a leniting relative clause type form: e.g. *anasberinn* ‘that what I said’ in example (77) and, with an absolute form, *apridchimme* ‘that what we preach’ in (66a) above. The process of internalization by which the independent demonstrative **sam* has entered the structure of the verbal complex in order to express the oblique relative clause type is detailed in García-Castillero (2018). The important point is, however, that once this element has arrived at that position of the verbal complex, its nasalizing mutation arrives at the same place in which relative lenition appears.

On the other hand, a good deal of the cases of the structures of Type IV can still be identified in Old Irish as a structure (i.e. an NP) in which a noun is followed by a relative verbal complex. For instance, the most frequent temporal conjunction *inta(i)n* ‘when’ clearly represents the accusative singular of the feminine noun *tan* ‘time’ followed by a relative clause, the meaning of which was ‘(in) the time which ...’. Though these adverbial clauses can also appear after their main clause, they are frequently anteposed and, in this situation, they are functionally very similar to the left-dislocated structures seen in Section 3.3. This pragmatic interpretation has been proposed by Poppe (1991: 96–105) for the Middle Welsh anteposed temporal clauses, and, in a broader perspective, one may refer to Diessel’s (2001: 448) consideration: “... adverbial clauses are commonly preposed

to the main clause in order to provide a ‘framework’ or ‘orientation’ for the interpretation of information expressed in the main clause ...” See also Erteschik-Shir (1997: 26), Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang (2007: 291).

The accusative singular case of *tan* ‘time’ (i.e. *tain^N*) is expected to produce nasalization on the following tautophrasal element according to Section 2.5.3, and this is in fact what happens when this conjunction is followed by an absolute relative form, as in e.g. *intain mbís* in (71a) above. The position of nasalization in compound verbal complexes, e.g. *intan domberam* (i.e. *do^Nber-am*) in (71b) above, is surely due to a process of internalization of that mutation produced by (tautophrasal antecedents >) conjunctions such as *inta(i)n* and reanalyzed as relative marker to the place in which such relative mutation appears in compound verbs. Recall that, as noted in Section 4.7.4, relative nasalization on absolute relative verbs after these conjunctions is regular already in Wb. This process of internalization was partly triggered by two morphosyntactic features shared with the previous relative clauses introduced by the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*-, which regularly provokes nasalization.

First, both structures involve a tautophrasal antecedent, that is to say, an antecedent that is not focused: recall the virtual lack of cleft-sentences in which the post focus verb is a relative with the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*-, as noted in Section 3.2.3. Relative lenition has a tautophrasal constituent on many occasions, but it is clearly the preferred relative mutation in the cleft-sentence that focuses the object and the regular one when it focuses the subject of the post-focus verb.

Second, in direct relationship to the link between clause type marking and pronominal arguments considered in Section 4.9 above, both the relative verbal complex formed with the conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*- and the one after a subordinating conjunction such as *inta(i)n* have (or introduce a clause that has) all its possible arguments, whether two (in transitive verbs) or one (in intransitive and passive verbs). Recall that relative lenition involves the elimination (by its anteposition) of one of the arguments of the verb.

These two features, tautophrasal antecedent and presence of all the possible core arguments in the relative verb (or clause), are visible in the examples of (84).

- (84) a. ... *foncheill fuandrogab in faith* (Ml 38c3)
 fo-n^L-ceill
 under-ART.DAT.SG.F-sense/DAT.SG.F
 fu-a^N-d^L-ro-gab
 under-OBL.REL-3SG.N/REL-PERF-utter/PRET.ACT.3SG

in-faith

ART.NOM.SG.M-poet/NOM.SG.M

‘... according to the sense in which the prophet uttered it’.

b. *issruith indairm indid epiur* (Wb 4b26)

is-sruith

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-venerable/NOM.SG.F

ind-airm

i^N-did-e-piur

ART.NOM.SG.F-place/NOM.SG.F in which-3SG.N/REL-PV-say/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT

‘venerable is the place in which I say it’.

c. ... *intan nondascribam* (Ml 35b1)

intan no-^N-da-scrib-am

when PART-REL-3PL/REL-write/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT

‘... when we write them’.

In (84a), the verbal complex [fo-(s)a^N-d^L-ro-gab] has the noun *ciall* (in dative case) as its tautophrasal antecedent and includes the nominal subject (*in faith* ‘the prophet’) and the pronominal object (the Class C 3SG n. infix). In (84b), the verbal complex *indid epiur* [i^N-did^L-e(ss)-biur], with the variant of the conjunct particle -(s)a^N according to Section 5.4.2 above, includes two pronominal arguments, the 1SG subject and the 3SG n. object, and is preceded by the noun *ind-airm* ‘the place’ in a use that is quite reminiscent of the structure that has given rise to the type of adverbial clause introduced by *inta(i)n* ‘when’, properly, ‘the time which’. This conjunction *inta(i)n* appears before the verbal complex [no-^N-da-scrib-am] in (84c), with the 1PL ending *-am* expressing the subject and the Class C 3PL infix *-da-* expressing the object of the verb.

5.7.3 The extensions and retractions of relative nasalization

The origin proposed for the temporal clauses with *inta(i)n* (+ relative nasalization) ‘when’ (i.e. ‘the time that ...’) may well be assumed for other cases included in Type IV above. For instance, the form (*h*)*óre* ‘when, since, because’ is a loanword taken from Lat. *hora* and its use as the nucleus of an NP including a relative clause must initially have meant ‘in the hour, at the moment that ...’. If *amal* ‘as’ is related to the noun *samail* ‘likeness’, the meaning of the original tautophrasal combination of noun and relative clause was probably something like ‘in the likeness that ...’. Other expressions with a similar adverbial meaning do not seem to

have arrived at the grammaticalized status of *inta(i)n*, (*h*)*óre* and *amal*. In (84b) above, *indairm indid epiur* ‘the place in which I say it’ is clearly an NP used as the subject of the copular predicate, but the same noun *airm* ‘place’ is more like a conjunction in example (103a), considered in Section 6.6(b) below, in which similar examples are given. For the use of relative nasalization noted as (b) in Section 5.7.1 above, see Section 6.6(c).

This section does not deal with every subordinating conjunction of Type IV that involves relative nasalization, and leaves open the possibility that some of them are due to the extension of the pattern originating in a more or less reduced group of adverbial clauses.⁴³ The explanation for the use of declarative clause type morphology in those adverbial clauses therefore depends on the assumed status for relative nasalization. If the explanation for (*h*)*óre* of above is accepted, the consequence is then that the use of declarative clause type morphology in the verb after this conjunction is due to a later innovation.

From this basic nuclear function, relative nasalization has spread to two different and opposite domains. On the one hand, the fact that the verb of those adverbial clauses maintains its arguments makes of it a less subordinate relative clause type marking, which can be used to mark complement clauses and in the cleft-sentence in which the focused constituent is neither the object nor the subject of the verb, i.e. the structures (g) and (b) respectively noted in Section 5.7.1 above. These functional domains were probably occupied by declarative morphology, in line with the idea of a preferred pronominal argument structure suggested in Section 4.9.3. On the other hand, relative nasalization has also made an inroad into the realm of leniting relative marking, and has been used to mark the relative verb after *m./f.* sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function, specifically when they are not the focused constituent of a cleft-sentence, i.e. when they constitute a tautophrasal constituent with the relative verb (i.e. the structure (a) in Section 5.7.1 above). One may say that the tendency of relative nasalization to avoid the cleft-sentence, as noted in Section 4.7.3, is properly due to its origin in a basically left-dislocating structure. As observed in the previous section, this is a remarkable feature of the structures with noun and relative clause (Type IV) expressing adverbial clause.

⁴³ Most probably, this is the case of the temporal subordinating conjunction *a^N* ‘when’, which is systematically distinguished from its etymological source, the light head *a^N* (followed by a leniting relative verbal complex), because it is regularly followed by a nasalizing relative verbal complex. The use of relative nasalization in this case is to be attributed directly to the model of the conjunction *inta(i)n* ‘when’.

5.8 Non-finite forms and subordination in Old Irish

In spite of the fairly numerous inflectional possibilities of the Old Irish finite verb, which can be deduced already with the description given thus far, the list of non-finite verb forms in Old Irish is reduced to a passive past participle formed with the Proto-Indo-European suffix **-tyo-*, e.g. *chumgabtha-* in example (118), a verbal of necessity, e.g. *eperthi* in example (51a), and a verbal noun that shows a great variety of formations, depending to a great extent on the verb, e.g. *precept* in (12a) and *labrad* in (64a). In this, Old Irish agrees with the tendency reported by Myhill (1985) of V1 languages to lack non-finite verbal forms.

Certainly, as noted already by Baudiš (1913b: 396), Old Irish makes use of verbal nouns combined with the prepositions *cen* and *oc* in order to express what could be translated in other languages as a participial expression; see again example (12a) above. The use of the verbal noun has been studied by Stüber (2009), who defends the existence of a category of infinitive in Old Irish, and Sanfelici (2015). However, the overall impression is that these non-finite verbal forms are much less used than in other languages such as Modern English or Spanish, let alone other ancient Indo-European languages such as Latin or Classical Greek.

In fact, the type of linguistic gloss that has been observed in Section 1.3.1 is very often devoted to the translation of a Latin non-finite verbal form by means of a subordinate (finite) verb, as in the cases of (85), in which the English translation of the Irish forms is also of the Latin ones.

(85) a. *anatammresa* (Ml 31c14)

a^N a-tamm·res-sa
when PV-1SG/DECL·raise/FUT.1SG.ACT-NA.1SG
'when I shall arise'.

b. *anonda imbide* (Ml 112b17)

a^N-no^N-da-imbide
when-PART-REL-COP.PRES.IND.2SG-hedged/NOM.SG.M
'when you are hedged'.

c. *cech óin gessid .i. giges dia* (Ml 53c3)

cech	óin	gessid
each/NOM.SG.M	one	suppliant/NOM.SG.M
.i. giges		dia
i.e. pray/FUT.3SG.ACT.REL		God/ACC.SG.M

'every suppliant, i.e. who shall supplicate God'.

As an example of a very frequent situation in the Glosses, in (85a), *anatammresa* [a^N ad-tamm^L·re(g)s-sa], the 1SG future of *at-reig* ‘arises’ (< ‘raises himself’, with reflexive infix) preceded by the temporal conjunction *a^N* ‘when’, is the translation of the Latin absolute construction *exurgente me*. The Latin absolute structure *te ... septo* is glossed in (85b), in which *anonda imbide* [a^N-no-^N-da-imdibe] contains the 2SG present indicative relative copula form *nonda-*, considered in Section 9.4.6; note in this example (85b) that *imbide* ‘hedged’ is a participial form in itself, but it is inserted in a copular clause in order to make clear the predicational value of the Latin absolute expression. Finally, in (85c), the noun *gessid* can have the participial meaning of the Latin noun *supplex* in the Latin expression *unumquemque tuetur supplicem* ‘he will protect every suppliant’, but the glossator has introduced a further translation, in which the future value of the action expressed by the Latin future form *tuetur* is more clearly expressed by means of the absolute relative 3SG future form *giges*, of *guidid*, a form quoted above in Section 4.6.2.

This chapter focuses on the use of the declarative and relative clause type forms and pays no attention to the use of the non-finite forms quoted above. It is however not unsound to affirm that the structural place of the participial forms widely used in other Indo-European languages is occupied in Old Irish by subordinate clauses or verbal complexes including a finite verbal form.

5.9 Summary

This chapter started with a classification of the Old Irish formal strategies that express subordination and observed the types of subordinate clauses expressed by each strategy. Such a systematic analysis of Old Irish subordination focusing on the relationship between form and function or semantic type has not been the usual approach to the issue at hand. To give only one example, Thurneysen (1946) treats the Old Irish relative verb and, therefore, the simple relative clause forms quite separately from the remaining structures of subordination; besides, complementation has in Thurneysen’s grammar no specific treatment. Greene (1969: 90–91) mentions that it is expressed in Old Irish by means of relative nasalization, among other formal possibilities.

The classification of formal strategies goes from Type I, which entails the bare use of a morphologically dependent form as a marker of syntactic dependency, to Type V, which consists of the combination of an independent conjunction with a declarative verbal complex. The intermediate strategies are Type II (the bare leniting and nasalizing relative marking analyzed in the previous chapter, which are morphologically independent forms), Type III (with some sort of subordinating conjunct particle, basically, the oblique relative conjunct particle

-(s)*a*^N- and its grammaticalized versions), and Type IV (the combination of an independent subordinating conjunction with a morphologically independent relative verbal complex). The bare declarative verbal complex (i.e. the declarative form without any subordinating conjunction) used in complement clauses must be mentioned along with the previous formal strategies, though it involves no formal expression of syntactic subordination.

The distribution of the Old Irish declarative and relative clause type forms in the expression of subordination offers a good example of the widely acknowledged continuum ranging from more to less main-clause like subordinate clauses. As case in point is the predominant use of declarative morphology in the copula after the causal conjunction (*h*)*óre* when this copula introduces a cleft-sentence; if the copula of that subordinate clause introduces an attributive non-verbal predicate, it tends to have relative nasalization. The cleft-sentence is a focusing structure that does not appear in (restrictive) relative clauses and seems to be the less main-clause like subordinate, where relative lenition is the predominant subordination marker.

As a subordination marker, so-called relative nasalization seems to stand between declarative and leniting relative clause type marking. The diachronic proposal included in this chapter, which also serves to explain the functional diversity of this relative marking in Old Irish, assumes that it has arisen in relative clauses introduced by the oblique relative conjunct particle -(s)*a*^N- and in (at least some) adverbial clauses that regularly use relative nasalization. From these structures, relative nasalization has spread to other domains by virtue of some shared morphosyntactic properties. On the one hand, the use in complement clauses is favored by the fact that both these and adverbial clauses include the whole array of arguments of the verb. On the other, the relative verb of those adverbial clauses and the relative clauses with masculine or feminine singular object antecedent that have nasalization both form a tautophrasal NP with the preceding noun.

The use of the Old Irish declarative clause type has been analyzed in this and in the previous chapters. A complete analysis of the relative clause type also requires the analysis of the Old Irish *wh*-interrogative clause type, which is the topic of the next chapter.

6 *Wh*-interrogative clause type

6.1 Introduction

The *wh*-interrogative clause type is one of the most obvious cases in which information structure and clause typing go hand in hand in Old Irish, and this specifically means that the cleft-sentence has a prominent place in the expression of *wh*-questions in Old Irish, which very often consist of a stressed *wh*-pronoun and a relative clause type verb. However, as anticipated in Section 2.3.1, Old Irish also has a *wh*-interrogative conjunct particle that occupies slot 1.

This chapter is basically about the different types and combinations of the characteristic element of the Old Irish *wh*-interrogative clause type, namely, the *wh*-element (or Q-constituent, in Dik's 1997: 257 terminology). The term *wh*-element is deliberately ambiguous and tries to avoid the term 'pronoun' not because there are no forms in Old Irish that can be defined as such, but because some of the markers of *wh*-questions are not pronominal in the strict sense of the term. In particular, I refer to a group of expressions such as *cicrud* '(in) what way?, how?', which represents a quite transparent combination of a noun (in this case, *cruth* 'way, manner') preceded by the interrogative form *ci-*, which is used also as an interrogative pronoun in isolation. In one way or another, the clause typing function of this *wh*-element is to state that the addressee is required by the speaker to give information about some constituent of a given proposition. One of the interesting aspects of the *wh*-interrogatives in Old Irish is their various relationships to other structures depending on the syntactic nature of the constituent that is being questioned.

In order to treat these and other issues, it is necessary to establish first, in Section 6.2, the basic formal distinction between stressed and unstressed *wh*-elements. Bearing in mind this formal distinction, the sections that come thereafter are based on the syntactic classification of uses of the Old Irish *wh*-elements proposed by Vendryes (1905: 396–405), which distinguishes between pronominal and adjectival uses. The former is the more or less tight combination of the *wh*-element with a verb (e.g. *who is coming now?*), and will be termed the pre-verbal use; the latter refers to the combination of a *wh*-element with a noun (e.g. *which man has done that?*), which will be termed as pre-nominal in this chapter. In this type, it will be possible to distinguish close combinations such as *cicrud* 'how?' above from cases in which the *wh*-element and the noun belong to two different syntactic constituents, say *cia salmscribid (...)* 'what (is the) psalmist (...)?' in example (101b) below. A third use will be distinguished from the two previous ones,

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-006>

namely, the case in which the *wh*-element precedes a personal pronoun, the so-called pre-pronominal use. Due to the different degree of formal cohesiveness of the *wh*-element with the following element, I prefer to use the terms pre-verbal, pre-pronominal, and pre-nominal, which simply make reference to the position of the *wh*-element involved, regardless of its specific syntactic value.

These three uses are analyzed in the following order: Section 6.3 deals with the pre-verbal uses, Section 6.4 with the pre-pronominal uses, and Section 6.5 with the pre-nominal uses. The structures observed in these sections are systematically considered in Section 6.6, in which the links with other structures will be examined. The main ideas of the chapter are summarized in Section 6.7.

6.2 Formal classification of the *wh*-elements

Two sets of *wh*-interrogative forms or *wh*-elements, the stressed and unstressed (or at least, less stressed) sets, are usually considered in the literature on Old Irish. To a great extent, this accentual differentiation runs parallel to another distinction, namely, that between fully inflected paradigm vs defective (or poorly inflected) paradigm (Thurneysen 1946: 286–287, *DIL s.u.* 1 *cía*, and Kavanagh 2001: 187–190).

The stressed paradigm is described as including three singular forms, masculine *cía* (with the formal variants *cia ce cí*), feminine *cisí^l* (with variant *ce(s)si^l*), and neuter *cid^l* (with variant *ced^l*), as well as a plural form *ci^lné*. Besides, the unstressed set of *wh*-elements includes a form variously spelled as *ce- cia- cía- c(i)-*, and a form *ced- / cid-*. The main reason for the interpretation of these forms as unstressed is that they stand in close combination with a following lexical element, whether a noun (i.e. pre-nominal) or a verb (i.e. pre-verbal); in the latter case, they are followed by a dependent verbal form.⁴⁴ This is why the interrogative pronoun has been included among the pretonic elements in Section 2.3.1 above. In other words, it is assumed that the unstressed (or less stressed) interrogative elements occupy slot 1 in the template of the Old Irish verbal complex described in Section 2.2.2. The interrogative form *cía* must be (functionally and etymologically) separated from the concessive conjunction *cía^l* studied in the previous chapter.

⁴⁴ Bergin interpreted these cases of interrogative (and indefinite) pronoun followed by conjunct or prototonic verbal form (e.g. *cia beir*) as further instances of the phenomena subsumed under his Law, which was introduced in Section 3.4.1. However, Bergin (1938: 205 fn.2) also mentions the nowadays accepted alternative, for which he refers to Pedersen (1913: 673).

Both the formal (stressed vs unstressed) and the syntactic (with pre-verbal, pre-nominal, and pre-pronominal uses) classifications are tightly interrelated, since both stressed and unstressed forms can be found in both pre-verbal and pre-nominal use. This makes it recommendable to inspect of the whole set of combinations in the way established above.

6.3 Interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use

The *wh*-elements that appear before a verbal form can be taken as *wh*-interrogative pronouns, which may be either stressed or unstressed. This section inspects these two possibilities in turn.

6.3.1 Stressed interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use

The language of the Glosses clearly prefers the structure of interrogative pronoun (with gender distinction) followed by a relative verbal complex.⁴⁵ These interrogative pronouns combined with a relative verb are taken by Thurneysen (1946) as stressed, as “more fully stressed” in *DIL s.u.* 1 *cía* and in Kavanagh (2001), and show gender and number distinction. Note, however, that the tonic feminine form of this paradigm (i.e. *cisí cesí*) does not appear in the Glosses in the pre-verbal, but only in the pre-nominal use; this is considered in Section 6.5.2 below.

In (86a), the stressed SG n. form *cid* ‘what’ is combined with the relative form of the copula, and in (86b) with the leniting relative 3SG preterite of *for-cumaing*. Example (86c) shows the use of the PL form *citné* with *foruar* [fo^l-ro-far], the leniting relative 3SG perfect of *fo-fera*.

(86) a. *cid asmaith disunt tra* (Wb 12d12)

<i>cid</i>	<i>as^lmaith</i>	<i>di-sunt</i>	<i>tra</i>
WH.SG.N	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL/good/NOM.SG.N	from-here	then
‘what then is good therefrom?’			

⁴⁵ The expression Ml 37a9 *cia beraid* has been interpreted as ‘who will refer ...?’ (i.e. with future form *béraid*) in the *Thes.* and in *DIL s.u.* 1 *cía*, and the form *beraid* must then be explained as an unparalleled case of absolute declarative clause type form after the interrogative pronoun. However, that form *cia* is better to be accounted for with Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i 719) as the concessive conjunction *cía^l* ‘though, if’ (i.e. *DIL s.u.* 2 *cía*), which is thus regularly followed by the declarative clause type form of the 3SG present subjunctive, according to the rule established in Section 5.5.2.

b. *cid forchomnacuir ...* (Ml 16c5)

cid for-^lcom-nac-uir
 WH.SG.N PV·REL/PV-happen/PERF.ACT-3SG.ACT
 ‘what has happened ...?’

c. *citné foruar* (Wb 8b5)

citné fo-^lru-(f)ar
 WH.PL PV·REL/PERF-prepare/PRET.ACT.3SG
 ‘what are they which He has prepared?’⁴⁶

On some occasions, and due to different reasons, the relative morphology cannot be observed, as in the examples in (87), which are considered in the *DIL* (*s.u.* 1 *cía*) as containing a relative verb. Example (87a) has the verb *con-icc*, i.e. a lexical compound with the deuterotonic shape (C)VC-VC(-) in which the leniting relative and the declarative clause types are not distinguished, the prototonic version of which is *-cumuing*; see Sections 2.4.2 and 2.5 above. Example (87b) has a deuterotonic form that must be analyzed as [to-^lbér-a], the 3SG future of *do-beir*.

(87) a. *cia conicc ní dúun* (Wb 4b11)

cia con-^(l)icc ní dú-un
 WH.SG.M PV·(REL/)can/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT anything/ACC.SG.N to-1PL
 ‘who can do aught unto us?’

b. *intan asmbeirsom cia dobera íc dosiún* (Ml 34d5)

intan as-^N-beir-som cia
 when PV·REL-say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT-NA.3SG.M WH.SG.M
 do-^lber-a íc do-siún
 PV·REL/give/FUT-3SG.ACT salvation/ACC.SG.F from-Sion
 ‘when he says, ‘who will give salvation from Sion?’⁴⁷

The examples in (86) and (87) can be translated more literally as ‘who (is who) can do ...’ and so on, in line with the translation of (86c), but the actual meaning

⁴⁶ Further examples in Wb 1a8, Wb 12d12, Wb 26a11, Ml 35a6, Ml 51b7, Ml 51b10, Ml 102d15.

⁴⁷ Similarly, Wb 4b15, Wb 9c20 (= Wb 19d10a), Wb 10a26, Wb 12c22, Wb 12d13, Wb 13a13, Wb 15a33, Wb 23b33, Ml 30b9. In Wb 12d14 *cia folínfea* ‘who shall fill?’ and in Ml 35b24 *cia atrebea ...* ‘who will dwell ...?’, the compound form can be interpreted as deuterotonic (relative) or as prototonic, but the former interpretation is more feasible.

of these questions including a relative verbal complex is most probably the unmarked rendering given for the other examples.

The expression of the oblique case of the *wh*-interrogative (i.e. *for what*, *to which* and so on) is realized by means of the (nominative) interrogative pronoun followed by the verbal complex introduced by the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ - combined with the corresponding preposition (see Thurneysen 1946: 288–289). Example (88a) illustrates the usual manner to ask ‘why’ in Old Irish: *arind epur* [ar-(s)a^N-d^L-e(ss)-biur] contains the preposition *ar-* ‘for’, the conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ -, the Class C 3SG n. infixed pronoun, and the prototonic 1SG present indicative form of *as·beir* ‘says’. In example (88b), *dia fiachaigedar* [do-(s)a^N-fi-achaig-edar] is made up of the preposition *do-* ‘to’, the particle $-(s)a^N$ - and the conjunct 3SG present indicative form of the deponent *fiachaigidir*.

(88) a. *asberidsi cid arind epur frit* (Wb 5a31)

as·ber-id-si	cid
PV·DECL/say/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT-NA.2PL	WH.SG.N
ar-i ^N -d ^L -e-pur	fri-t
for-OBL.REL-3SG.N/REL·PV-say/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT	towards-2SG
‘you say, why do I say it to you (sg.)?’ (lit. ‘... what is that for which I say it to you?’).	

b. *cia dia fiachaigedar* (Ml 44b3)

cia	di-a ^N .fiachaig-edar
WH.SG.M	to-OBL.REL·owe/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT
‘who it is to whom he is indebted?’	

Though it is not frequent, the combination of the interrogative particle with a form of the light head *intí aní* (see Section 4.7.3 above) is worth mentioning because it reveals the relationship of the *wh*-interrogative clause type to a non-interrogative structure based on a demonstrative. The link between the interrogative and the demonstrative element, a general trend according to Diessel (2003), is reinforced in this case by the definitory feature of the light head *intí aní* ‘this one’, which is that it regularly takes a relative verbal complex, as in e.g. *intí di-andilgidsi* ‘the one to whom you forgive it’, in example (7a). An example is (89), in which the interrogative element *ci-* is added to the accusative singular form of the light head that precedes the verbal complex [frith·^Nad-ci-siu], the nasalizing relative 2SG present indicative of *fris·aicci*. Note the use of relative nasalization for a m./f. sg. antecedent, according to what has been observed in Section 4.7.3 above.

(89) *cinní sin frisnaiccai siu* (*Thes.* ii 227.30)

c-inní sin fris^N-aic-cai-siu
 WH-LHEAD/ACC.SG.M DIST PV·REL-PV-see/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT-NA.2SG
 ‘whom do you expect?’ (lit. ‘which one is this whom you expect?’).

The form *cinní* in (89) is an attempt to render the accusative singular *quem* of the Latin question on the basis of the corresponding form of the Old Irish light head: e.g. Ml 51a16 ... *cosmail frissinní dorigni ezechias* ... ‘... like to that of which Hezekiah was guilty, ...’.

6.3.2 Unstressed interrogative pronoun in pre-verbal use

The morphosyntactic structure [interrogative pronoun + dependent form], in which the pronoun is taken as unstressed or less stressed form (Thurneysen 1946: 286), is most probably attested in the Glosses in the expression *ciarric* lit. ‘to what does it come?’ [*cia·r(o)-ing*], (of *ro·icc* ‘reaches, arrives’, with lexical preverb *ro-*), used to render Latin expressions like *quid ergo?*, *quid enim?*⁴⁸ A further example of this conjunct particle is in the form *cia·tīas-am* in (90), in which *·tīasam* is the conjunct 1PL of the *s*-subjunctive of the verb *tēt* ‘goes’ and *cia-* must be understood with indefinite meaning. The verb *tēt* takes object pronouns to express the direction or goal of the movement (cf. Ml 77a14 *amal nūntet cách* ‘as each goes to it’, with *nūntet* standing for [no^N-d^l-tēt]), so that *cia·* must be interpreted as an object marker.

(90) *cia tīasam cāintemadar* (*Thes.* ii 299.30)

cia·tīas-am cāin·tem-adar
 WH·go/PRES.SUBJ-1PL.ACT well·DECL/protect/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT
 ‘wherever we go, may He guard (us) well!’

The free-choice indefinite conjunct particle *cech(a)- / cach(a)-* ‘which-, who-ever, all that’ observed above in Section 5.4.3 represents a grammaticalized use of the

⁴⁸ This verbal complex is attested in Wb 2a5, Wb 3a11, Wb 3b13, Wb 3c18, Wb 9b24, Ml 16d1, Ml 18a9, Ml 67b21, Sg 199b12. The interrogative *ce-* / *ci-* combines with some forms of the copula that are given as conjunct, more in particular, with those forms preceded by a conjunct particle: with the preterite, Wb 7d16 *cepuđono* and Wb 19a14 *ciapudono* ‘why, then, was ...?’. The interrogative form of these expressions may be unstressed as well.

unstressed adjective form *cech / cach* ‘each, every, all’, and is therefore not directly related to this interrogative unstressed form, in spite of the semantic similarity of both conjunct particles. In both cases, however, the unstressed form stands along a tonic variant and has a certain tendency to express the object of the verb. Later forms show this use: e.g. TBDeuga 768 *cia-acca* ‘whom did you see?’, TBC-I² 722 *cia fil sund* (= *cia·fil*) ‘what’s here?’ (recall that the subject of the substantive verb with the stem (·)fil(-) takes accusative case; see Section 9.3.2). But there are also cases in which the interrogative conjunct particle stands for the subject: LL 1566 *cia·beir ...* ‘who takes ...?’.

The interrogative verbal complex TBC-I² 1848 *cé tái-siu* (i.e. *cé·tái-siu*), TBC-I² 2108 *cia tai-siu*, both ‘who are you?’ formally belongs to this type, in so far as it contains the stem (·)tái(-) of the substantive verb, though it must be understood as a copular question; for the suppletive relationship between substantive verb and copula in Old Irish, see Section 9.5.3. The use as substantive verb may be found in TBC-I² 451 *cid taí dano dóib ...?* (i.e. *cid·taí* or perhaps *cid·^Ntaí*) ‘what have you got against them ...?’, in the sense of ‘to be angry, vexed’ seen in Section 9.3.5. More examples can be found in Strachan (1904: 8).

The combination of *wh*-interrogative particle plus infixed pronoun, a combination not attested in the Glosses, is a further proof of its behavior as a conjunct particle. In this use, the form of the interrogative may be *cich-*, as in (91a), with [*cich-e-brat-a*] and so on, and (91b), with [*cich-ib-fo-ro-fereth*], i.e. the 3SG passive perfect of *fo·fera*, the same verb as in example (86c) above. But plain *cia-* in this function is found too, as in (91c), in which [*cia-b-de-r(o)-géni*] includes the proto-tonic 3SG perfect form of *do·gní*.

(91) a. *ciche brata, ciche áig, ciche goin?* (TBC-I² 1215)

<i>cich-e-brat-a</i>	<i>cich-e-áig</i>
WH-3PL(/REL)·rob/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT	WH-3PL(/REL)·drive/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
<i>cich-e-goin</i>	
WH-3PL(/REL)·kill/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	
‘Who takes them captive?, who drives them away?, who kills them?’	

b. *cichib foroíreth* (TBF 334)

cich-ib-fo-ro-(f)ir-eth
 WH-2PL(/DECL)·PV-PERF-cause-PRET.PASS.3SG
 ‘what has been caused to you (pl.)?’

c. *Ar fessid ciab dergéni ...* (*Ir.Gosp.Thom.* §6)

ar·fess-id
 PV·DECL/know/PRES.SUBJ-2PL.ACT
 cia·b·de-r-géni
 WH-2PL(/DECL)·PV-PERF-make/PRET.ACT.3SG
 ‘you may know who has made you ...’.

The character of conjunct particle occupying slot 1 of the Old Irish verbal complex may be assumed also for *co-* ‘how, of what sort?’ (cf. *DIL s.u.* 4 *co*), as in (92). In this example, *co·acci* [co·a(d)-ci] has the prototonic 2SG present indicative form of *ad·cí*. This form *co-* is not found as such in the Glosses, but formally enlarged as *cote* and with a different syntax (see Thurneysen 1946: 290 and Section 6.5.2 below).

- (92) *co·acci in slúag* (TBC-I² 48)
 co·ac-ci in·slúag
 how·PV-see/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT ART.ACC.SG.M-host/ACC.SG.M
 ‘how do you see (the fate of) the army?’

The same interpretation of the *wh*-element as conjunct particle is possible for forms in which the copula is not in the present indicative tense and is therefore formally expressed, as in the examples of (93).

- (93) a. ... *innaní asbertis cipadadéne indhesséirgi* (Wb 25b27)
 innaní as¹ber-tis
 LHEAD/GEN.PL PV·REL/say/PRES.IND-3PL.IMPF.ACT
 ci(d)-pa-d-a^N-déne
 WH.SG.N-COP.FUT-3SG.IMPF-ART.NOM.SG.N-swiftness/NOM.SG.N
 ind-hesséirgi
 ART.GEN.SG.N-resurrection/GEN.SG.N
 ‘... of those that used to say what would be the swiftness of the resurrection’.
- b. ... *conidfessed cia bed flaith innadiad* (Ml 89b7)
 co^N-id^L·fess-ed
 so that-3SG.N/REL·know/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMPF.ACT
 cia-be-d-flaith
 WH.SG.M-COP.PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMPF-ruler/NOM.SG.F

i^N-a-diad
 in-POSS.3SG.M-end/ACC.SG.M
 ‘... until he knew who should be king after him’.

In (93a), the 3SG conditional *-pad-* (for *-bad-*) of *cipadadéne* is the same copula form that is combined with other conjunct particles such as the negative declarative *ní-* (e.g. Wb 10c21 *ní bad nertad* ‘it would not be a strengthening’), so that an interpretation of a pretonic string such as [ci(a)-bad-] seems feasible. This interpretation is also possible in (93b), a case in which the copula form *bed-* can, however, also be interpreted as an ‘absolute’ relative form. The important point here is that the copula is a pretonic element that occupies slot 1 of the verbal complex, as stated in Section 9.4.1. According to the alternative interpretation put forward for *bed* in (93b), the unstressed form of the interrogative pronoun would be attached to that pretonic form just like other initially independent particles observed in Section 5.4.4.

6.4 Interrogative pronoun in pre-pronominal use

The combination in which the interrogative pronoun appears before a tonic or stressed personal pronoun implies in Old Irish a nominal clause in which the present indicative of the copula must be interpreted. There is no finite verb between interrogative and tonic pronoun, as in (94), and very often after the tonic pronoun either.

(94) *ced ed tra fodeud* (Wb 3b28)
 ced ed tra fo-deud
 WH.SG.N 3SG.N then under-end/DAT.SG.M
 ‘what is it then finally?’

The same copular question can be found also enlarged by an additional relative verb, which secondarily adopts the meaning of the copula, as in example (95) (Veselinović 2003: 100). Ó Máille’s (1911: 7) suspicion of an artificial effort to express a verbal form in such nominal questions is probably right.

(95) *cia tussu díxnigedar* (Wb 4c24)
 cia tu-ssu díxnig-edar
 WH.SG.M 2SG-NA.2SG exist/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL
 ‘who are you?’

Albeit not frequent, the sequence of *wh*-pronoun, tonic pronoun and relative verb is sometimes found, as in example (96), very probably as a variation of the pattern of *wh*-pronoun plus relative verb seen above in Section 6.3.1.

(96) *ce hé roscríb* (Sg 197a19)

ce	hé	ro. ^(L) scríb
WH.SG.M	3SG.M	PERF·REL/write/PRET.ACT.3SG

‘who is it that has written?’

The parallel structure of interrogative pronoun followed by the feminine pronoun (say, **cia sí* ‘who’s she?’) is not found in the Glosses or, apparently, elsewhere, although such a linguistic utterance is formally plausible and pragmatically expected. In fact, the actually attested form *cisí cesí*, which counts as the feminine of the inflected and stressed interrogative pronoun, and which is found only followed by a noun, see the example (101a) in Section 6.5.2 below, is probably based on a question such as ‘who’s she?’; for more instances, see the next section. Unlike the feminine, the plural *citné* appears before a (relative) verbal form, as in example (86c) above, though the pre-nominal use seems to be much more frequent; see again the next section.

It seems that in *wh*-interrogative copular clauses in which the interrogative pronoun is followed by the tonic pronoun, the former should be stressed. This is the interpretation of Kavanagh (2001: 189) for *ced ed* in (94), and for *cit(né)* in (101c) below; apparently, Thurneysen (1946: 287) has the same opinion. As stated in Section 9.4.1, the Old Irish copula is an unstressed element hosted by its nominal or pronominal predicate, so that the structurally equivalent *wh*-interrogative pronoun in pre-pronominal position can be deemed as exceptional in this regard. However, it could be supposed also that instances like *cia hé* or *ced ed* bear a single main stress, that belonging to the tonic pronoun, with the interrogative acting then as a sort of copular particle structurally similar to *ni in ni (h)é* ‘he is not / it’s not he’, *cani in cani (h)é* ‘is he not? / is it not he?’, or even *in in in ed* ‘is it?’. See Section 9.4.4 for these 3SG negative and/or interrogative clause type forms of the copula. A similar situation has been assumed at the end of the previous section for the interrogative pronoun preceding non-present indicative forms of the copula.

6.5 Pre-nominal use of interrogative elements

It seems that, in the language of the Glosses, both the stressed and the unstressed variants of the interrogative pronoun seen above in Section 6.2 can be combined

with a noun. The unstressed form makes up a single phrasal unit with the noun to which it is attached, and most often represents a stereotyped expression of the type illustrated in Section 6.5.1. When the stressed form is used, which is the possibility considered in Section 6.5.2, the resulting syntactic structure is a nominal clause of the same type as the one observed in the previous section. Sometimes it is difficult to decide which one of those two structures is being used in a given expression.

6.5.1 Stereotyped pre-nominal use of the interrogative pronoun

The unstressed (or less stressed) character may be detected in the lack of gender agreement of the interrogative element, and many of these cases constitute ‘stereotyped’ expressions (to use Thurneysen’s 1946: 286–287 term) in which the interrogative element *cia / ce / ci* is combined with feminine nouns such as *airm* ‘place’ in (97a) and *meit* ‘size’ in (97b), and with neuter nouns, such as *indas* ‘manner’ in (97c) and *eret* ‘length’ in (97d). Of course, the same uninflected character can also be suspected for the interrogative pronoun when it precedes a masculine noun in this type of fixed or stereotyped expression: this may be case of the usual combination with the masculine *cruth* ‘way, manner’, as in Wb 24a9 *cicrud*, Sg 212a1 *ciacruth* ‘(in) what way?, how?’, or as in example (97e), where the first sound of the noun is lenited.

(97) a. ... *cia airm indid immaircide* ... (Wb 12d18)
 cia-airm i^N-did-immaircide
 WH-place/NOM.SG.F in which-COP.PRES.IND.3SG-fitting/NOM.SG.N
 ‘... at what place it is fitting ...’ (lit. ‘... what (is the) place in which it is fitting ...’).

b. *ceméit asiniu aís quam abracham* (Wb 34a5)
 ce-méit as-sin-iu aís
 WH-size/NOM.SG.F COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-old-COMP age/DAT.SG.N
quam abracham
 than Abraham
 ‘how much older in age he was than Abraham?’ (lit. ‘what (is the) size (in) which he is older in age than Abraham?’).

c. *cindas on* (Sg 18a6)

by the NPs *etarscarad* and *acésme* respectively, which must be taken as the subject of the nominal question.⁴⁹ Note that *acésme* ‘that what we suffer’, includes the light head *a^N* ‘that’ plus the absolute relative 1PL present indicative of the simple verb *céssaid* ‘suffers’.

(98) a. *cedtorbe doib etarscarad ...* (Wb 13c6)

ced-torbe do-ib etarscarad
 WH.SG.N-profit/NOM.SG.N to-3PL separating/NOM.SG.M
 ‘what profit to them (is) to separate ...?’

b. *cedtorbe dúnni acésme ...* (Wb 13c7)

ced-torbe dú-n-ni
 WH.SG.N-profit/NOM.SG.N to-1PL-NA.1PL
 a^N-cés-me
 LHEAD/NOM.SG.N-suffer/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT.REL
 ‘what profit to us (is) that what we suffer ...?’

To complicate matters, the combination of stressed interrogative pronoun and noun can also express the equivalent to an interrogative adverbial such as ‘when?’, as in (99a), and ‘where?’, in (99b).

(99) a. *cessi aimser hi rogbath* (Ml 24d10)⁵⁰

cessi aimser hi^N-ro-gb-ath
 WH.SG.F time/NOM.SG.F in which·PERF-sing-PRET.PASS/3SG
 ‘at what time it was sung?’ (more lit. ‘what (is the) time in which it was sung?’).

b. *... cia port indib maith óigedacht* (Wb 26b24)

cia port
 WH.SG.M place/NOM.SG.M
 i^N-dib-maith óigedacht
 in which-COP.PRES.IND.3SG-good/NOM.SG.F guesing/NOM.SG.F
 ‘... in what place guesing is good’ (lit. ‘what (is the) place in which guesing is good’).

49 There are also such cases like Wb 12d5 *cedtorbe dúibsi didiu infogur sin ...* ‘what profit to you (is) this sound ...?’, in which the spelling also points to a close relationship between interrogative pronoun and noun.

50 Similar examples in Ml 97a5, Sg 197b3.

The stereotyped expressions with interrogative element and noun in the same syntactic phrase probably come from a syntactic structure in which interrogative pronoun and noun (followed by a relative clause) constituted the two NPs of the nominal sentence, as in (99a,b), which are basically of the type implied in the question ‘why’ illustrated in Section 6.3.1 above with the example (88a) *cid arind-epur* (‘what is for which I say it?’ →) ‘why do I say it?’. The same link can be stated between the syntactic structure of the examples (98a,b), on the one hand, and that of (100), on the other, in which *ced* ‘what (is)’ and *torbe frisateícomnacht* ‘(the) profit for which (...)’ constitute two different NPs; the verbal complex implied in the latter must be analyzed as [fri(th)-sa^N.t(o)-i(nd)-com-nacht], with preposition *fri*, oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*-, and prototonic perfect passive of *do-indnaig* ‘bestows, grants’.

(100) *ced torbe frisateícomnacht* (Wb 19c8)

<i>ced</i>	<i>torbe</i>	<i>fri-sa^N.t-eí-com-nach-t</i>
WH.SG.N	profit/NOM.SG.N	to-OBL.REL.PV-PV-PERF-impart-PRET.PASS/3SG

‘unto what profit has it been imparted?’ (more literally, ‘what is the profit to which it [scil. the Law] has been imparted?’).

6.5.2 Non-stereotyped pre-nominal use of the interrogative pronoun

There are plenty of interrogative clauses of the type that Vendryes (1905: 398–399) calls ‘adjectival’ (i.e. *wh*-pronoun + noun) that are best interpreted as nominal clauses. The examples with the feminine *cisí* in (101a), the masculine *cía* in (101b), and the plural *citné* in (101c), to quote the *wh*-forms mentioned above in Section 6.2, belong properly to this type. The three examples in (101) are nominal expressions in which the noun may be the head of an NP including a relative clause, i.e. a tautophrasal relative clause: in (101b), *con-icf-ed* must be a relative verbal complex; in (101c), the copular predicate *diandid-cóir* is formed with the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*-. This structure is the origin of the stereotyped expression of the previous section.

(101)a. *cisí chomairle áem* (Ml 34c18)

<i>cisí^L</i>	<i>comairle</i>	<i>áem</i>
WH.SG.F	counsel/NOM.SG.F	indeed

‘what indeed is the counsel?’

b. *aircia salmscribdid conicfed són* (Ml 14a6)

air cia salmscribdid con.^(L)ic-f-ed són
 for WH.SG.M psalmist/NOM.SG.M PV·REL/can-FUT-3SG.IMP.F.ACT DIST
 ‘for what psalmist could have done that?’ (lit. ‘for who (is the) psalmist
 that could have done that?’).

c. ... *citné cumachte diandid cóir infognam* (Wb 6a9)

citné cumachte di-a^N-did-cóir
 WH.PL power/NOM.PL.N to-OBL.REL-COP.PRES.IND.3SG-proper/NOM.SG.M
 in-fognam
 ART.NOM.SG.M-service/NOM.SG.M
 ‘... what (are the) powers unto which the service is proper’.

In this structure, the interrogative pronoun does not agree with the noun on very few occasions: in texts other than the Glosses, this is the case of the question *cia th’ainm-seo* (TBC-I² 443) ‘what’s (your) name?’, with the neuter noun *ainm* ‘name’. For this question, which apparently does not appear as **cid th’ainm-seo*, Strachan (1904: 9) considers either a reflex of a pre-Old Irish situation in which there was still no gender distinction or an anticipation of the Middle Irish loss of this distinction.

Instead of the interrogative conjunct particle *co-* ‘how, of what sort?’ seen above in Section 6.3.2, the language of the Glosses makes use of the apparently related forms 3SG *cote cate*, 3PL *cotee[e]t cateet*, which are illustrated in the examples of (102).

(102) a. *cote andobeir fochricc domsa* (Wb 10d28)

cote a^N-do.^Lbeir
 how/SG LHEAD/NOM.SG.N-PV·REL/give/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 fochricc do-m-sa
 reward/ACC.SG.F to-1SG-NA.1SG
 ‘what is that which gives a reward to me?’

b. *ceist cateet diuitiae sund ...* (Wb 5c16)

ceist cate-et diuiti-ae sund
 question how-PL wealth-NOM.PL.F here
 ‘Question: what are *diuitiae* here, ...?’

Quin (1966: 140–142) prefers an interpretation of these forms as ‘in what consists?’, ‘of what kind?’. These forms are also characterized by its exclusively pre-nominal use, i.e. they are only used before an NP.

6.6 *Wh*-interrogative clause type and other structures in Old Irish

The syntactic possibilities of the *wh*-elements analyzed in the previous sections are summarized in Table 6.1, in which the forms given in parentheses are unusual in the Glosses. The question mark in the cell belonging to the use of the *wh*-element in pre-pronominal position refers to the suggestion in Section 6.4 above.

Tab. 6.1: Forms and uses of Old Irish *wh*-interrogative elements

	Pre-verbal position		Pre-pronominal position		Pre-nominal position	
Stressed <i>wh</i> -element = <i>wh</i> -pronoun	<i>cia / ce</i>				<i>cia / ce</i>	
	<i>cid / ced</i>	+ relative verb	<i>cia / ce</i> <i>cid / ced</i>	+ pron (+ relative verb)	<i>cid / ced</i> <i>cisí</i> <i>citné</i>	+ N + relative verb
Unstressed <i>wh</i> -element	(<i>cia· / ce·</i> <i>ced·</i>)	+ dependent form)		?	<i>cia· / ce·</i> <i>ced·</i>	+ N + relative verb

The following observations try to explain the most important structural links between the various possibilities included in the table, and further suggest some relationships between the forms and structures of the Old Irish *wh*-interrogative clause type and other syntactic structures hitherto observed. These relationships, which may lead to diachronic considerations, are included in Table 6.2 below.

(a) The frequent combination of *wh*-pronoun plus relative verb observed in Section 6.3.1 has an obvious parallel in the structure of the cleft-sentence. This structural link between *wh*-interrogative clause and cleft-sentence, which has been already observed by Henry (1977: 36 fn.4) for Old Irish, is based on the focused character of the stressed *wh*-pronoun. This basic functional similarity has been stated by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 176–178), Dik (1997: 318–324), Lambrecht (1994: 283), (2002: 204 fn.3), Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 420–425), Lee (2005: 100), among other scholars. Though the (stressed) feminine form *cisí* is not found in this pre-verbal use, the stressed *wh*-pronouns show a striking similarity with the tonic 3rd person pronouns. From the point of view of their paradigmatic configuration, both groups have the same number and gender differentiation; from the point of view of their function, both are focused constituents that can be followed by a relative verb.

In order to make clear this relationship between tonic personal pronoun and *wh*-pronoun, some minimal or quasi-minimal pairs of *wh*-question and cleft-sentence in Old Irish can be adduced. Consider e.g. the question Wb 31b10 ... *cid forchana* ‘... what may he teach’ (< ‘... what is what he may teach’) and the cleft-sentence *ished tra forchain som híc* ... ‘this then is what he teaches *híc*, ...’ in (44b) above; similarly, *cid asmaith disunt tra* ‘what then is good therefrom?’ in (86a) above and Wb 6c25 *ished asmaith dúib* ‘it is this that is good for you’. This similarity between subject and object clefted *wh*-question and cleft-sentence may be considered along with the links between demonstratives and interrogatives mentioned in Section 6.3.1.

Tab. 6.2: The relative position of the cleft *wh*-interrogative clause type with respect to other Old Irish syntactic structures

	V1 with declarative clause type marking	Cleft-sentence	Clefted <i>wh</i>-interrogative clause type	Left-dislocated NP with tautophrasal relative verb
Subject	<i>as·beir</i> ‘(s)he says’	<i>is (h)é as·^Lbeir</i> ‘it’s he who says’	<i>cia as·^Lbeir</i> ‘who (is who) says?’	<i>ind fer as·^Lbeir</i> ‘the man who says’
Object	<i>at·beir</i> ‘(s)he says it’	<i>is (h)ed as·^Lbeir</i> ‘it’s it what (s)he says’	<i>cid as·^Lbeir</i> ‘what is what (s)he says?’	<i>in bríathar as·^{L/N}beir</i> ‘the word that (s)he says’
	<i>as·beir samlaid</i> ‘(s)he says thus’	<i>is samlaid as·^Nbeir</i> ‘it’s thus that (s)he says’	<i>cia c(h)ruth as·^Nbeir</i> how does (s)he say?	<i>cruth as·^Nbeir</i> ‘the manner (s)he says’
Oblique	<i>as·beir airi</i> ‘(s)he says for this’	<i>is airi as·beir</i> ‘it’s for this that (s)he says’	<i>cid arind·epir</i> ‘what is for which (= why) (s)he says it?’	<i>ind accuis arind·epir</i> ‘the reason for which (s)he says it’
	<i>as·beir and</i> ‘(s)he says there’	<i>is and as·beir</i> ‘it’s there that (s)he says’	<i>c(ia) airm ind·epir</i> ‘what-place in which (s)he says it?’	<i>airm ind·epir</i> ‘the place where (s)he says it’

(b) But the cleft-sentence is not the only structure that is related to the Old Irish *wh*-interrogative clause type. On the one hand, the question on an oblique (prepositional) constituent, which regularly takes the structure *cid arind epur* ‘what is for which I say it?’, i.e. ‘why do I say it?’, in (88a) above, is most directly related to the subordinating strategy Type IIIb seen above in Section 5.4.2, i.e. [preposition + conjunct particle -(s)a^N- + dependent form]. There is therefore a clear difference between cleft-sentence and question when an oblique (prepositional) constituent is involved: while the question on an oblique constituent involves the oblique NP function being set apart from the question marker, the cleft-sentence

prefers to express the focused oblique constituent as a whole, as stated in Section 3.2.3, and avoids the relative verbal complex with *-(s)a^N* in the post-focus position.

On the other hand, the stereotyped pattern of questions such as *cia airm* ('what-place' → 'where', *ciachruth* ('what-manner' → 'how', observed in Section 6.5.1, is structurally related to the subordinating strategy that uses the same or a semantically similar noun followed by a relative verbal complex. Compare e.g. *cia airm* 'where?' in (97a) and *ciachruth* 'how?' in (97e) above with examples (103a) and (103b) below respectively.

(103) a. *airm ifuirsitis intorcc arimbadand furruintis apraintech* (*Thes.* ii 242.4)

airm	i ^N .fuir-r-s-itis
place/NOM.SG.F	in which·PV-PV-find/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.IMP.F.ACT
in-torcc	ari ^N -ba-d-and
ART.ACC.SG.M-boar/ACC.SG.M	so that-COP.PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMP.F-there
fu-rruim-tis	a-praintech
PV·DECL/locate/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.IMP.F.ACT	POSS.3PL-refectory/ACC.SG.N

'the spot in which they should find the boar, be it there that they put their refectory'.

b. *cruth nandat chomsuidigthi sisi leo* (Sg 201b12)

cruth	na- ^N .da-t ^L -comsuidig-thi
manner	NEG.REL-REL-COP.PRES.IND-3PL-compound-PRT.PASS/NOM.PL.M
sidi	le-o
PROX-NOM.PL.M	with-3PL

'as these are not compounded for them' (lit. 'the manner (in) which these are not compounded for them').

In (103a), the noun *airm* 'place' is followed by the relative verbal complex *ifuirsitis* [*i^N*·for-r(o)-(ing)s^L-itis], with the conjunct particle *i^N* 'in which', and the prototonic 3PL past subjunctive form of *for-ricc* 'comes across, finds'. In (103b), *cruth* 'manner' appears before the nasalizing relative form of the copula. These two expressions of (103) resemble the left-dislocated structures considered above in Section 3.3, which surely are in the origin of many subordinating structures of the Type IV, as stated in Section 5.7.2 above.

With respect to a structure such as [*cruth* + (nasalizing) relative clause type] in (103b), a question such as [*cia-chruth* + (nasalizing) relative clause type] in (97f) involves the presence (or addition) of the bare *wh*-interrogative clause type

marker to a structure that expresses the remaining semantics of the question ‘how?’.

(c) The common feature implied in the two previous points is the structural link between the *wh*-interrogative and relative clause types, in the specific sense that the latter is the basic component of the cleft-sentence and of the other structures in point (b), that is to say, of all the structures considered in the column of the clefted *wh*-interrogative clause type in Table 6.2. This structural link is further considered in Section 8.5.1 below, in which the whole Old Irish paradigm of clause types is inspected. This point and the next one are devoted to the detailed analysis of the relationship between oblique *wh*-questions and adverbial clauses in Old Irish.

In spite of the structural link observed in the previous point, there can be in Old Irish a considerable difference between a specific subordinating adverbial conjunction and the semantically corresponding *wh*-word. The temporal meaning provides a clear example: whereas *inta(i)n* ‘when’ and *a^N* ‘when’ are the two most frequent temporal conjunctions (see Section 5.5.1), the way to ask ‘when?’ is *cessi aimser ...* ‘what is the time ...?, i.e. ‘when ...?’, as illustrated in (99a) above. In the case of manner semantics, the subordinating conjunction *amal* ‘as’ (see again Section 5.5.1) is by far the most frequent one (much more than the structure in (103b) above), which clearly contrasts with *cia-c(h)ruth* ‘how?’. For other semantics, however, the subordinating and questioning strategies seem to share a common ground, in this case based on the former: this seems to be the case of the local semantics based on the noun *airm* ‘place’, as noted in the previous point.

The reason for the difference between subordinating conjunction and semantically equivalent *wh*-interrogative expression in Old Irish may simply be that the basic relative marking and the *wh*-element(s) are different. In this case, relative nasalization, which – according to Section 5.7 – is secondary with respect to relative lenition, is the basis of the expression of adverbial clauses neatly different from the questions based on *wh*-elements, so that there was initially the subordinating structure [*intain* + nasalizing relative verb] ‘when ...’ and the question *cessi aimser hi-* ‘when ...?’ illustrated in (99a), which involves the use of the oblique relative verbal complex with *i^N*. An expression such as [*cruth* + nasalizing relative verb] observed in (103b) above seems to be the outcome of a contamination of a subordinating structure with a question such as *cia-c(h)ruth ...* ‘what manner ...?’, i.e. ‘how?’ illustrated in (97f). If the origin of relative nasalization is in the subordinating conjunctions of the type *inta(i)n*, as suggested in Section 5.7.2 above, the use of this relative mutation in the post-focus verb of the cleft-sentence that focuses on an adverbial constituent (Section 3.2.3) would be due to the extension from an interrogative structure such as [*cia-c(h)ruth* + nasalizing relative verb]

‘how?’, thus giving rise to a further use of relative nasalization, in line with what has been proposed in Section 5.7.3. In this case, a feature of the cleft-sentence would be due to the model of the *wh*-interrogative clause type. This possibility can be observed in the first example of the oblique row in Table 6.2.

(d) In line with the previous point, the expression of the three NP_{rel} functions of the antecedent in the Old Irish relative verbs may be compared to that of the subject, object and oblique NP functions included in the left-most column in Table 6.2. Recall that, as stated in Section 4.7.3, the Old Irish relative verbal complexes marked with lenition, nasalization and the conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* constitute a sort of nominal paradigm in which the subject, object and oblique NP_{rel} functions respectively are expressed. The use of relative nasalization to mark the object NP_{rel} function of a m./f. sg. antecedent is notably more frequent when the antecedent constitutes a tautophrasal unit with the relative clause, as argued in Section 4.7.3. When the subject or object antecedent is the focused element of a cleft-sentence, however, lenition is the predominant relative marking in the post-focus verb. The difference between the aforementioned paradigm or system of relative verbs and what can be observed for the *wh*-questions is that, due to the focusing character of the latter, the cleft-sentence plays a preponderant role in the latter, as stated in Section 6.3.1 above and in point (a) of this section. This agrees with Dik’s (1997: 320–324) idea that cleft questions are preferred when the subject is the questioned element. As a counterpart of this, when an oblique constituent is questioned, Old Irish prefers a strategy based on dislocated NPs, in line with points (b) and (c) of this section.

(e) As for the forms given as stressed interrogative pronouns, the predominantly pre-nominal use of the forms *cisí* and *citné* complies with their most probable origin as a combination of the form of the pronoun with the corresponding tonic pronoun *sí* ‘she’ and *é* ‘they’. In other words, the void cell in Table 6.1, in which only a question mark appears, is the origin of those forms. The pre-nominal use of those tonic forms is rarely followed by a (relative) verb, as if relative verb and tonic pronoun stood in complementary distribution in the position after the *wh*-interrogative pronoun. Most probably, this is related to the fact that the Old Irish tonic pronouns do not appear after verbs other than the copula, a feature of its morphosyntactic behavior that has been dubbed ‘non-verbal’ in García-Castillero (2013b). The few exceptions to this rule may be explained as secondary: the pre-verbal use of *citné*, e.g. *citné foruar* in example (86c), is surely due to an extension of the pre-nominal use, e.g. *citné cumachte ...* in (101c), once the form *citné* has been fixed. More importantly, the few pre-nominal uses such as e.g. *ce hé roscríb* in (96), are probably due to the influence of the pre-

pronominal (as if it were *ce hé* ‘who’s he?’) on the pre-verbal use (namely, *ce ros-críb* ‘who has written?’), probably under the direct influence of a cleft-sentence structure such as **is hé ros-críb* ‘it’s he who has written’.

(f) The tendency delineated in the previous point may well be one of the important factors for the creation of two paradigms of interrogative pronouns in Old Irish, stressed and unstressed. Assuming that the original paradigm of interrogative pronouns had only the two forms inherited from Proto-Indo-European **k^wis* and **k^wid*, which ultimately arrived at the Old Irish forms *cia* and *cid*, and further that these two forms were used both as stressed and unstressed, the rise of a series of stressed forms involved the creation of feminine *cisi* and plural *citné* in the pre-nominal context, arriving thus to the paradigmatic structure of the tonic pronouns. The original forms were maintained as unstressed forms, in which a certain tendency to use only *cia* (and formal variants) is also observed. The circumstances in which these unstressed forms are used are not clear enough: a cursory view of the available evidence permits us to assume a certain involvement of fixed expressions (cf. *ciarric*), or the indefinite meaning (cf. *cia tiasam* ... ‘wherever we go, ...’), both quoted in Section 6.3.2.

6.7 Concluding remarks

The treatment of the various *wh*-interrogative clause types in Old Irish leads us to consider two variables, one of a formal nature, the distinction between stressed and unstressed *wh*-elements, and the other of a purely syntactic character, the pre-verbal, pre-nominal or pre-pronominal of the *wh*-element. Almost every logical possibility resulting from the combination of these two variables is expressed in Old Irish, and the forms involved can be considered in a diachronic perspective. The combination of a *wh*-element with a declarative verbal complex is avoided in Old Irish, in which some kind of dependency on the verb that takes part in the *wh*-question, whether syntactic (i.e. with a relative verbal complex) or morphological (with a dependent form in the sense established in Section 2.4.4 above), is the rule. Note that there is no negative version of the verbal complex formed with the *wh*-interrogative conjunct particle *cia-*; see Section 8.5.2 for this issue. The combination of pre-pronominal and pre-verbal uses seems also to be avoided, though there are some few examples.

In the expression of oblique questions that are semantically and, in Old Irish, structurally equivalent to *wh*-words such as ‘where?’ and ‘how?’, the unstressed *wh*-elements of the stereotyped pre-nominal use are found. In the pre-nominal use, the stressed *wh*-elements are used in non-stereotyped expressions.

There is the clear link between the structure of the cleft-sentence and that of [stressed *wh*-pronoun + relative verb] for the case in which the subject or the object of the verb is questioned, as stated in point (a) in the previous section. When an oblique constituent is questioned, the structure used in Old Irish is not related to the cleft-sentence, but to the NP that has a tautophrasal relative clause type verbal complex with conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*-, or – as a further possibility – with ‘autonomous’ relative nasalization, as stated in point (b) in the previous section. In contrast to the system or paradigm of relative clause types in which there is an attempt to distinguish the tautophrasal relative verb of an antecedent with subject, object and oblique NP_{rel} function, the questions for the constituents with the corresponding functions are divided in two basic types, one for the questioned subject and object, and another one for the oblique and other adverbial constituents; this difference, with its corresponding diachronic consequences, was dealt with in point (d) in the previous section.

In Old Irish, some *wh*-questions are completely different from their semantically equivalent subordinating conjunctions (e.g. conjunction ‘when’ vs *wh*-expression ‘when?’), whereas others (e.g. the local meaning ‘where?’), based on the noun *airm* ‘place’) seem to run in parallel, as noted in point (c) in the previous section.

The two series of *wh*-elements that can be identified in Old Irish and, thereby, the need itself of working with the notion of *wh*-element, are the product of a paradigmatic split from a previous situation in which there were two forms that could be used as both stressed or unstressed. In this diachronic process of paradigmatic split, the pre-pronominal use turns out to be of great importance, since it is the basis for the creation of the tonic forms *cisi* and *ciné* and seems to be in complementary distribution with the pre-verbal use.

7 Polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types

7.1 Introduction

This chapter rounds off the description of the Old Irish clause types by inspecting the three most simple ones from both a formal and a functional perspective, namely, the polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types. To a great extent, the formal definition of these clause types can be made on the basis of the description in the previous chapters, in particular in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 4 focused on three markers of declarative and relative clause types, namely, (i) absolute declarative and relative endings in slot 5 of the verbal complex, (ii) relative mutations and – as the marker of declarative clause type – contrastive lack thereof in slot 3 or 4 of the verbal complex, and (iii) the special distinction between Classes A/B and C in slot 2 for declarative and relative clause types respectively. A further strategy to mark declarative and relative clause types, as observed in both Chapters 4 and 5, are some (iv) specific conjunct particles in slot 1, whether negative or not. Finally, as a strategy that was mentioned in Chapter 5, (v) the prototonic form (i.e. the articulation of a lexical compound in slots 3 and 4) is in very few cases used as the marker of relative clause type.

The formal strategies to be considered in this chapter are directly related to the previous ones. With respect to (i), the polar interrogative, responsive and imperative clause types make use of the conjunct endings, which were observed previously in the declarative and relative clause types when this clause type is expressed in another slot of the verbal complex; the exception are here the 2SG and the 3SG of the imperative clause type, which have endings different from the conjunct ones. In other words, as already stated in Section 4.2, the difference between absolute and conjunct endings applies to declarative and relative clause types, but not to the other clause types, in which only one set of endings is used regardless of its simple or compound character. With respect to (ii), there is the nasalizing mutation triggered by the polar interrogative conjunct particle, but not autonomous mutations. With respect to (iii), Classes A/B and C can appear in the polar interrogative clause types, whereas the imperative clause type only uses Classes A/B. With respect to (iv), the three clause types dealt with in this chapter have their own conjunct particles, with the exception of the responsive clause type, which has the same negative conjunct particle *nad-* as the relative clause type. Finally, with respect to (v), the three clause types to be considered in the following make regular use of the prototonic variant of lexical compounds, with

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-007>

the exception of the imperative clause type combined with infixed pronouns in slot 2, in which case lexical compounds are articulated in their deuterotonic form.

The reference to the declarative and relative clause types serves to the introductory purpose of emphasizing the formal (and, to some extent, functional) simplicity of the polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types. In line with a short comment in Section 1.7.3 above, the reason for this formal feature may well be that, with respect to the three previous ones, the three clause types considered in this chapter share a more thetic character, in the sense of Sasse (1987), i.e. in the sense that they mainly focus on the verbal predicate itself. As directly related to this, the various types of nominal constituents mentioned above as well as the pronominal references play a fairly secondary role in the Old Irish polar interrogative, imperative, and responsive clause types, to the extent that the latter is characterized by the lack of any pronominal affix and mostly has no nominal constituent. As for the Old Irish polar interrogative and imperative clause types, neither nominal nor pronominal constituents are excluded from their structure, but the presence of the latter do not trigger the paradigmatic intricacies observed in the previous chapters.

The amount of formal elements to be considered in this chapter is therefore relatively reduced, bearing in mind that it deals with three different clause types. Actually, few new elements need to be introduced: on the one hand, the 2SG and 3SG imperative endings in slot 5; on the other, the two positive polar interrogative conjunct particles, as well as the conjunct particles for the negative versions of each clause type, all of them included in slot 1 of the verbal complex.

The structure of the chapter is straightforward. Section 7.2 deals with the polar interrogative, Section 7.3 with the imperative, and Section 7.4 with the responsive clause types. Section 7.5 summarizes the main ideas of the chapter.

7.2 The Old Irish polar interrogative clause type

The basic marker of the Old Irish polar interrogative clause type is the conjunct particle *in*^N, regularly followed by the dependent form of the lexical verb, that is to say, by the conjunct form of simple verbs and by the prototonic form of lexical compounds. In the form *in*^N·*bér-tar* of (104a), *-bértar* is the conjunct 3PL passive future form of the simple *beirid* ‘brings’, and in (104b), the form [*in*^N·*a(d)-ci*] includes the prototonic 2SG present indicative of *ad-cí* ‘sees’. The infixed pronouns are most often of Class C, as *-dam*^L- in the form *in*^N·*dam*^L·*soirf-ad* of (104c), the 3SG conditional of *saeraid* ‘delivers’. Note that, as stated in the previous section, the endings of those forms will always be the conjunct ones illustrated above in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.5.1. For the copula, see the examples in Section 9.4.5.

- (104)a. *inbértar epistli uaín dothabirt testassa dínn* (Wb 15a3)
 in^N·bér-tar epistl-i uaí-n
 POLINT·bring/FUT-3PL.PASS epistle-NOM.PL.F from-1PL
 do^L-tabirt testass-a dí-nn
 to-bringing/DAT.SG.F testimony-GEN.SG.M of-1PL
 ‘shall epistles be brought from us to bear testimony of us?’
- b. *innaci* (Sg 15b6)
 in^N·a-ci
 POLINT·PV-see/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT
 ‘do you see?’
- c. *in damsoirfad dia* (Ml 90c19)
 in^N-dam-soir-f-ad dia
 POLINT-1SG(/REL)-deliver-FUT-3SG.IMP.F. God/NOM.SG.M
 ‘whether God would deliver me’.

The corresponding negative particle form can be either *innad^N*, as in the form *innádcualaidsi* [innád^N-cual-id^L-si] of (105), with the 2PL perfect form of *ro-cluine-thar*, or *cani*· (also *cini*·), in (106a), where [cani·a(d)-ci] has again the prototonic 2SG present indicative of *ad-cí* ‘sees’. The latter is used for negative questions expecting an affirmative answer. Apparently, *cani*· takes Class A infixes, as in *cani epir* [cani-(a^L)-e(ss)-bir^L] of (106b). The form *cani*· seems to be the preferred form for the negative polar interrogative of the copula in the language of the Glosses (see again Section 9.4.5 on the copula); the copula form that is used instead, *in-nach*·, seems to be from a later date.

- (105) *innádcualaidsi* (Wb 5a21)
 innád·cual-aid-si
 POLINT.NEG·hear/PRET.ACT-2PL-NA.2PL
 ‘have you not heard?’
- (106)a. *caniaccai* (Ml 25b14)
 cani·ac-cai
 POLINT.NEG·PV-see/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT
 ‘do you not see?’
- b. *cani epir náte atbeir* (Wb 10d5)

cani.^(L)e-pir
 POLINT.NEG-3SG.N(/DECL).PV-say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 náte a-t^L.beir
 no PV-3SG.N/DECL.say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 ‘does it not say it? No, it says it’.

The sequence *in ní nad·* in example (107), which appears in Ml in quite a number of cases, is probably a further way to state a negative polar question, perhaps with a pronominal object. The expression *inní nad n imcai* consists of the polar interrogative copula form *in-* ‘is it ...?’ (Section 9.4.5), the neuter form of the indefinite pronoun *nech ní* ‘somebody, something’, and the negative relative verbal complex [nad^N.im(mi)-(ad)-ci], of the verb *imm-accai* ‘considers’, based on the compound *ad·cí* ‘sees’.

(107) *inní nad n imcai ate imma accai* (Ml 114a15)
 in-ní
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT-something/NOM.SG.N
 nad.^Nim-cai ate
 NEG.REL·REL-PV-PV/see/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT yes
 imm-a^L.ac-cai
 PV-3SG.N/DECL·PV-see/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT
 ‘Is it a thing He does not consider? Yes, He considers it’.

Note the same sequence of polar interrogative question and answer in (106b) and (107). The possibility of a negative polar interrogative verbal complex including a pronominal infix seems to be rare in Old Irish.

Greene (1962: 73) assumes that the polar interrogative preverbal particle was actually *i^N*, on the basis of spellings such as that of Ml 43d1 *imbóí* ‘whether there is’, which he analyzes as *i^N-boí*, and that this form was different from the corresponding copula form, *in-*. Greene refers to the Modern Irish differentiation between polar interrogative particle [ə^N] and the corresponding copula form [ə-n]. However, a general consideration of the Old Irish forms makes it recommendable to maintain the idea that there is only one pretonic element *in^N*- that can be both preverbal particle and copula form, in exactly the same way as forms like *ní-* and other conjunct particles, see Section 9.5.4. The spelling *imbóí* can be considered then as a graphic or even partially phonetic simplification of *in^N-boí*, which should have been spelled **inmbóí*.

7.3 The Old Irish imperative clause type

According to the descriptions of Pedersen (1913: 249), Thurneysen (1946: 28,539), McCone (1997a: 70–72), McQuillan (1997: 9–23), the Old Irish verbal complex expressing imperative clause type has the following features regarding (a) endings, (b) form of lexical compounds, (c) affixal pronouns, and (d) negative particles.

(a) The endings are the same for both simple and compound verbs (and this includes the negative forms). As anticipated above, the 2SG and 3SG of the active possess special imperative endings and, in these two forms, the difference between strong and weak verb is lost. The 2SG is characterized by the bare form of the stem: *be(i)r* ‘bring’ (of *beirid*) and *ca(i)n* ‘sing’ (of *cainid*) are from strong verbs, whereas Wb 6c7 *léic* ‘leave’ (*léicid*) and Wb 30d6 *pridach* ‘preach’ (*pridchaid*) are examples of weak verbs.⁵¹ Within its paradigm, this 2SG can be said to be marked with a zero morpheme. The 3SG has the ending *-e/ath*, *-e/ad*: Wb 12d41 *gaibed*, of *gaibid*, ‘let him seize’, Wb 28b12 *na imchomarcad* (of *imm.comairc*) ‘let him not ask’. See also the forms in (109) below. The remaining persons of the active paradigm show, from a purely descriptive point of view, conjunct endings: 2PL Wb 6b29 *léicid* ‘let!’, Wb 7b14 *gaibid* ‘seize!’, 3PL Wb 13a11 *berat* ‘let them carry’. The imperative passive endings are also the conjunct ones: 3SG Wb 7b4 *berar* ‘let ... be taken’; for a 2PL passive verb, see (d) below. On the 1SG imperative and its relationship to the responsive form, see Sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 below.

(b) Lexical compounds that take no affixal pronoun appear as prototonic, as anticipated in Section 2.4.4: (2SG) Ml 27c12 *tabair* ‘inflict!’ of *do-beir*;⁵² (3SG) Wb 6b18 *dénad* ‘let him do!’, of *do-gní*; (2PL) Wb 27a3 *comid* ‘preserve!’, of *con-oí*; (3PL) Ml 60d4 *fulngat* ‘let them bear’, of *fo-loing*. The contrast between the imperative prototonic and the deuterotonic form of the same verb in the same gloss can be observed in (108), in which *tomil* is the 2SG imperative clause type form, and *dommeil* (i.e. *do.^Nmeil*), the 3SG nasalizing relative form.

(108) *tomil innahí sin dommeil do chenél* (Wb 6c7)

<i>to-mil</i>	<i>innahí-sin</i>
PV-consume/2SG.ACT.IMPV	LHEAD/ACC.PL-PROX

⁵¹ The verb *téit* ‘(s)he goes’ has a suppletive imperative stem *eirg(-)* for the 2nd persons, along with the stem *tét / tiag(-)* in the other forms of the paradigm, such as e.g. the 1SG *tiag* observed in Section 7.4.3 below. For the suppletive imperative forms of the substantive verb and copula, see Sections 9.3.1 and 9.4.1 respectively.

⁵² Thurneysen (1946: 374–375) gives some cases of 2SG imperative clause type forms with shortened (perhaps better, truncated) stem in unstressed posttonic position: e.g. *Thes. ii 241.12 tair* ‘come!’, from the lexical compound *do-airicc*, which has the lexical preverbs *to-* and *ar(e)-*.

do^N-meil do^L-cenél
 PV·REL-consume/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT POSS.2SG-race/NOM.SG.N
 ‘consume these [scil. foods] which thy nation consumes’.

(c) Affixal pronouns are obligatorily infixes, regardless of the basically simple or compound character of the verb; the resulting compound verb will be obligatorily deuterotonic: (2SG subject + 1SG object) Ml 24a15 *atamrochoilse* ‘determine me’ [e(ss)-tam^L-ro-choil-se] of *as-rochoili*; (2PL subject + 3PL object) Wb 24b12 *dosnigniithsi* ‘do you them’ [de-s^N-gni-ith^L-si], of *do-gní*. Simple verbs make use of the semantically empty *no-* also observed in Section 2.3.1, and Sections 4.2 to 4.5: (3SG subject + 3SG m. reflexive object) Wb 11d8 *nanglanad* ‘let him clean himself’ [n(o)-a^N-glann-ad], of *glanaid*; (3SG subject + 1SG object with 1SG *nota augens*) *Thes.* ii 245.6 *numsechethse* ‘let him follow me’ [no-m^L-sech-eth-se], of *sechithir*.

As argued by Breatnach (1977: 86–87), the few cases in the Old Irish literature that could be interpreted as an imperative form with suffixed pronoun can better be accounted for either as subjunctive forms or as textual corruptions.

(d) The negative imperative conjunct particle is *na-*: (3PL) Wb 31c12 *na berat* ‘let them not carry’; cf. the declarative clause type form *ní-berat* ‘they do not carry’. In (109), two contiguous and textually related Wb glosses with the same basic 3SG imperative form of *do-áirci* ‘causes, procures for’ are offered, the first in the negative and the second in the positive version.

(109) a. *natáirged cách indocbáil do fesin* (Wb23c13)

na-t-áir-g-ed		cách
NEG.IMPV-PV-PV-cause-3SG.ACT.IMPV		each/NOM.SG.M
indocbáil	do-fesin	
glory/ACC.SG.F	to-self/ACC.SG.M	
‘let no every one procure glory for himself’.		

b. *táirced diachéliu* (Wb 23c14)

t-áir-c-ed		di-a ^L -céli-u
PV-PV-cause-3SG.ACT.IMPV		to-POSS.3SG.N-other-DAT.SG.M
‘let him procure [glory] for another’.		

Before Class A infix pronouns, *nach(i)-* is used. An example of the combination of 3SG subject plus 3SG n. object can be found in (110a), in which *nach thoimled* ‘let him not so partake’ is to be analyzed as [nach-(a)^L-to-m(e)l^L-ed], of the same verb *do-meil* ‘consumes, eats’ seen above in (108); for the use of the infix, see

In Table 7.1, the conjunct forms are given in the leftmost column in order to clarify the extent to which the forms of the imperative paradigm are the same as the conjunct ones. This conjunct paradigm was given in e.g. Table 4.3, in which it appears side by side the absolute declarative paradigm. Note that the paradigms with the 3SG n. affix must be read as e.g. *na-char* ‘love it!’ and *nach-char* ‘don’t love it!’, and that the forms must be analyzed as [n(o)-a^L-] for the positive, and as [nach-(a)^L-] for the negative form, according to Section 2.6.

Tab. 7.2: Active paradigms of the imperative clause type of *do-beir* ‘gives, brings’

	Prototonic	Imperative clause type verb			
		Positive	Positive [+pron]	Negative	Negative [+pron]
1sg	<i>·tabur</i>	<i>tabur</i>	<i>da-biur /·v/</i>	<i>na·tabur</i>	<i>nach·thabur</i>
2sg	<i>·tabair</i>	<i>tabair</i>	<i>da-ber /·v/</i>	<i>na·tabair</i>	<i>nach·thabair</i>
3sg	<i>·tabair</i>	<i>taibred</i>	<i>da-berad /·v/</i>	<i>na·taibred</i>	<i>nach·thaibred</i>
1pl	<i>·taibrem</i>	<i>taibrem</i>	<i>da-beram /·v/</i>	<i>na·taibrem</i>	<i>nach·thaibrem</i>
2pl	<i>·taibrid</i>	<i>taibrid</i>	<i>da-berid /·v/</i>	<i>na·taibrid</i>	<i>nach·thaibrid</i>
3pl	<i>·taibret</i>	<i>taibret</i>	<i>da-berat /·v/</i>	<i>na·taibret</i>	<i>nach·thaibret</i>

In Table 7.2, the leftmost column shows the prototonic form that can be used in the declarative or relative clause types if preceded by the appropriate conjunct particles: for instance, with the negative declarative conjunct particle *ní-*, Ml 21b2 *nítair* ‘he does not give’; with the relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-*, Ml 45a3 *fu-antaibret* ‘in accordance with which they apply it’. The corresponding positive declarative forms of those prototonic forms are *do-biur*, *do-bir*, *do-beir*, *do-beram*, *do-berid* and *do-berat*. As in the previous table, the paradigms marked as [+pron] with the 3SG n. infix must be understood as e.g. *da-ber* ‘give it!’ and *nach·thabair* ‘don’t give it!’ and so on, and the forms must be analyzed as [t(o)-a^L-] for the positive, and as [nach-(a)^L-] for the negative form.

The introduction of the conjunct and prototonic forms in the left-most columns in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 respectively has the purpose of illustrating the idea that the opposition between dependent (as a covert term for prototonic and conjunct) and independent (as a covert term for deuterotonic and absolute) forms, the terms introduced in Section 2.4.4, is operative for the expression of the declarative and relative clause types, as stated in Section 4.2. In the case of the imperative clause type, the form considered dependent in the sense of Section 2.4.4 (i.e. the so-called conjunct form of a simple verb and the prototonic variant of the lexical compound) is also used in isolation (at least in the plural forms), and should in that function be considered independent.

7.4 The Old Irish responsive clause type

The term responsive was coined by Watkins (1963: 43), but the implied verbal forms were already considered by previous scholars: see Pedersen (1913: 249) and, very briefly, Thurneysen (1946: 29). The formal description of the Old Irish responsive is offered in Section 7.4.1, and both its basic function and some derived meanings are dealt with in Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3. Roughly speaking, the Old Irish responsive is an echo responsive that consists of (a part of) the predicate that typically appears in a previous polar interrogative clause type. Jones (1999: 22–27), who deals with the Welsh responsive, offers some parallels of this echo responsive in Malay, Finnish and Thai, among other languages. This characterization must be further qualified with respect to the copular predicate, and some of the features of this Old Irish non-verbal predicate will be anticipated in Section 7.4.3 below, but the bulk of the treatment is left for Section 9.4.5 below. The place of the responsive among the polar interrogative and imperative clause types is considered in Section 7.4.4.

7.4.1 Formal features of the Old Irish responsive

Greene (1972: 60) establishes the following formal features for the Old Irish responsive. (a) Simple verbs display conjunct endings, as *icfa* in (111a), the corresponding declarative absolute form being *icfaid*, the *f*-future of the weak verb *iccaid*; the responsive clause type form *agur* in (111b) contrasts with the declarative clause type *ad·águr*, which is a compound form, and shows the use of the 1SG as responsive; this form can also be considered in the next point. (b) Compound verbs appear as prototonic, as *cumcim* in (112), a form that contrasts with the declarative deuterotonic *con·icim* ‘I can’. (c) The negative particle is *nád-* (Pedersen 1913: 257), as *nád géb-sa* in (113); the declarative clause type form would be *ní·géb-sa*. (d) The form *fil* is used in the paradigm of the substantive verb to answer the question *in·fil ...?* ‘is there ...?’ (see Strachan 1898/99: 54–55, Veselinović 2003: 219), as in (114); the corresponding declarative form would be *at·tá*, as stated in Section 9.3.2 below on the substantive verb. (e) The 3SG of the negated copula is *nách-*, as in (115), in which the declarative clause type form would be *ní hé*; for more details on the copula, see Section 9.4.5. A general feature of the Old Irish responsive clause type forms is that it takes no pronominal affixes.

(111) a. ‘*eprid in n-icfa in fer sin i mbárach?*’ ‘*Ícfa écin,*’ or *Cú Chulaind* (TBC-I² 1800–1802)

epri^d in^N·íc-f-a
 PV-say-2PL.ACT.IMPV POLINT·save-FUT-3SG.ACT
 in-fer-sin i^N-bárach íc-f-a
 ART.NOM.SG.M-man/NOM.SG.M-DIST tomorrow RESP/save-FUT-3SG.ACT
 écin or-Cú Chulaind
 indeed RSM-Cú Chulaind/NOM.SG.M
 “Tell me, will that man give compensation tomorrow?. ‘He will,
 indeed’, said Cú Chulainn’.

- b. *‘In aigther écc, a Brénainn’, ar espoc M(ainenn). ‘Agur ém’, or Brenaind* (Vendryes 1910: 309)

in^N·aig-ther écc a-Brénainn
 POLINT·fear/PRES.IND-2SG.ACT death/ACC.SG.M VOCP-Brenain/VOC.SG.M
 ar-espoc M(ainenn) ag-ur
 RSM-bishop/NOM.SG.M Mainenn/NOM.SG.M RESP/fear/PRES.IND-1SG.ACT
 ém or-Brenaind
 truly RSM-Brenain/NOM.SG.M
 “Crains-tu la mort, ô Brendan?” dit l’évêque Mainenn. - ‘Je la crains
 certes’, dit Brendan’ (‘Are you afraid of the death, Brendan?’, said
 Bishop Mainenn. – ‘Yes, I am’, said Brendan’).

- (112) *‘Ní chumci-siu ón a beó nach áe do br[e]ith’, ol in t-ara. ‘Cumcim écin’, ar Cú.* (TBC-I² 774–776)

ní^{-l}·cum-c-i-siu ón
 NEG.DECL-3SG.N/DECL-PV-can/PRES.IND-2SG.ACT-NA.2SG DIST
 a^{-l}-beó nach áe do-br[e]ith
 POSS.3SG.M-life/ACC.SG.M any/ACC.SG.M POSS.3PL to-bringing/DAT.SG.F
 ol-int-ara cum-c-im
 RSM-ART.SG.M-charioteer/NOM.SG.M RESP/PV-can/PRES.IND-1SG.IND.ACT
 écin ar-Cú
 indeed RSM-Cú/NOM.SG.M
 “But you cannot carry off any one of them alive’, added the charioteer. ‘In-
 deed I can’, said Cú Chulainn’.

- (113) *‘Acc óm’, or Cú, ‘acht dabér seótu dait’. ‘Nád géb-sa ón’, ar in cáinte* (TBC-I² 1514–1515)

acc óm or-Cú acht d-a^{-l}-bér
 no verily RSM-Cú/NOM.SG.M but PV-3SG.N/DECL·give/FUT.1SG.ACT

seót-u da-it nád·géb-sa
 wealth-ACC.PL.M to-2SG NEG.RESP·take/FUT.1SG.ACT-NA.1SG
 ón ar-in-cáinte
 DIST RSM-ART.NOM.SG.M-satirist/NOM.SG.M
 ‘No indeed’, said Cú Chulainn, ‘but I will give your treasure’. ‘I shall not accept that’, said the satirist’.

(114) *In fil imbass forosna lat?*, or *Medb. ‘Fil écin’, or ind ingen* (TBC-I² 44–45)

in^N-fil imbass
 POLINT-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG knowledge/ACC.SG.M
 for-¹osn-a la-t or-Medb
 PV·REL/illuminate/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT with-2SG RSM-Medb/NOM.SG.F
 fil écin or-ind-ingen
 RESP/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG indeed RSM-ART.NOM.SG.F-maiden/NOM.SG.F
 ‘Have you the power of prophecy called *imbass forosna?*’, asked Medb. ‘I have indeed’, said the maiden’ (lit. “is there for you ...?”, ‘There is ...’).

(115) *Imcomairc Ailill iarom: ‘Inn é Conchobar dorigni seo?’ ‘Nách hé’, ol Fergus* (TBC-I² 361–363)

im-com-airc Ailill iarom
 PV·DECL/PV-ask/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT Ailill/NOM.SG.M then
 in^N-é Conchobar
 COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT-3SG.M Conchobar/NOM.SG.M
 do-¹ri-gni seo nách-hé
 PV·REL/PERF-make/PRET.ACT.3SG PROX COP.PRES.IND.3SG.RESP-3SG.M
 ol-Fergus
 RSM-Fergus/NOM.SG.M
 ‘Ailill asked: ‘Is it Conchobar who has done this?’. ‘It is not indeed’, said Fergus’.

The examples in (111) to (115) are all from texts other than the Glosses. For some forms of the responsive in the language of the Glosses, I refer the reader to Section 7.4.3. For more examples, see Draak (1952), Eska (1991), and Greene (1972). For responsive forms of the copular predicate, see Section 7.4.3 in this chapter and Section 9.4.5 on non-verbal predication. Further details on the evolution in the Old Irish period can be found in Greene (1972: 61). The extent cannot be determined to which tenses and moods other than the present and the future, the tenses attested in the examples of responsive given in this study, were possible

in Old Irish responsive clause types. Jones (1999: 54–58) reports on these limitations in some varieties of Welsh, though it seems that there is no fixed rule.

7.4.2 On the function of the responsive

There is consensus on the idea that this form basically serves to answer directly to a polar interrogative clause type, as in most examples of the previous section. However, there is no such an agreement about cases in which a morphologically similar form appears in other contexts. Sims-Williams (1984: 195 n.50), followed by Eska (1991), has assumed in these forms “an emphatic present indicative,” according to the former’s own insights on the function of the initial placement of the verb discussed in Section 8.2 below. I think that it is descriptively more economical to deal with a single category, the function of which is to give a direct response to a preceding utterance by which the addressee is (or feels him- / herself) required to answer. Most often, the responsive appears after a polar question, but the above definition can also include, as secondary functions, the response or reply to a preceding imperative or to a more or less strong statement, as in (112) and (113) above. This wider conception of the responsive has been defended by Draak (1952), whose consideration as ‘emotional reflex’ centers perhaps upon a rather secondary feature of the forms, that can be described in the more purely formal terms of above, i.e. as the way of marking a given verbal complex as a direct answer and, in this sense, as directly opposed to a preceding utterance. The functions identified by Jones (1999: 129–146) for the Modern Welsh responsive (i.e. answers, (dis-)agreements, response questions, acknowledgements, corrections) are much the same as those of the Old Irish corresponding clause type, and can be understood as a case of reactive illocution, in the sense of Roulet (2006: 121).

This is also the place to deal with 1SG forms that seem to be used as imperatives, as Thurneysen (1946: 373–374) states for *tíag* ‘I will go’ in (117) below. There is no doubt about the responsive character of 1SG forms such as *agur* in (111b) above (Eska 1991: 87), and even *cumcim* in (112), even though it does not reply to a polar question. This is why I propose to consider that a 1SG form such as *tíag* in (117) below is basically a responsive form that is secondarily used as an imperative. As is well-known, and due to semantic-pragmatic reasons, the imperative has in many languages a defective paradigm, especially in the 1SG person, which can be supplied by forms of other paradigms, as stated by Justus (2000); the Old Irish solution turns out to be the corresponding form of the responsive paradigm. The next section elaborates on this idea.

‘I will go⁵³ to take his head off the proud vassal who is pelting you ...’.

b. *tiach didiu mad ferr lat* (Sg 210 *marg.inf.* [= *Thes.* ii xxii])

<i>tiach</i>	<i>didiu</i>	
RESP/go/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT	then	
<i>ma-d-ferr</i>		<i>la-t</i>
if-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG.DECL-good/COMP		with-2SG

‘I will go then, if you prefer it’.

(118) *cenita chumgabthasiu cumgabthæ æcin* (Ml 84c3)

<i>ce-ni-ta¹-cum-gab-tha-siu</i>	
NEG.POLINT-COP.PRES.IND.2SG-PV-exalt-PRT.PASS/NOM.SG.M-NA.2SG	
<i>cum-gab-thæ</i>	<i>æcin</i>
COP.PRES.IND.RESP/PV-exalt-PRT.PASS/NOM.SG.M	indeed

‘are you not exalted? exalted truly’ (i.e. ‘are you not exalted? Yes, indeed’).

In line with Thurneysen’s interpretation, the form *tiagsa* of (117a) seems to be a hortative or exhortative, the function assigned by Aikhenvald (2010: 48) to 1st person imperative forms. But, at the same time, in line with the considerations in the previous section, I think, following Draak (1952: 76–78), that *tiag* and *tiach* in (117a,b) are basically responsive forms that are used as the 1SG form of the imperative paradigm. As a preliminary observation, this may well be a case in which defectiveness interacts with syncretism, in line with the observations of Sims (2015: 101). The situation of this responsive form can be considered from a slightly different perspective; see the next section.

Note further in example (117b) that the responsive form *tiach* properly acts as the apodosis of a conditional sentence, even though it is placed before the conditional protasis introduced by *mad-*. Certainly, the Old Irish evidence is too meager as to make general statements in this sense, but this use of *tiach* is in line with the close connection of two other clause types to the conditional protasis, to wit, the imperative (e.g. *Do that again and you’ll regret it*, see e.g. Aikhenvald 2010: 235–241, Jary and Kissine 2014: 110–160), and the polar interrogative, for which I refer to Nordström (2010: 226), who among other phenomena mentions the use of the English subordinator *if* both in protases and embedded polar interrogatives.

53 This is the translation in the *Thes.* As an anonymous reviewer notes, this translation should be changed to ‘Let me go’, i.e. to an interpretation more in line of an imperative form, under the assumption that the glossator has in mind the passage 16:9 of the Second Book of Samuel, which says *Vadam, et amputabo caput eius* (‘Let me go over and cut off his head’).

The specific idea I propose is that, whereas the imperative and the polar interrogative clause types, which have a basically initiating character, are also used as conditional protases, the Old Irish responsive, which is a basically reactive clause type, can also be used as a conditional apodosis.

7.4.4 The responsive among the polar interrogative and the imperative clause types

On the basis of the formal description in Section 7.4.1, and also of the functional characterization in Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3, Table 7.3 offers the paradigm of the responsive of the simple verb *caraid* ‘loves’ that is surrounded by the two other paradigms considered in this chapter, the polar interrogative and the imperative. To some extent, this table is a summary of the formal and functional description of this chapter, and aims at offering a specific argument for the idea expressed in Section 7.1 that these three Old Irish clause types belong together.

Tab. 7.3: Active paradigms of the polar interrogative, imperative and responsive clause types of AI (weak) *caraid* ‘loves’

	Polar interrogative clause type		Responsive clause type		Imperative clause type	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
1SG	<i>in-car(a)im</i>	<i>innad-car(a)im</i>	<i>car(a)im</i>	<i>nad-car(a)im</i>	<i>car(a)im</i>	<i>na-car(a)im</i>
2SG	<i>in-car(a)i</i>	<i>innad-car(a)i</i>	<i>car(a)i</i>	<i>nad-car(a)i</i>	<i>car</i>	<i>na-car</i>
3SG	<i>in-cara</i>	<i>innad-cara</i>	<i>cara</i>	<i>nad-cara</i>	<i>carad</i>	<i>na-carad</i>
1PL	<i>in-caram</i>	<i>innad-caram</i>	<i>caram</i>	<i>nad-caram</i>	<i>caram</i>	<i>na-caram</i>
2PL	<i>in-car(a)id</i>	<i>innad-car(a)id</i>	<i>car(a)id</i>	<i>nad-car(a)id</i>	<i>car(a)id</i>	<i>na-car(a)id</i>
3PL	<i>in-carat</i>	<i>innad-carat</i>	<i>carat</i>	<i>nad-carat</i>	<i>carat</i>	<i>na-carat</i>

To begin with the left part in Table 7.3, it seems clear that the functional link between polar interrogative and responsive clause types has a clear formal counterpart in that the latter simply represents a form of the former without its constitutive interrogative marker *in*^N. One is thus tempted to say that the responsive is subtractively derived from the polar interrogative form.

As for the relationship between responsive and imperative, Table 7.3 makes clear that the positive plural and 1SG forms of both paradigms are the same. Despite that fact that the 1SG was interpreted in the previous sections as basically a responsive form that can secondarily be used in imperative function, this 1SG form has also been considered in the imperative paradigm, in much the same way as the positive plural forms must be taken as both responsive and imperative forms.

To that extent, it is possible to say that the positive 1SG and the plural forms of the imperative and responsive paradigms are syncretic, as a case to be compared to other cases reported by Baerman, Brown, and Corbett (2005: 99–100) in which there is syncretism of values of tense, aspect or mood features.

This paradigmatic consideration, of course, stands in no contradiction to the fact that some forms may be found more frequently with a given function, so that the responsive function of the 1SG is expected to be more frequent than the imperative one, while the imperative function of the 2PL is surely more frequent than the responsive one.

Viewed from a general perspective, the formal similarity of the positive responsive and imperative paradigms is a clear sign of their functional closeness. The disposition in Table 7.3 provides a good basis to start with the general issue of the paradigmatic relationships between the six Old Irish clause types, in particular, with their paradigmatic cohesion, an issue that will be explored in the next chapter.

7.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has defended the idea that there are specific reasons for a comprehensive consideration of the Old Irish polar interrogative, imperative and responsive clause types. Largely, these reasons are related to their commonthetic character mentioned at the beginning of the chapter.

In this sense, a general feature of the Old Irish declarative, relative and *wh*-interrogative clause type forms described in Chapters 4 to 6 is their involvement in pragmatically marked constructions such as the cleft-sentence or those including a left-dislocated NP. To different degrees, the three clause types considered in this chapter are less prone (or directly not expected) to appear in these pragmatically marked structures. On the one hand, as noted in 3.2.3, the post-focus position of the cleft-sentence only accepts (leniting and nasalizing) relative and declarative clause type forms; the interrogative clause types as well as the responsive and the imperative clause types are excluded from that position. On the other hand, the Old Irish responsive seems to avoid nominal complements and is formally defined as lacking any pronominal affix, and all this also makes it plausible to suggest that it will be hardly combined with a left-dislocated NP. What should be investigated more in detail is whether a similar repulsion to combine with a left-dislocated NP can also be perceived with other clause types such as polar interrogatives and imperative clause types. One may easily imagine and find cases in which these clause types are attached to such a left-dislocated NP, but the overall impression is that this combination is less frequent than with a

declarative clause type. The opposition between categorial andthetic seems therefore to be related to illocutionary differences.

In addition, there are clear functional and formal links between the three clause types examined in this chapter. On the one hand, it is clear that polar interrogative and responsive clause types are directly related in their use, in the sense that the main function of the latter is to appear after the former. This is however not the only function of the responsive, and it is by virtue of one of its functional extensions considered in Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3 that at least the 1SG of the responsive is also used to express the corresponding form of the imperative paradigm. This structural interpretation complies with the defective character of the imperative paradigm, and with the fact that its 1SG is usually expressed by the corresponding person of functionally close paradigms. For the rest, the assumable imperative and responsive paradigms of Old Irish are syncretic in their plural forms.

Part III: The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

8 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

8.1 The case for clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex

The general aim of this chapter is to elaborate on the idea of the paradigm of the Old Irish clause types, and its starting point must be the often quoted passage of Sadock and Zwicky (1985).

In untangling clause types of a language from related phenomena, the following two observations are helpful: First, the clause types of a language form a *system* [emphasis of S. and Z.], in at least two senses: there are sets of corresponding clauses, the members of which differ only in belonging to different types, and second, the types are mutually exclusive, no sentence being simultaneously of two different types. ... Second, sentence types show certain *characteristic forms* across languages ...

(Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 158–160)

Clearly, the first observation of the previous quote, which introduces the notion of a system of forms of the same lexical basis that exclude each other, is important at this point. This idea of a system of clause types is also emphasized by Collins (2006: 181), and represents a very appropriate definition of the classical idea of paradigm that fits in perfectly with the situation of the Old Irish clause types.

Now that the clause types morphologically marked in the Old Irish verbal complex have been analyzed, the opinions by other scholars about the forms concerned can be addressed properly. As preliminary but necessary work for the general aim of this chapter, Section 8.2 proceeds to the critical review of previous interpretations of the forms involved.

The development and discussion of a paradigmatic presentation of the Old Irish clause types as coherent and significant as possible comes thereafter. Section 8.3 offers some observations on the expression of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex, on the basis of which Section 8.4 proposes a paradigm of clause types that includes the expression of negative polarity and pronominal affixes and that is illustrated with some specific verbs. Section 8.5 deals with a number of features of this paradigm: first, the relative disposition of the six Old Irish clause types, i.e. the possibility of arranging them in a semantic map; second, the void cells of the proposed paradigm; and third, the various degrees of formal distinctivity that some forms within that paradigm display. Section 8.6 considers the notions of relevance and (a)symmetry with respect to negative polarity and Section 8.7 summarizes the main findings of the chapter.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-008>

8.2 Previous scholarship on the Old Irish clause types

In the previous chapters, no radical new interpretation was put forward for the forms that have been traditionally interpreted as relative, interrogative and imperative; the responsive clause type has been incorporated to the list of clause types somewhat more recently. What this study offers, among other contributions, is the consideration of these forms as part of a functionally coherent system and the consequent identification of the declarative (clause type) forms as a further type to be included in the same system of clause types morphologically marked in the Old Irish verbal complex. The functional and structural consequences of this denomination go beyond the mere use of a tag, and can be considered in this section in which previous scholarship on the forms considered is discussed.

Most frequently, the declarative clause type forms have been interpreted as main clause forms, as in relatively recent times by scholars discussing the diachronic origin of the Old Irish absolute (declarative) forms. For example, Schrijver (1994: 180; 1997a) speaks about a “main clause verbal particle *es,” Schumacher (1999: 454) also considers a “main clause form” (‘Hauptsatzform’), whereas McCone (2006: 94–95) works with the oppositional value of the verbal complex marked as belonging to a non-relative, main clause.

Apart from the fact that main and declarative clauses are not coextensive, as stated in Section 1.7 above, the consequences of the observations quoted in the previous paragraph for the synchronic analysis of Old Irish verbal morphology have not been developed systematically. This is probably due to two reasons. On the one hand, the lack of mutation in the deuterotonic declarative clause type compound verb has probably been considered as a sort of default form that serves as a mere basis form for the relative mutations. However, such compounds with unmutated anlauting consonant in its tonic part do appear in actual utterances and, consequently, must receive a functional identification according to the formal opposition(s) in which they undoubtedly take part. On the other hand, the defective character of the absolute relative paradigm noted in Section 4.3 has probably acted as an obstacle to its consideration as an actual paradigm, as in the classical descriptions of Strachan or Thurneysen, in which absolute relative forms are simply noted as additional forms attached somehow to the paradigm of absolute (declarative) and conjunct forms. True, paradigmatic defectiveness can be perhaps an intermediate stage before paradigmatic elimination, but it does not mean paradigmatic inexistence, and three relative absolute forms (i.e. the 3rd persons and the 1PL) can be taken as a basis solid enough to consider the existence of a paradigm in which some cells make use of the compounding strategy.

In this section, I focus on the basically synchronic consideration of the so-called absolute and conjunct forms. As will be observed in the discussion below on some relevant descriptive proposals, the label ‘absolute’ has usually been applied only to the declarative clause absolute verb forms, and this is probably due to the idea that there is some structural correlation between absolute inflection and deuterotonic compound form, on the one hand, and between conjunct inflection and prototonic compound form, on the other. As stated in Sections 2.4.4, 4.2, and 7.3, the consideration of those pairs in terms of (morphologically) independent and dependent forms respectively makes sense provided that this is restricted to the declarative and relative clause type forms.

A further aspect to be considered is the role and importance granted to Bergin’s Law in the interpretation of the independent forms, properly, of the declarative absolute and deuterotonic forms. In this regard, Cowgill (1975: 45–46) went so far as to state that the actual character of the conjunct endings must be determined according to that Law, which “shows that position in the clause and not compounding is the decisive factor in choice of endings.” If Bergin’s Law were not the result of conscious language manipulation, it should be considered as an archaic remnant of previous linguistic stages with no synchronic relevance in Old Irish, so that the basic analysis defended here in terms of clause typing would not be affected by this Law: conjunct endings and prototonic forms could be taken as the consequence of the non-initial position of the verb in those clause types, so that the morphological difference between declarative and relative clause types would be neutralized or suspended when there was no V1 order. However, Bergin’s Law has been considered in recent decades as representing no more than artificial or literary constructions, as observed in Section 3.5.

Sims-Williams’ (1984: 148) functional description takes Bergin’s Law described above in Section 3.4 as the basic reference to state the actual value of the opposition absolute / conjunct, and considers thus absolute (= ABS) and deuterotonic (= DT) as a set of forms opposed to another set including conjunct, prototonic, and “the forms combined with relative particles and object pronouns”; the sole justification is that the forms in this second set “are regular in their morphology and syntactical usage, whereas the ABS and DT are eccentric both in their morphology and in their regular initial position in the sentence.” Sims-Williams assigns an ‘unemphatic’ character to the “ABS and DT,” as opposed to the ‘emphatic’ conjunct and prototonic forms (when used as imperative and responsive).

The following observations can be opposed to this explanation: (i) The label ‘absolute’ should be applied not only to the declarative clause type form *beird*, but also to the relative clause type form *beires*, as noted in Section 4.2, and ‘deu-

terotonic' is not only to be applied to "*do-bbeir*" (i.e., to the non-lenited declarative clause type form of the lexical compound), but also to the relative compound verb with mutation (e.g. *fo-cheil* 'who hides'), as stated in Section 2.4.4. (ii) The morphological 'eccentric' character of the absolute and deuterotonic forms is certainly difficult to understand. (iii) The fact that the imperative and responsive paradigms make use of conjunct forms does not point inevitably to an inherently 'emphatic' character of the prototonic and conjunct forms. Certainly, imperative and responsive clause type forms may be considered as somehow more 'pragmatic' than other clause types, in line with the observations in Section 7.5, but this general impression can be more accurately formulated. (iv) Similarly, the characterization of absolute and deuterotonic forms as 'unemphatic' can be formulated in more specific pragmatic terms, namely, as expressing various clause types.

McCone (1997a: 2–3) grants precedence to the semantic-functional difference between 'preverbs', i.e. the lexical preverbs seen in Section 2.3.2 above, whose absence / presence decides the simple or compound character of the lexical verb respectively, on the one hand, and the conjunct particles in Section 2.3.1, whose absence / presence decides whether the verb – simple or compound – is independent or dependent, on the other. The terms dependent and independent are descriptively appropriate, as noted in Section 2.4.4, provided that they are taken in a morphological sense and referred only for the declarative and relative clause types: that is to say, the variation between such independent and dependent forms is given in the expression of declarative and relative clause types. The other Old Irish clause types have no such formal opposition, as noted in Section 7.3.

Koch's (1987: 168) basic idea that the absolute (declarative) verbs "confirmed to the listener that he was hearing the beginning of the sentence, that he had missed nothing ahead of V" could perhaps be related to the proposed analysis in terms of an opposition between declarative and relative clause type verbs, in the sense that the absolute declarative clause type verb may be interpreted as a marker of syntactic independence in opposition to the relative verb, which marks syntactic dependency. However, the same independency may be assumed for the imperative verbal complex and/or for the declarative clause deuterotonic verbal complex. Koch's observation, if it is to be interpreted as referring to syntactic independence, is best captured by the declarative clause type characterization.

A further attempt to define the Old Irish opposition absolute / conjunct is Isaac's (2001: 157–161), who applies to the Old Irish system the model of the double inflection used in the Ancient Egyptian verb (defined basically as emphatic vs non-emphatic). According to Isaac, the Egyptian emphatic form is used when

the verb appears in clause-initial position, and the non-emphatic one when it appears after the negative, affirmative, and interrogative particles. Isaac (2001: 161) explains further: “The emphatic forms have a topicalizing effect on the predicative content of the verbal form; where the non-emphatic forms occur, in non-clause-initial position, other facets of the content of the clause have higher communicative prominence, e.g. negativity, consecutivity, the speaker’s guarantee of the truth of his utterance.” Note that this assignment of ‘emphasis’ seems to be the opposite of that made by Sims-Williams above.

The idea that pragmatic oppositions play a relevant role in the use and configuration of the Old Irish system of clause types is important and is also assumed in this study. Certainly, one could consider here McConvell’s (1996: 316–317) general observation that “certain elements are chosen as clitic hosts not solely by virtue of their structural position but also because of the discourse pragmatic role which they play. The most prominent of such roles so far encountered is that of Focus” (McConvell cites here the negative particle, and the interrogative forms). This idea could then be paired with the alleged unemphatic character of the conjunct verbal forms in the Old Irish verb morphology. However, some kind of pragmatic markedness should be expected then in the absolute forms as a consequence of their clause initial position, and this goes against the fact that this is precisely the unmarked position of the verb in Old Irish; put another way, it is not clear in which sense it can be said that the pragmatic force of clause initial, say, *beirid* ‘(s)he brings’ differs from that of clause initial *do·beir* ‘(s)he gives’ (= /do-‘berⁱ/), i.e. in which sense these two declarative forms are pragmatically different.⁵⁴

Finally, Russell (2005: 431) has stated that the ‘absolute’ form of the V1 simple verb was used “in a declarative sentence with no negative or interrogative particle or conjunction,” but the equally absolute relative forms are not considered and he makes no explicit mention of the category of clause typing.

To sum up, apart from its suitability and theoretical basis, the description advocated in this study in terms of clause type distinctions implies a more comprehensive and economical consideration of the relevant morphological markers of both simple and compound verbs, and understands the phenomenon of composition as a morphosyntactic procedure serving a wide range of functions: as

⁵⁴ This consideration is perhaps related to Isaac’s (1996: 357) perception of the word order of the Welsh poetical texts: “While the initial position of the verb is properly to be regarded as a feature of basic order, it may be that the ‘special emotive force’ Koch mentions is really a feature of the absolute forms: they are clearly a marked category, and as such may have an emphasising function of some sort, though it is difficult to characterise this precisely.”

noted in Section 2.3, the more or less homogeneous sets of conjunct particles and lexical preverbs can be identified as inflectional and derivational procedures respectively.

The prominence of the Old Irish relative verbal complex in the expression of subordination is undeniable, since it is used in quite a number of subordinate clauses, as observed in Chapter 5 above. The fact that a good deal of subordinate clauses makes use of the declarative clause type form, as illustrated in Section 5.5.2, is no argument against the proposed basic description, in so far as the subordinate types involved (mainly some types of adverbial clauses such as causal and modal) represent a type of clause that is less subordinate than restrictive relative clauses.

8.3 The morphological expression of clause types in the Old Irish verbal complex

After the analysis of the previous chapters, we are in a position to make a more comprehensive statement about the role that the category of clause typing plays in the verbal complex described in Chapter 2. I will refer to three general features of this category as it is morphologically expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex, namely, pervasiveness, preferential location, and portmanteau character.

In order to make clear the extent of this general characterization, Section 8.3.1 briefly considers the other categories expressed in the verbal complex as well as their morphological means, and Section 8.3.2 recapitulates the morphological strategies used to express clause typing and compares them with those of the other categories. Section 8.3.2 also makes clear that the category of clause typing is the most pervasive one in the Old Irish verbal complex, since it potentially affects every slot of this morphological structure, and Section 8.3.3 that some slots of the verbal complex are the most typical when it comes to expressing clause typing. Finally, Section 8.3.4 establishes the categories with which clause typing is expressed in the form of portmanteau morphemes.

8.3.1 Grammatical categories other than clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex

Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 40–43) propose a list of eight “syntactic operators” that take part in the clause and that are “qualitatively different from predicates and their arguments”: aspect, time, negation, modality (that refers to obligation or permission), status (that refers to necessity and possibility), illocutionary

force, which “refers whether an utterance is an assertion, a question, a command or an expression of a wish,” directionals (“markers which indicate direction”) and evidentials.

With the exception of evidentials, the other syntactic operators included in Van Valin and LaPolla’s list are expressed in the verbal complex described in Chapter 2, including directionals, which I identify with most lexical preverbs. The list of categories other than clause typing and directionals that are considered now are the following: (i) tense, (ii) mood, (iii) aspect, (iv) diathesis, (v) person, (vi) number, (vii) gender, (viii) negative polarity.

(i) Old Irish distinguishes four tenses: present, imperfect, future, and preterite. The use of the conjunct particle *no-* in slot 1 for basically simple verbs expressing positive declarative and relative clause type in the imperfect and associated forms (i.e. past subjunctive and conditional), as noted in Section 4.2, is rather a marker of clause type. Apart from that, tense is marked by means of different verbal stems in slot 4 in which a temporal suffix can be analyzed or not, and different inflectional endings for present, imperfect, and preterite in slot 5.

(ii) As regards mood, and apart from the indicative, there is a subjunctive form usually associated with (i.e. derived from) the present form, and this is why it is called present subjunctive. On the basis of the subjunctive and future forms, a past form is derived by adding the inflectional endings of the imperfect: the resulting paradigms are those of the past subjunctive and the conditional respectively; the latter is an instance of the so-called Western conditional, a notion for which I refer to García-Castillero (2017b). Mood is therefore expressed by the stems and endings in slots 4 and 5 also considered in the previous point. If the potential meaning of the particle *ro-* considered in the next point is included here, then slots 1 and 3 are also a place in which mood is expressed.

As a result of the tense and mood distinctions, Old Irish has the following seven basic paradigms: present (indicative), imperfect, present subjunctive, past subjunctive, future, conditional, and preterite.

(iii) Old Irish distinguishes between perfective and non-perfective aspect. The perfective version of the preterite, usually termed perfect, is a very frequent form. Less frequently, present indicative and subjunctive can also have a perfective version, which expresses potentiality. The future and conditional have no perfective version. Aspect may be expressed by preverbal particles in slots 1 or 3 or by different (suppletive) stems in slot 4.

More details on the tense, mood, and aspect distinctions can be found in Thurneysen (1946: 335–474), McCone (1997a: 21–62).

(iv) Apart from its exclusive formation of the 1st and 2nd persons (i.e. slot 2), the passive voice makes use a specific set of endings in slot 5 and a specific stem

in slot 4 for the preterite, which differs from the deponent and active preterite stem.

(v)–(vii) In active and deponent verbs, the inflectional endings included in slot 5 of the Old Irish verbal complex usually distinguish 1st, 2nd and 3rd persons in singular and plural. Recall that, as noted in Sections 2.8(a) and 4.3.1, some conjunct forms include the expression of the SG persons in the final part of slot 4. As observed in Section 2.6 above, the affixal pronouns in slots 2 and 6 distinguish the same persons, and the 3SG also between masculine, feminine, and neuter.

(viii) Negative polarity is basically a matter of the negative particles appearing in slot 1. Since the use of this type of particles provokes the use of the prototonic form of the lexical compounds, it is to be assumed that slots 3 and 4 are also involved in the expression of this category.

8.3.2 The pervasiveness of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex

In Old Irish, clause typing is the category that touches all slots of the morphological structure given in Section 2.2.2, as stated in García-Castillero (2012: 63). To be more precise, the expression of clause types in the Old Irish verbal complex makes use of the following formal elements.

(i) The conjunct particles in slot 1 express every clause type in Old Irish, either in combination with negative polarity or alone as the only carrier of the specific clause type at stake. This statement includes the use of the semantically void conjunct particle *no-* for the expression of some forms of the positive declarative and relative clause types in simple verbs.

(ii) The opposition between Classes A/B and C of pronominal infixes included in slot 2 basically distinguish declarative from relative clause types. The mere presence of a suffixed pronoun in slot 6 implies declarative clause type.

(iii) The mutations (i.e. the so-called autonomous mutations, according to Section 2.5.3) and their contrastive lack, which appear in either slot 3 or 4, express the basic difference between relative and declarative clause types.

(iv) The minimal opposition between prototonic [3 - 4 (- 5)] and deuterotonic [1 - 4 (- 5)] forms of a given lexical compound basically distinguishes clause types: as observed in Chapter 7, positive imperative and responsive clause type forms make use of the prototonic, whereas the deuterotonic form of a lexical compound is the expected form of a relative or declarative clause type. This means that slot 3 is also involved in the expression of clause types.

(v) The suppletion of the stem appearing in slot 4 is also a way of distinguishing clause types in Old Irish, not only for the expression of specific imperative

stems, but also for the other clause types in the present indicative paradigm of the substantive verb and of the copula. These paradigms receive a detailed analysis in Chapter 9.

(vi) The specific relative and declarative absolute endings, as well as the specific imperative 2SG and 3SG imperative endings occupy slot 5.

Table 8.1 shows the different slots in which the categories considered in this and in the previous section are included.

Tab. 8.1: Grammatical categories expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex

	Slot 1 Particle(s) / preverb	Slot 2 Pronominal affix	Slot 3 Preverb(s)	Slot 4 Verbal stem	Slot 5 Verbal ending	Slot 6 Pronominal affix
Tense						
Mood						
Aspect						
Person						
Number						
Gender						
Polarity						
Diathesis						
Clause typing						

It is important to state that Table 8.1 represents all the slots in which a given category is potentially expressed. For both those categories that occupy more slots such as clause typing or mood, and others that occupy fewer slots such as tense, aspect, and gender, it must be clearly stated that no Old Irish verbal complex makes use of all the implied markers at the same time to express that category. One of the reasons is the limitation stated in Section 2.2.2 on the pronominal affixes, which appear only in slot 2 or 6, but never in both positions at the same time. As observed in Section 4.9.1, this sort of complementary distribution can also be detected with the marking of the declarative and relative clause types, which are either expressed at the left edge (when the verb is basically compound) or at the right edge (when the verb is simple) of the verbal complex. Recall, however, that this does not mean that number and person are only expressed in slot 2 or 6, since they also appear in the inflectional endings in slot 5.

Another observation that is valid for polarity and clause typing refers to the involvement of both slots 3 and 4. Reference is made here to the interplay between deuterotonic and prototonic forms described in Section 2.4 above, in the sense that the addition of the negative conjunct particle to a lexical compound

triggers the use of the prototonic version of the latter, i.e. the use of the string formed by slots 3 and 4. In other words, in the expression of some categories such as negative polarity, one may state a distinction between the markers used in their expression: on the one hand, there is the primary, in the sense of *sine qua non* marker of the category; on the other, other markers may be taken as secondary, in the sense of determined by the presence of the primary marker, even though they are a source of considerable formal variation, as happens with the deuterotonic vs prototonic opposition.

Some categories are only rarely expressed in some of the slots that have been assigned to them in Table 8.1. This is clearly the case of negative polarity just alluded to, and also of aspect: while this category is mostly marked by particles in slots 1 and 3 (the preverbs *ad-*, *com-*, and regularly *ro-*, which is counted as a conjunct particle in this function), it can also make use of a different stem, as in e.g. the remarkable case of the opposition between preterite *luid* '(s)he went' and the corresponding perfective form *do-coïd*. The case of diathesis is partially similar, since passive is at least expressed by means of inflectional endings in slot 5, though the verbal stem (slot 4) changes more or less drastically in some preterite forms (those of the strong verbs). Clause typing also tends to appear in some specific slots, as argued in the next section.

8.3.3 The preferential location of the clause type marking in the Old Irish verbal complex

The pervasiveness of the morphological markers of clause typing in the verbal complex should not make us forget that there are some specific slots in which this category is most often expressed. In this regard, it is necessary to consider first a component of the verbal complex that was not considered in the previous section, namely those elements that have lexical meaning. These elements appear at least included in slot 4, there being other frequent possibilities such as the combinations of slots 3 and 4, of slots 1 and 4, or of all three slots (i.e. of slots 1, 3, and 4). The presence of a lexical preverb in slots 1 and/or 3, as stated in Section 2.3.2 above, involves a lexical compound. Despite the special nature of slot 1, which may include either lexical or grammatical elements, it is clear that the central part of the verbal complex, i.e. slots 3 and 4, mainly express lexical meaning, whereas the peripheral slots, i.e. slots 1 and 2 at the left edge, and slots 5 and 6 at the right edge, are proper for grammatical elements.

The placement of the person (and number/gender) markers in Table 8.1 complies perfectly with the suggested distribution, and this also agrees with the limited involvement of slot 4 (that of the verbal stem) in the expression of aspect and diathesis, as noted at the end of the previous section.

The expression of tense and mood also involves markers located at the edges of the verbal complex, but it is also true that they frequently involve some variation in the verbal stem, i.e. in slot 4: most frequently, this involves a suffix added to the basic verbal stem, but tense and aspect distinctions involve the use of suppletive stems. This relatively more central or internal position of the formal markers of tense, aspect, and mood with respect to other categories such as person is clearly due to the greater relevance of the former on the lexical meaning of the verbal complex. The notion of relevance considered here is Bybee's (1985: 13): "A meaning element is *relevant* to another meaning element *if the semantic content of the first directly affects or modifies the semantic content of the second* [emphasis of J.B.]."

The formal expression of clause typing is most often located at the edges of the verbal complex and, in this sense, coincides with the expression of the category of person (and number / gender). This idea was introduced in Section 4.9.1 and refers not only to the pronominal references in slots 2 and 6, but also to the inflectional endings in slot 5. The other place in which clause typing is usually expressed is slot 1, in which it often coincides with the expression of negative polarity. See further Section 8.6 for the notion of relevance.

8.3.4 The exclusive and portmanteau expression of the Old Irish clause types

In line with the previous section, a final but important observation on the categories that are expressed together with clause typing in the same morphological element, i.e. by means of a portmanteau morpheme, is in order at this point, among other reasons, because this observation constitutes the basis for the paradigm of clause types proposed for Old Irish in the next section.

Before proceeding to the analysis of these portmanteau morphemes, it is necessary to say that clause typing is also expressed in Old Irish by means of exclusive markers, i.e. formal strategies that only express this category. This is the case of some conjunct particles such as the oblique relative $-(s)a^N$ -, the (positive) polar interrogative in^N -, as well as the less frequent indefinite relative *cecha*- and *wh*-interrogative $ci(a)$ -, provided that the positive polarity that these forms also express is not counted as a category expressed by them. Furthermore, the autonomous mutations (and their contrastive lack) in the deuterotonic form of lexical

compounds are clear cases of clause type markers, namely of relative and declarative clause types. Finally, the use of the prototonic version of lexical compounds as the morphological expression of other clause types such as responsive and imperative should also be mentioned in this set of exclusive markers.

As mentioned at the end of the previous section, the two Old Irish categories that are involved in portmanteau morphemes also expressing clause typing are negative polarity and person (with number and gender). The negative conjunct particles express clause type, so that there is no exclusive expression of negative polarity in Old Irish; this portmanteau character has been considered in Section 2.7, which has discussed the affixal character of these conjunct particles. As for the pronominal references, the phenomena at stake are the distinctions between Classes A/B (for declarative) and Class C (for relative) clause types in the infixes, the inherently declarative character of the verbs with a suffixed pronoun, and the declarative and relative clause type absolute endings, all of them considered at once in Section 4.9.1; add to this the specific imperative endings in the active paradigm observed in Section 7.3, and, perhaps, the definitory character of the responsive clause type form as a form deprived of any pronominal affix (for which see Section 7.4.1).

The previous arguments suffice to justify the inclusion of the categories of (negative) polarity and person in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types, but it should be said that these two types of portmanteau morphemes are not due to mere chance, since both negative polarity and person are somehow related to the grammatical category of clause typing. On the one hand, negative polarity may sometimes suppose a more or less different speech act. Reference is made to the widely acknowledged idea, referred to by Croft (1994: 466) and Miestamo (2007: 561–561) among others, that negative imperatives are rather prohibitives, and very often make use of a negative marker that differs from that used for the declarative forms, as precisely in Old Irish, or even a different verbal form, as in Spanish, in which such a negative command obligatorily uses the subjunctive form and not the imperative form used in the positive form (e.g. 2SG *come* ‘eat!’, but *no comas* ‘don’t eat!’). Accepting thus the semantic value as a prohibitive (or inhibitive), however, the Old Irish forms such as *natáirged* (*cách*) ‘let no (every one) procure’, quoted in (109a) above, as well as the remaining negative forms that are based on the positive imperative form, are considered imperative forms in this study. Section 8.6 below elaborates on the paradigmatic features of negative polarity in Old Irish. On the other hand, both general and Old Irish specific cases in which there is a special link between person and clause type have been adduced in Section 4.9 to propose a preferred pronominal argument structure.

Section 8.5.3 below offers more observations on the relevance of clause typing onto the expression of person in Old Irish.

8.4 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types and its categories

The previous section offered a comprehensive description of the morphological strategies used in the Old Irish verbal complex to express the six clause types distinguished in this language, namely, declarative, relative, *wh*- and polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types. These six clause types constitute the basis from which one of the axis of the Old Irish paradigm of clause types, the horizontal one in Tables 8.2 to 8.6 below, is built up. The specific arrangement of the clause types in this horizontal dimension is justified in the next section.

The basic assumption of the syntactic possibilities of the Old Irish verbal complex has been suggested by Henry (1977), who explicitly mentions these clause types.⁵⁵ A less systematic treatment can be found in Ternes (1996: 271–273).

As noted in the previous section, the categories that interact more closely with clause typing in Old Irish are two, polarity, expressed mainly by conjunct particles in slot 1, and person (with number / gender), expressed by both the pronominal affixes in either slots 2 or 6 and the inflectional endings in slot 5. The vertical axis of the paradigm of clause types proposed in this section therefore includes these two categories, i.e., the possibility of negative, versus unmarked positive polarity, and the possibility of having an affixal pronoun.

Table 8.2 states the basic possibilities of both simple and lexical compounds, and is illustrated in Tables 8.3 to 8.6 with various verbs. It is important to stress that the Old Irish paradigm of clause types proposed in this section only includes those combinations that are expressed by a verbal complex, as defined above in Section 2.2.2, and this means that Tables 8.2 to 8.6 do not include the periphrastic construction of the *wh*-interrogative with tonic *wh*-pronoun and relative clause type form, which is the most frequent one in the Old Irish contemporaneous texts.

⁵⁵ Some other aspects of Henry's interpretation, however, seem more disputable to me. Thus, Henry's (1977: 40–41) main descriptive conclusion that interrogatives, negatives, and compound verb forms imply a copular clause seems to be quite forced for the negatives (*nis-car* should be understood as 'it is not that (s)he loved her', and not simply as '(s)he didn't love her') and it is really difficult to accept for compound verbs of the type *do-beir* (for which Henry 1977: 41 assumes "a kind of copula-adjunct structure"). Henry's (1977: 36 fn.4) claim on the relationship between *wh*-interrogative and copular clauses (more in particular, those of the cleft-sentences) in Old Irish is also assumed in this study (see Section 6.6), but this does not mean that the negative verbal complex must receive exactly the same syntactic interpretation.

Tab. 8.2: The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interrogative	Polar interr.	Responsive	Imperative
1	Absolute declarative form (also 2 and 4, with <i>no-</i>)	Absolute relative form (also 2 and 4, with <i>no-</i>)			Conjunct form	Conjunct form (2sg and 3sg imperative endings)
Positive	Deuterotonic form without mutation	Deuterotonic form with mutation or <i>-(s)dⁿ, cech(a)-, no-</i> + prototonic / conjunct form	<i>cí(a)-/ce-/ci-</i> + prototonic / conjunct form (or periphrasis according to Section 6.3.1)	<i>inⁿ.</i> + prototonic / conjunct form	Prototonic form	Prototonic form (2sg and 3sg imperative endings)
2	Compound (Simple verbs with <i>no-</i> + conjunct form)					
3	Suffixed form (also 4, with <i>no-</i>)					
Positive + pronominal affix	Deuterotonic + Class A/B infix	Deuterotonic form + Class C infix or <i>-(s)dⁿ, no-</i> + Class C infix or <i>cech(a)-</i> + Class A infix + conjunct form	<i>ci(ch)-</i> + Class A/C infix + prototonic / conjunct form (or periphrasis according to Section 6.3.1)	<i>inⁿ.</i> + Class C infix + prototonic / conjunct form	Deuterotonic + Class A/B infix (Simple verbs with <i>no-</i> + Class A infix)	Deuterotonic + Class A/B infix (Simple verbs with <i>no-</i> + Class A infix) (2sg and 3sg imperative endings)
4	Compound					

Tab. 8.2 (continuation): The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interrogative	Polar interr.	Responsive imperative
5	Negative (Always with prototonic / conjunct form)	<i>nī-/nī-</i> <i>nicon-</i>	<i>nad^{L/N}- / nadcon^{L/N}-</i> or <i>-(s)a^N-na-</i>	<i>cani- / innad^N-</i>	<i>nā-/nā-</i> (2sg and 3sg imperative endings)
6	Negative + pronominal infix	<i>nī-/nī-</i> + Class A infix	<i>nach-</i> + Class A/C infix or <i>-(s)a^N-na-</i> + Class C infix	<i>cani-</i> + Class A infix	<i>na(ch)-</i> + Class A/C infix (2sg and 3sg imperative endings)

An observation on Table 8.2 that clearly speaks for its descriptive adequacy is in order at this moment. The Old Irish paradigm of clause types that incorporates negative polarity and the affixal pronoun includes all the conjunct particles considered above in Section 2.3.1, with the exception of the particle *ro-*, which basically expresses aspect, and of the rare reciprocal particle *imm(a)-*. In other words, virtually every preverbal element with a grammatical meaning used in the Old Irish verbal complex (and this refers to the elements considered in Section 2.3.1) finds a place in Table 8.2. This includes the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*, as well as the semantically void conjunct particle *no-*, the uses of which are mostly related to clause typing: for basically simple verbs, *no-* serves to express the positive declarative and relative clause type forms of the imperfect, past subjunctive and conditional (Section 4.2); the 1SG, 2SG and 2PL of the positive relative clause type (Section 4.3); quite a number of combinations of positive declarative clause type forms with an infix (Section 4.4), and every combination of positive relative clause type forms with an infix (Section 4.8). Only in the case of the imperative clause, it seems to be only related to the expression of pronominal infixes (Section 7.3).

The fact that Table 8.2 includes all the conjunct particles of the Old Irish verbal complex except *ro-* and *imm(a)-*, of course, does not mean that clause type markers and affixed pronouns only appear in slots 1 and 2. As observed in Section 4.4 and in the previous section, a feature of basically simple verbs is precisely that clause types and affixed pronouns can be expressed (or appear) in slots 5 and 6 of the Old Irish verbal complex.

The Old Irish paradigm of clause types presented in Table 8.2 is illustrated in this section with three verbs, the simple *caraid* ‘loves’ (AI present class) in Tables 8.3 and 8.4, as well as the compounds *fo-cain* ‘accompanies with song’ in Table 8.5 and *do-gní* ‘makes’ in Table 8.6. The forms are mostly the 3SG of the present indicative active and passive (with the exception of the imperative, in which there is no possibility of tense, aspect or mood alternation), and are combined with the 3SG n. affix in Table 8.3 and with the 2SG affix in the other tables. Needless to say, the Old Irish evidence does not suffice to support all the forms included in those tables, even for a frequent verb such as *do-gní* ‘makes, does’, and it must be acknowledged that those paradigms result from the extrapolation of the previous descriptive observations. Tables 8.3 to 8.6 do not include the relative verbal complex formed with the conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*, and relative nasalization is exemplified only in its use after subordinating particles, that which was considered original in Section 5.7.2.

Tab. 8.3: The paradigm of clause types of the active 3SG present indicative of *caraid* ‘loves’

Declarative	Relative	<i>Wh</i> -interrogative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
<i>caraid</i> 1 ‘(s)he loves’	<i>caras</i> ‘who(m) (s)he loves’			<i>cara</i> ‘yes, (s)he loves’	<i>carad</i> ‘let him/ her love’
2	<i>no-chari</i> ‘that you love’	<i>cia-cara</i> ‘who loves?’	<i>in-cara</i> ‘does (s)he love?’		
<i>cairthi</i> 3 ‘(s)he loves it’					
<i>na-chari</i> 4 ‘you love it’	<i>nod-chara</i> ‘who loves it’	<i>cich-chara</i> ‘who loves it?’	<i>ind-chara</i> ‘does (s)he love it?’		<i>na-charad</i> ‘let him / her love it’
<i>ni-cara</i> 5 ‘(s)he does not love’	<i>nad-chara</i> ‘who does not love’		<i>innad-cara</i> ‘does not (s)he love?’	<i>nad-cara</i> ‘no, (s)he does not love’	<i>na-carad</i> ‘let him / her not love’
<i>ni-chara</i> 6 ‘(s)he does not love it’	<i>nach-chara</i> ‘who does not love it’		?		<i>nach-charad</i> ‘let him / her not love it’

Obviously, since the Old Irish imperative makes no tense, aspect or mood distinctions, and aligns rather with the present stem, the paradigm of clause types corresponding to any other tense or mood listed in Section 8.3.1 would be different in the sense that it should not include an imperative form. The remaining clause types are available for the imperfect, present subjunctive, past subjunctive, future, conditional, preterite, and perfect forms. For the systematic lack of negative content interrogative clause type and the combination of responsive forms with pronominal affixes, see Section 8.5.2 below. For the question mark in the cell of the negative polar interrogative clause type with pronominal affix, see Section 7.2 above, and also Section 8.5.2.

The mixed paradigms of simple verbs considered in Chapter 4 (in particular in Section 4.9.1) are made visible in Tables 8.3 and 8.4 in the following manner. In Table 8.3, which includes only active forms of *caraid* ‘loves’, the cells of the positive relative simple and compound forms are not separated by the horizontal line, since both belong to the paradigm considered in Section 4.3.1. Also in Table 8.3, rows 3 and 4 of the declarative clause type constitute a part of the same paradigm, as observed in Section 4.4.1. In Table 8.4, which includes the passive forms of the simple *caraid*, the obligatory compound character of the 1st and 2nd

persons entails that the cells in rows 1 and 4 of the positive declarative and imperative clause types, those in rows 2 and 4 of the positive polar interrogative, and those in rows 5 and 6 of the negative declarative, and negative imperative clause type belong to the same paradigm; this is considered at length in Section 4.5.1.

Tab. 8.4: The paradigm of clause types of the passive 2SG and 3SG present indicative of *caraid* ‘loves’

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interrogative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
1	<i>carth(a)ir</i> ‘(s)he is loved’	<i>carthar</i> ‘who is loved’			<i>carthar</i> ‘yes, (s)he is loved’	<i>carthar</i> ‘let him / her be loved’
2			<i>cia·carthar</i> ‘who is loved?’	<i>in·carthar</i> ‘is (s)he loved?’		
4	<i>not·charthar</i> ‘you are loved’	<i>(intain) nondat·charthar</i> ‘(when) you are loved’		<i>indat·charthar</i> ‘are you loved?’		<i>not·charthar</i> ‘be (you) loved’
5	<i>ni·carthar</i> ‘(s)he is not loved’	<i>nad·charthar</i> ‘who is not loved’		<i>innad·carthar</i> ‘is not (s)he loved?’	<i>nad·carthar</i> ‘no, (s)he is not loved’	<i>na·carthar</i> ‘let him not be loved’
6	<i>nit·charthar</i> ‘you are not loved’	<i>(con-) nachit·charthar</i> ‘(so that) you are not loved’		?		<i>nachit·charthar</i> ‘don’t be loved’

Table 8.4 also illustrates some other inflectional features of the passive paradigms in simple verbs. One is the complete lack of pronominal suffixes noted in Section 4.5.1, which is reflected in the lack of row 3. Another one is the difference in the positive and negative relative forms of the passive 1st and 2nd persons, which – as also mentioned in Section 4.5.1 – only appear in subordinate clauses other than restrictive relatives and can be marked with relative nasalization; this is why they are separated by lines in Table 8.4: these 1st and 2nd persons have their proper 3rd person (say, *intain carthar* ‘when (s)he is loved’, with nasalization of the initial sound of the verb, according to Section 4.7.4) and therefore belong to paradigms different from the relative forms adduced.

Tab. 8.5: The paradigm of clause types of the active and passive 3SG present indicative of *fo-cain* ‘sings’

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interrogative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
2	<i>fo-cain</i> <i>fo-canar</i>	<i>fo-chain</i> <i>fo-chanar</i>	<i>cia-fochain</i> <i>cia-fochanar</i>	<i>in-fochain</i> <i>in-fochanar</i>	<i>fochain</i> <i>fochanar</i>	<i>fochned</i>
4	<i>fof-chain</i> <i>fof-chanar</i>	<i>fo(n)dot-chain</i> <i>(inta(i)n)</i> <i>fondot-chanar</i>	<i>cichit-fochain</i> <i>fochain</i>	<i>indot-fochain</i> <i>indot-fochanar</i>		<i>fof-chained</i> <i>fof-chanar</i>
5	<i>ni-fochain</i> <i>ni-fochanar</i>	<i>nad-fochain</i> <i>nad-fochanar</i>		<i>innad-fochain</i> <i>innad-fochanar</i>	<i>nad-fochain</i> <i>nad-fochanar</i>	<i>na-fochned</i> <i>na-fochnar</i>
6	<i>nit-fochain</i> <i>nit-fochanar</i>	<i>nachit-fochain</i> <i>(con-)</i> <i>nachit-fochanar</i>		?		<i>nachit-fochned</i> <i>nachit-fochnar</i>

As illustrated in Tables 8.5 and 8.6, lexical compounds display a formally simpler inflectional behavior in the sense that they have no mixed paradigms. However, the difference between deuterotonic and prototonic versions may be a source of considerable formal variation in Old Irish.

Tab. 8.6: The paradigm of clause types of the active and passive 3SG present indicative of *do-gní* ‘makes’

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interrogative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
2	<i>do-gní</i> <i>do-gníther</i>	<i>do-gní (J·γ)</i> <i>do-gníther (-γ)</i>	<i>cia-déni</i> <i>cia-déntar</i>	<i>in-déni</i> <i>in-déntar</i>	<i>déni</i> <i>déntar</i>	<i>dénad</i> <i>déntar</i>
4	<i>dot-gní</i> <i>dot-gníther</i>	<i>dodot-gní</i> <i>(inta(i)n)</i> <i>dodot-gníther</i>	<i>cichit-déni</i>	<i>indat-déni</i> <i>indat-déntar</i>		<i>dot-gníid</i> <i>dot-gníther</i>
5	<i>ní-déni</i> <i>ní-déntar</i>	<i>nad-déni</i> <i>nad-déntar</i>		<i>innad-déni</i> <i>innad-déntar</i>	<i>nad-déni</i> <i>nad-déntar</i>	<i>na-dénad</i> <i>na-déntar</i>
6	<i>nít-déni</i> <i>nít-déntar</i>	<i>nachit-déni</i> <i>(con-)</i> <i>nachit-déntar</i>		?		<i>nachit-dénad</i> <i>nachit-déntar</i>

The clause type paradigms corresponding to the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb and the copula are analyzed in the next chapter.

8.5 Paradigmatic cohesion, defectiveness, and distinctiveness

This section deals with issues related to the consistency and design of the Old Irish paradigm of clause types delineated in the previous section. First, the reasons for the arrangement of the six Old Irish clause types in the horizontal axis in Table 8.2 are given in Section 8.5.1. Second, the void cells in Table 8.2 (or in Tables 8.3 to 8.6), interpreted as cases of defectiveness, are addressed in Section 8.5.2. Third, as observed in Section 8.5.3, the clause types considered in Table 8.2 are not all equally distinguished for every category of the Old Irish verbal complex, there being some cells in which the clause type marking is clearer.

Most of the cases included in this section have already been dealt with in the previous chapters, so that they will be referred to only briefly. It is worth noting that these cases have in common that they have a pragmatic or discourse motivation. The situations considered in this section are therefore similar to those of the declarative clause type with affixal pronoun and relative clause type forms of simple verbs considered in Section 4.9 above, in which the notion of preferred pronominal argument structure was suggested. Given that clause typing is a pragmatic category, it is hardly surprising that the shape of the Old Irish paradigm of clause types be determined by discourse and pragmatic factors.

8.5.1 Paradigmatic relationships between the Old Irish clause types

The arrangement of the Old Irish clause types in the horizontal dimension of Table 8.2 attempts to reflect some structural relationships between the Old Irish clause types. The obvious theoretical counterpart of this idea is the notion of ‘semantic map’ developed by Haspelmath (2003), as noted in the previous chapter, or by Croft and Cruse (2004: 322), who state that “constructions must map onto a continuous region of conceptual space.” The horizontal dimension of Table 8.2 may thus be viewed as the conceptual space in which those clause types are distributed. This is a basically functional notion of paradigm cohesion, but I think it can be considered also in the morphological sense established by Sims (2015: 163–164).

The paradigmatic arrangement of the clause types in Table 8.2 can be viewed as an instantiation of the schema of basic illocutions proposed by Hengeveld et

alii (2007: 85), in which the declarative and imperative illocutions constitute the basic poles of the ‘assertive’ and ‘behavioural’ general types of illocutions. Hengeveld et alii (2007) propose a general split between ‘propositional’ (which further includes ‘assertive’ and ‘questioning’ illocutions) and ‘behavioural’ illocutions, which “aim at influencing the behaviour of the addressee and/or others.”

With respect to this classification, the Old Irish paradigm of clause types proposed in Table 8.2 permits us to establish the relationships between these three types, the assertive, the questioning and the behavioral. This is why, in line with the consideration of Section 7.4.4 on the formal and functional links between polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types, I propose to analyze separately the two halves that result if we cut Table 8.2 along the line between the *wh*- and the polar interrogative clause types. This is in line with the difference between categorial and thetic suggested in Chapter 7.

As for the set of declarative, relative and *wh*-interrogative clause types, and according to the description in Chapters 4 to 6, the relative form occupies an intermediate position between the two others. On the one hand, as stated in Section 5.7, relative nasalization represents a marker of subordination that is more main clause-like than relative lenition and that therefore stands closer to the declarative clause type. This difference can be made explicit by putting two columns in the relative clause type, the one for the nasalizing relative clause type appearing close to the declarative one. This could be done for the tables in the previous section, but it is definitively necessary for the clause type paradigm of the substantive verb presented in Section 9.3.1 below. Declarative and (both nasalizing and leniting) relative clause types are the only ones that can appear in the post-focus verb of the cleft-sentence, as stated in Section 3.2.3. On the other hand, the cleft-sentence is the model for the pattern of the Old Irish *wh*-interrogative clause type in which the stressed *wh*-pronoun is followed by a relative clause, as stated in Section 6.6. That relative and *wh*-interrogative clause types are syntactically related structures is usually acknowledged: see Lehmann (1984: 325–329), Hopper and Traugott (1993: 175), Harris and Campbell (1995: 293–307), Bhat (2004: 189–190). The inherent focused character of the *wh*-element of the *wh*-interrogative clause type is the illocutionary force lacking in the relative clause type, as variously noted in Section 6.6 above.

As for the right half of Table 8.2 above, the same idea of a functionally intermediate form also applies to the responsive with respect to the polar interrogative and imperative verb forms, a point already made in Section 7.4.4. On the one hand, the responsive is most properly the answer to a polar interrogative clause

type, and, correspondingly, it seems that the morphology of the former represents the outcome of a process of subtraction of the characteristic formal features of the latter. On the other, responsive and imperative share the 1SG and the plural persons. A further argument for the cohesion of these three clause types, i.e. the symmetric character of their negative versions, is given at the end of Section 8.6 below. Thurneysen (1946: 29) suggested that the responsive is related to the relative forms, and in fact, both Old Irish clause types (especially in the passive paradigm) have the same form in some cases, as can be observed in Tables 8.4 to 8.6 above. A reason for this similarity could perhaps be the dependent character of both forms, in the sense that the relative verb syntactically depends on a previous antecedent and the responsive pragmatically depends on a preceding utterance. However, and in much the same way as the relative and responsive clause type forms are mostly different, the relation of the responsive to the polar interrogative and imperative clause types is much more direct and solid than the structural parallelism hinted at in Thurneysen's suggestion.

If, as stated in Section 1.7.3 above, the declarative, interrogative and imperative clause types are the cross-linguistically basic clause types, it seems that the somewhat more sophisticated Old Irish paradigm includes clause types that occupy functionally intermediate positions between these three basic types.

8.5.2 Defectiveness in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types

Table 8.2 has some void cells. Some of them, the cases included in (a) below, are simply due to the proper constituency of the clause type at stake. In other cases, however, the lack of a given combination of clause type and polarity or affixal pronoun, as in (b) and (c) below, are due to a specific functional reason. It is important to stress that the lack of a given verbal complex does not necessarily mean that the corresponding function is not expressed at all in Old Irish. In other words, this combination may not be expressed at all, or may have an alternative expression by means of a periphrastic structure.

(a) There is no absolute form for the positive *wh*- and polar interrogative clause types, and this is due to the definitory structure of the corresponding clause types. Similarly, as a consequence of another definitory property, there are no suffixed forms in clause types other than the declarative one.

Another structural hole in the paradigm of Table 8.2 is the lack of responsive clause type forms with pronominal affixes. This is a definitory property of the Old Irish responsive as a formally separate category, but this does not mean that verbal complexes including a pronominal affix are not permitted at all in Old Irish

to answer a question. In example (106b) in Section 7.2 above, the form *atbeir* ‘he says it’ is used to answer a preceding polar interrogative clause type form.

(b) The Old Irish verbal complex has no negative *wh*-interrogative particle or particle string (**cina(d)*· or the like); the negative polar interrogative particle *cani*·, which seems to precede chronologically the equivalent and more usual *in-nad*^N, could be a combination of an element akin to the *wh*-interrogative pronoun seen in Section 6.3.1 with the negative particle. Nevertheless, if that was actually the origin of the form *cani*·, it has been reinterpreted as a polar interrogative marker. The lack of a negative *wh*-interrogative verbal complex is most probably due to the fact that such a combination of clause type and polarity is relatively rare, as recognized by Erteschik-Shir (1992: *passim*, especially 42–43); Laughren, Pensalfini, and Mylne (2005: 375) report on a similar restriction in Wanyi, an Australian V1 language. The scarcity in discourse terms (see Karlsson 2000 and Sims 2015: 58–59) of negative *wh*-interrogative clauses has left it out of the possibilities of the Old Irish verbal complex. In other words, this is an effect of the “frequency condition on grammaticalization” stated by Haspelmath (2004: 27). Instead, a periphrastic expression with stressed interrogative pronoun and relative verb like the one in Section 6.3.1 must be used: e.g. *cía nād cūala ...?* (= *cía nād·cūala*) ‘wer hat nicht ... gehört?’ [‘who has not heard ...?’, lit. ‘who is it who has not heard?’] (Meyer 1917: 109–111).⁵⁶

The negative polar interrogative clause type with pronominal affix is also a very rare combination, and this is why it has not been exemplified in Tables 8.3 to 8.6, though Table 8.2 includes the possibility with the particle *cani*·, based on the observations in Section 7.2. As also suggested in that section, the structure *in ní nād*·, frequent in Ml, is perhaps the periphrastic manner in which such a combination is expressed.

(c) A limitation which is not visible in Table 8.2 is the lack of a combination of relative verb preceded by an antecedent with object NP_{rel} function and pronominal affix (something like **the man that I (don’t) see him*), as noted in Section 4.9.1. As just reminded in Section 8.4, leniting relative clause type and 1st and 2nd grammatical persons are incompatible in passive verbs.

56 With *ced* / *cid* as ‘why?’, one can find outside of the Glosses such structures as in TBC-I² 2694 *Cid ná berid mo bendachtain* ‘Why do you not take my blessing?’; TBR 25–26 *cid nach é in fer atom-gládathar* ‘Warum spricht nicht der Mann zu mir?’ [‘why does not the man speak to me?’, lit. ‘why is not he the man who speaks to me?’, with a cleft-sentence]. Strachan (1944: 52) explains *cid na*· as substituting *cid arna*· (that is, the tonic interrogative particle followed by the conjunct particle string *ar-na*· seen in Section 6.4.2); see e.g. the positive verb with infix pronoun of Class C in cases such as (88a) *cid arind epur frit* ‘why do I say it to thee?’ (initially, ‘what/why is that for which I say it to you?’).

The remaining NP_{rel} functions of the relative ‘declension’ suggested above in Section 4.7.2, i.e. subject and oblique, may be combined with an affixal pronoun functioning as object of the clause; in the case of the passive verbs, 1st and 2nd persons can appear in a relative verb with an oblique antecedent.

8.5.3 Distinctiveness and syncretism in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types

Tables 8.3 to 8.6 above are virtually restricted to 3SG present indicative forms. The paradigms with the three persons in both numbers, in this case, of the simple verbs (Class AI) *caraid* ‘loves’ and (Class BI) *ceilid* ‘hides’, are given in Tables 8.7 and 8.8 below respectively. These tables result from the combination of the paradigms of simple verbs in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 for declarative and relative clause types, on the one hand, and those in Table 7.3 for polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types, on the other. Tables 8.7 and 8.8 only include the positive forms without any pronominal affix, and do not include the synthetic *wh*-interrogative clause type forms, which are very poorly attested in the Old Irish linguistic evidence and are irrelevant at this moment.

As also observed in Section 7.4.4 above, a feature in Tables 8.7 and 8.8 which also applies to lexical compounds is the syncretic expression of a number of persons of the positive responsive and imperative paradigms, in which only the 2SG and 3SG forms are different due to their different endings. The remaining observations in this section refer only to the inflectional endings.

Tab. 8.7: Positive active clause types of the present indicative of Class AI *caraid* ‘loves’ without pronominal affix

	Declarative	Relative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
1SG	<i>car(a)im(m)</i>	<i>no-char(a)im(m)</i>	<i>in-car(a)im(m)</i>	<i>car(a)im(m)</i>	<i>car(a)im(m)</i>
2SG	<i>car(a)i</i>	<i>no-char(a)i</i>	<i>in-car(a)i</i>	<i>car(a)i</i>	<i>car</i>
3SG	<i>car(a)id</i>	<i>caras</i>	<i>in-cara</i>	<i>cara</i>	<i>carad</i>
1PL	<i>carm(a)i</i>	<i>carm(a)e</i>	<i>in-caram</i>	<i>caram</i>	<i>caram</i>
2PL	<i>carthe</i>	<i>no-char(a)id</i>	<i>in-car(a)id</i>	<i>car(a)id</i>	<i>car(a)id</i>
3PL	<i>car(a)it</i>	<i>carte</i>	<i>in-carat</i>	<i>carat</i>	<i>carat</i>

The remarkable fact in the inflection of weak verbs such as *caraid* ‘loves’ in Table 8.7 is that the inflectional endings of the 1SG and 2SG persons are the same in all the paradigms with the exception of the 2SG imperative. The relative and polar interrogative forms are distinguished by their conjunct particles in the weak as well as in the strong (BI) verbs of the type of *ceilid* ‘hides’, which – as shown in

Table 8.8 – have different absolute declarative 1SG and 2SG forms. The 2PL has a similar situation in both strong and weak verbs, with a different declarative clause type form, and the 1PL and 3PL of these simple verbs has one more different ending, the relative one.

Tab. 8.8: Positive active clause types of the present indicative of Class B1 *ceilid* ‘hides’ without pronominal infix

	Declarative	Relative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
1SG	<i>cilu</i>	<i>no-chiul</i>	<i>in-ciul</i>	<i>ciul</i>	<i>ciul</i>
2SG	<i>cili</i>	<i>no-chil</i>	<i>in-cil</i>	<i>cil</i>	<i>cel</i>
3SG	<i>ceilid</i>	<i>celes</i>	<i>in-ceil</i>	<i>ceil</i>	<i>celed</i>
1PL	<i>celmi</i>	<i>celm(a)e</i>	<i>in-celam</i>	<i>celam</i>	<i>celam</i>
2PL	<i>ceilthe</i>	<i>no-chelid</i>	<i>in-celid</i>	<i>celid</i>	<i>celid</i>
3PL	<i>celit</i>	<i>celte</i>	<i>in-celat</i>	<i>celat</i>	<i>celat</i>

The person that has more distinctive endings in simple verbs is the 3SG, with four different endings, which express declarative, relative, and imperative clause types, in addition to the conjunct ending, which expresses responsive when the form is used without any conjunct particle. Viewed in general, it can be stated that there are more 3rd person endings (3SG x 4, and 3PL x 3) than 1st (1SG x 1/2, 1PL 3) and 2nd (2SG x 2/3, 2PL x 2) person endings in the paradigms included in Tables 8.7 and 8.8.

On account of the fact that these formal distinctions are related to illocutionary differences, the observed difference between 3rd and non-3rd persons is most probably due to pragmatic reasons. On the one hand, as noted in Section 4.9, the tendential lack of paradigmatic distinctivity in the 1st and 2nd person inflectional endings (clearly in the 1SG and 2SG) is probably due to the fact that they appear less frequently in relative clauses, so that a systematic differentiation for the declarative / relative opposition in both persons is maybe less necessary. Recall that a relative verb with 1SG or 2SG subject is anyway expressed by means of a compound form with *no-*.

On the other hand, and in line with Section 8.3.4 above, the 3SG forms without any pretonic element are systematically distinguished for clause type by means of the portmanteau morphemes in slot 5. One would say that the fact that the 3SG is a zero person, that is to say, that it involves no speech act participant, calls for or requires the expression of clause type, as if the expression of the categories of 1st and 2nd person and clause typing would stand in a sort of complementary distribution. A very similar situation in which non-3rd persons may lack a formal

distinction that is regularly marked in 3rd persons forms has already been observed in Section 4.8 for the distinction between Classes A/B and C of infixes.

8.6 Relevance and asymmetry in the expression of negative polarity

This section deals with the combinatorial and paradigmatic relationship between the positive and negative forms of each clause type, namely, with the notions of relevance and asymmetry respectively. The former focuses on the forms of the negative conjunct particle, and the latter on the verbal form combined with that particle.

The specific notion of ‘relevance’ referred to is that developed by Croft and Cruse (2004: 318–320), who establish the hierarchy of relative relevance presented here in (119). To be sure, this hierarchy is not given as such by those scholars; it is the outcome of the combination of the simpler one by Croft and Cruse (2004: 318) that does not include polarity, and their observation (Croft and Cruse 2004: 320) that “polarity is intermediate in relevance between illocutionary force and predicate type.”

(119) illocutionary force < polarity < predicate type < participant type

Croft and Cruse explain the fact that the English negative imperative clause *Don't be cruel* makes use of the construction with *Don't* of verbal predicates in spite of the construction with *Be not* previously used in that type of non-verbal predicate. Their assumption is that illocutionary force and negative polarity are more relevant than predicate type, because the negative imperative of non-verbal predicates such as *to be cruel* is expressed as other negative imperatives and becomes formally separated from other constructions of the same non-verbal predicate in which the auxiliary *do* is not used (e.g. *Are you cruel?*).

The hierarchy of (119) also explains some features in the expression of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex, which – as argued at length in Chapter 2 – has the character of a morphosyntactic word. Given that, according to this characterization, clause typing is morphologically encoded in Old Irish, Croft and Cruse's specific notion of relevance can be paired with that of Bybee (1985) considered in Section 8.3.3 above, which is intended for morphological elements, and it seems also to be compatible with Thompson's (1998: 329–330) ‘Q-N Hypothesis’, which basically assumes that the scope of interrogative markers is wider than that of the negatives.

In the Old Irish paradigm of clause types, the negative conjunct particle varies according to clause type, *ní-* in declarative, *nad-* / *nach-* in relative (*nad-* also in responsive), and *na-* in imperative clause types. In other words, the formal variation in the marker of negative polarity is mostly determined by clause typing. In the case of *innad-*, the negative polar interrogative conjunct particle sequence, the marker of clause type is more external than the negative marker.

The notion of asymmetry referred to here is that developed by Miestamo (2005) in his treatment of ‘Standard Negation’, i.e. the negative of basically verbal declarative clauses. In Miestamo’s (2005: 52) definition, “[w]hen there are structural differences, i.e. asymmetry, between the affirmative and the negative in addition to the negative marker(s), the structures are asymmetric.”

Tables 8.9 and 8.10, based on Tables 8.3, 8.4 and 8.6 above, include the positive and negative 3SG active and passive forms. The negative declarative 3SG form is asymmetric: i.e. *caraid* ‘(s)he loves’ vs *ní-cara* ‘(s)he does not love’; or, with a compound verb, *do·gní* ‘(s)he does’ vs *ní-déni* ‘(s)he does not do’. In active verbs, the same asymmetric pattern is observed in the relative forms, i.e. *caras* ‘who loves’ vs *nad·chara* ‘who does not love’, and *do·gní* (/·γ/, i.e. [de·^lgní]) ‘who does’ and *nad·déni* ‘who does not do’, but not in the polar interrogative, responsive and imperative, which have a symmetric negative form.

Tab. 8.9: (A)symmetry of the negative form in the active and passive 3SG of the present indicative of simple *caraid* ‘loves’

	Declarative	Relative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
Positive	<i>caraid</i>	<i>caras</i>	<i>in-cara</i>	<i>cara</i>	<i>carad</i>
	<i>carth(a)ir</i>	<i>carthar</i>	<i>in-carthar</i>	<i>carthar</i>	<i>carthar</i>
Negative	<i>ní-cara</i>	<i>nad·^{lN}cara</i>	<i>innad-cara</i>	<i>nad-cara</i>	<i>na-carad</i>
	<i>ní-carthar</i>	<i>nad·^{lN}carthar</i>	<i>innad-carthar</i>	<i>nad-carthar</i>	<i>na-carthar</i>

Note that, in the simple active verbs, the degree of asymmetry is higher in verbs such as BI *ceilid* (see Table 8.8 above), which also distinguishes between 1SG and 2SG absolute and conjunct forms; in an AI verb such as *caraid* (see Table 8.7 above), the negative declarative forms of these two persons (namely, *ní-caraim(m)* and *ní-carai* respectively) are symmetric. The remaining active forms of every simple verb as well as every form of compound forms are asymmetric in the negative declarative and relative clause types.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ For forms of the type *tánicc*, which more or less consistently express the positive declarative and leniting (but not the nasalizing) relative clause types by means of the prototonic form, as

For passive (and deponent) verbs, the previous distribution of asymmetric and symmetric patterns is the same for lexical compounds, but slightly different for simple verbs, where only the negative declarative form is asymmetric.

Tab. 8.10: (A)symmetry of the negative form in the active and passive 3SG of the present indicative of compound *do·gní* ‘makes’

	Declarative	Relative	Polar interrogative	Responsive	Imperative
Positive	<i>do·gní</i>	<i>do·^{L/N}gní</i>	<i>in·déni</i>	<i>déni</i>	<i>dénad</i>
	<i>do·gníther</i>	<i>do·^{L/N}gníther</i>	<i>in·déntar</i>	<i>déntar</i>	<i>déntar</i>
Negative	<i>ní·déni</i>	<i>nad·^{L/N}déni</i>	<i>innad·déni</i>	<i>nad·déni</i>	<i>na·dénad</i>
	<i>ní·déntar</i>	<i>nad·^{L/N}déntar</i>	<i>innad·déntar</i>	<i>nad·déntar</i>	<i>na·déntar</i>

At first sight, the Old Irish asymmetric negative declarative and relative forms seem to enter into Miestamo’s (2005: 112,115) ‘Type A/Cat’, i.e. the type of asymmetry in which the grammatical category that is differently marked is not finiteness, realis or emphasis, but any other category (mostly of a verbal nature) which is not cross-linguistically recurrent in asymmetric negation. However, one should also consider the possibility of classifying the Old Irish mentioned asymmetry into the more general type that entails a reduction in finiteness of the negative form. In this I rely on the idea that illocutionary force is a category on the basis of which finiteness can be defined, as suggested by Bisang (2007: 125–128), who also considers person, tense and politeness as defining categories for finiteness. In this sense, Miestamo (2005: 73–75) rightly observes that finiteness may be gradual, and that this type of asymmetry may also imply a reduction in finiteness, and not necessarily a completely non-finite form. Certainly, the forms to which the negative declarative and relative conjunct particles are prefixed (*·cara* in e.g. *ní·cara* and *·déni* in e.g. *nad·déni*) still distinguish other categories such as person, mood, and tense (depending on the specific form), so that they are far from being non-finite, but it is equally true that they express one category less than their positive counterpart (*caraid / caras* and *do·gní* (*/·g/* and */·γ/*) respectively), which also express declarative or relative clause type respectively. In the light of the idea of asymmetry considered now for the expression of negation, the use of the morphologically dependent form to express syntactic dependency, as stated

observed above in Section 2.4.2, negation is almost entirely symmetric in the whole paradigm, in the sense that the negative declarative form *ní·tánicc* ‘(s)he has not come’ belongs to a positive declarative form *tánicc* ‘(s)he has come’.

in Section 5.3.1 above, can be considered as a further case in which a potentially somewhat less finite form such as e.g. the prototonic form *thórñther* of example (60a) comes to express relative clause type, a type of clause that is potentially less finite. A clearer case of loss of finite character is to be found in the clause type paradigm of the substantive verb, as noted below in Sections 9.3.2 and 9.3.7.

The asymmetric negative declarative and relative clause type forms are clearly a consequence of the aforementioned relevance of illocutionary force on polarity. To be more precise, it can be said that the declarative and relative clause type character is marked at either the left or the right edges of the verbal complex, so that if the negative particle expresses those clause types, the marker used in the positive form to express them is no longer necessary and the form that bears no clause type marker, which is nevertheless inflected for person, number, tense, and mood, is used instead. The asymmetric character of the Old Irish negative declarative and relative clause types is directly related to the portmanteau expression of person (and number) and clause types that is characteristic of these two clause types, as observed in Section 8.3.4

The fact that polar interrogative, responsive, and imperative clause types consistently show a symmetric negative form is a further argument for the paradigmatic disposition of the Old Irish clause types proposed above in Section 8.4, in particular, for the paradigmatic cohesion defended in Section 8.5.1.

8.7 Concluding remarks

This study proposes a systematic consideration of clause typing in the analysis of the Old Irish verbal complex. This grammatical category has a clear definition in functional terms, as stated in Section 1.7, and each of the Old Irish clause types considered in Chapters 4, 6 and 7 owns a specific morphological encoding in the Old Irish verbal complex, which may consist of a specific set of endings (absolute declarative, absolute relative, and imperative, apart from the conjunct ones, which express no clause type distinctions), the relative mutations (or its contrastive lack to mark declarative clause type in deuterotonic forms of lexical compounds), various classes of infixed pronouns (Classes A/B vs C), conjunct particles (basically, negative, relative, interrogative ones), or a specific combination of them. The marking of clause typing predominantly appears at the edges of the Old Irish verbal complex, but it can also affect its central part. Clause typing is the only category that potentially affects every slot of the Old Irish verbal complex.

The categories that show a higher degree of interaction with clause typing are polarity and person (and number / gender), and this means that these two

categories must have a place in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types expressed by means of a verbal complex. In the paradigm proposed in this chapter, the six clause types are arranged in the horizontal axis attending to their functional and, thereby, formal closeness: declarative, relative, *wh*-interrogative, polar interrogative, responsive and imperative.

The Old Irish paradigm of clause types proposed in this chapter has the following descriptive and theoretical advantages: (i) It includes all the conjunct particles used in the Old Irish verbal complex, with the exception of perfectivizing *ro*- and reciprocal *imm(a)*-. (ii) It reflects the notional links between the various clause types and may well serve as a semantic map; in this sense it is a cohesive paradigm, in the functional, but also in the formal sense. (iii) It accounts for the specific relevance of the expression of clause typing for polarity, since at least four clause types are basically distinguished by the specific form of the negative conjunct particle. (iv) It also explains the relevance of clause type for affixed pronouns, since the basic opposition between declarative and relative clause type may be marked also by the sole form of the infix pronoun.

Not every combination of these clause types with the markers of negative polarity and affixal pronouns is in fact expressed by means of a verbal complex, nor do all the verbal complexes that are expressed have the same degree of formal distinctness. These phenomena, i.e. defectiveness and syncretism, are in this case motivated by eminently pragmatic reasons, in accordance with the basic level of linguistic analysis in which illocutionary force must be considered.

While defectiveness and syncretism are paradigmatic situations that are characterized by a lack of expression or distinctivity, the mixed paradigms considered in Chapter 4 for simple verbs involve the use of the opposite trend, i.e. the presence of formal distinction. The mixed paradigms concerned make use of two formal strategies in the same paradigm, one strategy being more economic than the other. This situation was interpreted as due to the more frequent character of some forms (the absolute relative forms for 3rd persons) and also as perceptually less problematic (the absolute declarative forms with suffixed pronoun). All in all, the less frequent forms (mainly relative 1st and 2nd persons) and some combinations of pronominal subject and object are still expressed, even though the formal strategy used, a compound verb, is somewhat more complex.

The other morphological phenomenon that implies formal distinctivity is suppletion, which is the general issue considered in next chapter on the expression of non-verbal predication. As in the cases of the mixed paradigms just mentioned, suppletion in the paradigms of the copula and substantive verb is especially notable in the declarative and relative clause type paradigms. The next chapter focuses specifically on this point.

9 Clause types in the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb and copula

9.1 Aims and structure of the chapter

The two Old Irish verbal paradigms that are known in the traditional terminology as the copula and the substantive verb are the means to express non-verbal predication in this language. This chapter is based on this general notion of non-verbal predication and has the following aims.

First, the clause type paradigms of the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb and copula are considered in turn, paying special attention to the suppletive stems determined by clause type distinctions. These forms will be analyzed according to the paradigmatic disposition offered in the previous chapter. The resulting suppletive pattern is not found in any other Old Irish verb and must be interpreted in structural terms as directly related to the specific interplay between clause typing and non-verbal predication. In this interplay, negative polarity and affixal pronouns play a crucial role.

The Old Irish contemporaneous texts offer plenty of forms and examples of these two verbs, so that it is possible to cover with attested forms quite a number of the various cells of the paradigm of clause types.

Second, and on the basis of the previous description, which analyzes in detail the formal and functional differences and similarities between the copula and substantive verb, a diachronic explanation for the suppletive pattern will be attempted. I will defend the idea that the suppletive patterns of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb are diachronically related, in such a manner that the former has taken forms of the latter.

It is also necessary to make clear that those two Old Irish verbs are not the only ones that display a suppletive paradigm according to clause type differentiations, nor will every suppletive stem of them be analyzed here in detail. In practical terms, this chapter will leave apart the suppletive imperative stems of the copula and the substantive verb. For these Old Irish forms, and for other suppletive paradigms according to tense and aspect, I refer to Veselinović (2003). The tenses and moods of the copula and substantive verb other than the present indicative are briefly referred to in Section 9.5. A further limitation of this chapter is that it only deals with two main types of non-verbal predicates, which are the attributive and the locative ones. The referential type is considered in the next chapter on personal pronouns.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-009>

The structure of the chapter is as follows. The notion of non-verbal predication is introduced in Section 9.2, in which some terminological points of the chapter will also be fixed. Sections 9.3 and 9.4 offer a comprehensive description of the present indicative forms of the substantive verb and copula respectively. The diachronic discussion on the origin of the suppletive verbs will be addressed in Section 9.5. The main results of the chapter are offered in Section 9.6.

9.2 General remarks on non-verbal predication

Non-verbal predication is characterized by the fact that the semantic nucleus of the predicate is not a verbal element. This definition, which assumes a number of specific parts-of-speech such as nouns and also adjectives as separate word classes, applies to the Old Irish case. As stated by Hengeveld (1992: 26–27), “a verb can assume a non-predicative function only after undergoing a further measure such as nominalization or participialization, whereas a non-verbal predicate can be put to some non-predicative use without any of these measures being taken.”

There are at least two syntactic ways of forming a non-verbal predication. Either the non-verbal predication does not make use of any verbal auxiliary or a verbal auxiliary (a copula or closely related verbal forms such as the so-called ‘semi-copulas’) is used. The first is called the ‘nominal clause’. Indeed, Old Irish sometimes makes use of this as a formal strategy. However, more often, the second strategy is found in Old Irish, in which the copula and the substantive verb are the forms that normally express the different types of non-verbal predicates. Hengeveld’s (1992: 35) definition of the semi-copula, which “can never be left out without changing or affecting the meaning of the resulting construction” and which is exemplified with the Spanish verb *estar*, also applies to the Old Irish substantive verb.

The classification of non-verbal predicates considered here assumes three basic types, locative (e.g. *She is in London*), bare or attributive (e.g. *She is tall*) and referential (e.g. *She is the boss*) non-verbal predicates, much in line with current treatments on this type of predicates. See Hengeveld (1992: 74–106), Veselinova (2004: 116), Dryer (2007: 224–249). These three basic types may further be classified into subtypes and are assumed to stand in a continuous semantic space. As stated at length by Stassen (1997: Ch.14), these types of non-verbal predicates are potentially expressed by more than one form, and the non-verbal predicates that are contiguous in that semantic space are susceptible to being expressed by the same form.

Instead of ‘locative’, Hengeveld (1992: 91–101) uses the term ‘relational’ with the aim of embracing other similar predicates that are “based on a referential expression that carries an indication of a semantic function.” This wider definition includes typical locational predicates such as *She is in London*, but also *This book is by Shakespeare*. Since it involves a formal differentiation in the Old Irish substantive verb, it is worth mentioning that this locative type includes, apart from the properly locative, also the existential (e.g. *There is a man in the garden*) and the possessive predicates, as e.g. the Old Irish form *taithiunn* ‘we have’, lit. ‘there is for us’ in example (127) in Section 9.3.4 below.

Though the Old Irish substantive verb expresses bare or attributive non-verbal predicates on some occasions, these are regularly expressed by the copula. According to Hengeveld (1992: 75–77), the main feature of this type of non-verbal predicate is the use of ‘bare predicates’, adjectives for property assignment and (non-referential) nouns for status assignment. These two types are formally not distinguished in Old Irish.

Finally, referential predicates are defined by Hengeveld (1992: 77) as “predicates based on terms, i.e. referring expressions with a nominal head, and predicates based on larger referential units, i.e. predications, propositions, and clauses.” According to Dryer (2007: 233), the referential predicate “identifies the individual denoted by the predicate with the individual denoted by the subject.” In Old Irish, this general type of non-verbal predicate characterized by a referential predicate is based on the copula, and makes systematic use of a tonic pronoun. This is why this type of non-verbal predicate is left for the next chapter on pronouns in Old Irish.

9.3 The present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb

The basic function of the Old Irish substantive verb is the expression of locative and existential predication. As above noted, it also expresses possession and, in some specific circumstances, bare or attributive non-verbal predicates. This analysis of the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb does not include the so-called consuetudinal form *bí-* and is structured as follows: Section 9.3.1 offers a paradigm of clause types on the basis of attested forms corresponding to the present indicative. Section 9.3.2 deals with the basic functions of the stems $(\cdot)fil(-)$ and $(\cdot)tá(-)$, and Section 9.3.3 then considers some specific and less basic uses of $(\cdot)fil(-)$, whereas Section 9.3.4 centers on the use of the stem $(\cdot)tá(-)$ to express possession. Section 9.3.5 pays special attention to the specific use of the stem $(\cdot)tá(-)$ in nasalizing relative verbal complexes, and, finally, Section 9.3.6 considers some cases in which the stem $(\cdot)tá(-)$ takes the value of the copula.

9.3.1 Basic paradigmatic constituency

Based on Table 8.2 above, Table 9.1 offers the paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb. This table only offers attested forms of the substantive verb, most of them included in the examples in this Section; some forms have been already exemplified in previous chapters: for the *wh*-question *cia fil*, see Section 6.3.2; the polar question form *in fil* as well as the responsive *fil* were introduced in Section 7.4.1 above. A collection of all the forms attested in the Glosses can be found in Strachan (1898/99: 1–22).

In addition to the stem (·)bí(-) used for the imperative clause type, this paradigm includes the suppletive stems (·)tá(-) and (·)fil(-), which occupy slot 4 of the Old Irish verbal complex described in Section 2.2.2 and are used for the clause types other than the imperative. This section on the substantive verb is focused on the distribution of the stems (·)tá(-) and (·)fil(-). The notation (·) means that these stems may be preceded by pretonic elements, either in slot 1 or in slots 1 and 2, or may not; the notation (-) means that the form may be followed by a segmental element in slot 5, or in slots 5 and 6. These inflectional possibilities are not exactly the same for (·)tá(-) and (·)fil(-), and will be considered in more detail below.

If the general paradigm of clause types developed in the previous chapter is borne in mind, Table 9.1 is remarkable in at least two ways.

The first point to be noticed is the variety of functions and meanings expressed by the forms included in this paradigm. While the locative and existential predicates are expressed by the forms given in Table 9.1 without any marker, the forms based on the stem (·)tá(-) that are given in parentheses express a slightly different meaning, both in the declarative and in the nasalizing relative clause types. On the one hand, the combination of (·)tá(-) with affixed pronouns expresses possession and is examined in Section 9.3.4 below, in which other verbal complexes that also combine the stem (·)tá(-) (i.e. *ni-m·tha*, *ce·tai-*) to express the meaning of the copula are also dealt with. On the other, the passive (in this case, impersonal) 3SG relative form *dáthar* (with 2PL *no·taid*), which expresses the meaning ‘to be angry, vexed’, is considered in Section 9.3.5, along with other nasalizing relative forms such as *oldaas*, *ol·dáu* used to express the standard NP of comparative constructions.

The second point of Table 9.1 refers to the expression of locative and existential predicates, in particular to the split of the declarative and relative clause type columns into two. In the case of the declarative clause type, the positive forms with the stem (·)tá(-) are by far much more frequent than those with the stem (·)fil(-); in the negative declarative forms, the stem (·)fil(-) is the norm.

Tab. 9.1: The paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb

	Declarative	Relative	Wh-interr.	Polar interr.	Resp.	Impv.
1	<i>fil</i>	3SG <i>ol daas</i> (<i>dáthar</i>) <i>fil/file</i> 3PL <i>ol date</i> (further forms of the paradigm → 2)			<i>fil</i>	? ? <i>bíid</i> ? <i>biid</i> <i>biat</i>
2	<i>at-táu</i> <i>at-tái</i> <i>at-tá</i> <i>at-taam</i> <i>at-taid</i> <i>at-taat</i>	<i>i-táu ol-dáu</i> <i>i-tái ol-dái</i> <i>i-tá</i> ? (<i>no-taid</i>) <i>i-taat</i>		(<i>ce-tái</i>) <i>cia fil</i>	<i>in-fil</i>	
3	(<i>táthium</i>) (<i>táthiut</i>) (<i>táthi</i>) (<i>táthiun</i>) (<i>táthuib</i>) (<i>táthius</i>)					<i>filus</i>
4		(<i>nom-thá</i>) ? ? ? ? (<i>nob-tá</i>) ?	? ? <i>ma-nud-fel</i> ? <i>ma-nudub-feil</i> ?		?	? ? ? ? ?
5					?	? ? <i>na-bíd</i> ? ? ?
6	(<i>ním-tha</i>) ? (<i>nít-ta</i>) ? (<i>ní-tha</i>) (<i>nin-tá</i>) (<i>níb-tá</i>) (<i>nís-ta</i>)	? ? <i>ci-nid-fil</i> <i>ci-nin-fil</i> ? <i>nis-fil</i>	? ? ? ? <i>nachib-fel</i> ?		?	? ? ? ? ?

In the case of the relative clause type, the left column corresponds to the stem (*·*)*tá*(-), which – in the positive relative cells – mainly expresses functions proper

to the nasalizing relative clause type;⁵⁸ the right one corresponds to the stem (·)fil(-), and – again this statement refers only to the positive relative cells in Table 9.1 – mostly fulfills functions ascribed to the leniting relative clause type. This is of course not the sole explanation of the suppletive relationship between those two stems, because the stem (·)tá(-) is the basic form in the positive declarative clause type, as already observed, and the stem (·)fil(-) is the basic one in the responsive clause type.

But, even with this proviso, the use of two different stems for functions that can be found in nasalizing and leniting relative clause types, which merely imply a different morphophonological mutation in most of the other verbs (with the exception of the CV·VC(-) lexical compounds seen in Section 2.4.2), is a remarkable fact and immediately recalls the functional characterization of the nasalizing relative form as a more declarative clause-like relative clause type, as stated in Section 5.7.1.

As for the void cells in the paradigm of Table 9.1 (i.e. the shaded ones), some of them are those considered in Section 8.5.2 for every verb: (a) absolute *wh*- and polar interrogative, non-declarative suffixed forms, the combination of responsive form with affixed pronoun, and (b) negative *wh*-interrogative clause type; for point (c) in Section 8.5.2, i.e. the limitation for the use of relative clause type forms, see below. Some others are specific to this paradigm and can confidently be given as assured, in view of the lack of attestation. This is especially clear in the declarative and relative clause types.

In the declarative clause type with the meaning of the locative copula, the stem (·)tá(-) appears as neither (i) a simple verb without affixed pronouns (something like a 3SG *táid ‘stands, is’), or (ii) a (positive) compound with infix pronoun, nor finally (iii) a (negative) compound without infix. These are the shaded cells of the declarative column belonging to the stem (·)tá(-) in Table 9.1. Restriction (i) reminds the case of other verbs that cannot appear as simple and take a lexical preverb in case they do not take a conjunct particle, e.g. *ro·cluínethar* ‘(s)he hears’, the negative of which is *ní·cluínethar* ‘(s)he does not hear’; see Section 2.4.4. Restriction (ii) seems to be related to the fact that a typical locative non-verbal predicate (e.g. *The house is in the valley*) has only one main argument, and

58 The use of these two stems in some situations in which there is regularly a nasalizing relative clause type form seems, however, to be avoided in the language of the glosses: after the highly frequent temporal subordinating conjunction *inta(i)n* ‘when’, there is not a single case with either (·)tá(-) or (·)fil(-), but with the corresponding consuetudinal stem (·)bí(-), an example of which is *intain mbís ísiu* ‘when he is here’ in (71a) above. Apparently, the substantive verb is not combined with the equally frequent conjunction *a^N* ‘when’. I hope to deal with this remarkable distribution in another study.

a verbal complex with this stem and two arguments is devoted to the expression of possession, as in the case of forms such as *nob-tá* ‘that you (pl.) have’ given in example (128b) below. Restriction (iii) is proper of this paradigm, i.e. ‘they are not here’ is not said in Old Irish **ní-táat sund* or such like, but *ní-s-fil sund* in view of in (122c) below, and this is probably due to diachronic reasons, as suggested in Section 9.5.3 below.

In the columns of the relative clause type, there is no evidence of a negative form formed with the stem $(\cdot)tá(-)$, something like **nad^{L/N}tá sund* ‘that is not here’; this notion is expressed with the stem $(\cdot)fil(-)$. For the possibility of a negative version of *i-tá* ‘in which (s)he is’, see Section 9.3.5. In the relative clause type, the use of the stem $(\cdot)fil(-)$ is limited in the sense that the simple form *fil(e)* or *feil* expresses both 3SG and 3PL (e.g. ... *fil sund* ‘... that is / are here’); in such a relative clause, 1st and 2nd persons are not expected (e.g. **The men that you are here* or such like). The inflectional possibility of combining such a relative stem with non-3rd persons is made by means of compound forms with infixed pronouns (e.g. *ma-nu-dub-feil* ‘if you are ...’, in Section 9.3.3), albeit the form is not used in a relative clause, but in another type of subordinate clause. This use, which is related to restriction (c) in Section 8.5.2, is considered in Section 9.3.3 below. The negative paradigm with $(\cdot)fil(-)$ uses the same inflectional means for the non-3rd persons, i.e. infixed pronouns, though this inflectional possibility is very poorly attested and, again, it does not express relative subordinate clause, but another type of subordinate such as the complement clause.

Finally, the other empty cells in Table 9.1, those that include a question mark, are most probably due to defective attestation, that is to say, the corresponding forms are simply not attested, though they surely existed. This is the case for the positive polar interrogative clause type form combined with an infix, which would presumably be the way of asking a fairly normal question such as ‘are they here?’, which would be in Old Irish something like **inda-fil sund*. After an expected question such as **innad-fil sund* ‘is it not here?’, the negative responsive would probably have been **nad-fil* ‘no, it isn’t’.

9.3.2 The stems $(\cdot)tá(-)$ and $(\cdot)fil(-)$ in the declarative vs relative clause type opposition

The positive declarative clause type is expressed by the lexical compound usually quoted as *at-tá* ‘is, stands’, which is inflected in all three persons, singular and plural: 1SG *at-tó*, 2SG *at-tái* and so on. As noted by Hull (1956: 247–248), the verb should be quoted properly as *ad-tá*, a form that is attested at least once. As the

examples make clear, this form is usually spelled as *ata* or *atá* in Old Irish. The corresponding positive (leniting) relative form is expressed by the simple form *f(e)il* / *file*, which may be used after singular and plural antecedents. One may therefore say that the relative form *f(e)il* / *file* expresses both 3SG and 3PL, as observed in the examples below. With respect to *f(e)il*, the form *file* shows the same specific absolute relative ending as the 3SG *téte*, of the verb *téit* ‘goes’. See Section 4.6.2 above for this absolute relative ending.

The examples in (120) and (121) illustrate the basic functions of the Old Irish substantive verb, namely existential, and locative predicates, respectively, and both cases involve the basic opposition between the positive declarative form *ata* / *atá*, i.e. (120a) and (121a), and the positive relative forms *f(e)il* / *file*, i.e. (120b) and (121b,c). For this suppletive relationship, the reader is further referred to Veselinović (2003: 90). The form *fil* in (120b) has been interpreted by Pedersen (1913: 435) as a declarative clause verb, but it is better understood as a relative verb form expressing a complement clause syntactically dependent on an implicit main clause or, simply, on the Latin verb *credo* ‘I believe’ that the gloss refers to, as also assumed by Strachan (1898/99: 5) and Kavanagh (2001: 116); the resulting hybrid expression should be intended as ‘I believe that there is something ...’. This example is clearly different to that in (126a) below. Note that, in (121c), *file* appears after a plural antecedent.

(120) a. *atá mordechur etir deacht 7 doinacht* (Ml 26b1)

a(d)·tá				mor-dechur
PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT				great-difference/NOM.SG.N
etir	deacht	7	doinacht	
between	divinity/ACC.SG.F	and	humanness/ACC.SG.F	
‘there is a great difference between Godhead and Manhood’.				

b. *fil ní de asfir* (Wb 11d2)

fil			ní	
REL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT			something/ACC.SG.N	
de	as ⁽¹⁾ -fir			
of/3SG.N	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL-true/NOM.SG.N			
‘that there is something of it that is true’.				

The relative use of the substantive verb involves a certain neutralization of the locative and existential predicate types because the main argument of the verb is anteposed on the verb. This anteposed argument has many chances of being therefore definite and, in fact, Thurneysen (1946: 296) states that “the use of the

article is obligatory when the substantive is made determinate by means of a defining relative clause.” When the main argument of the relative verb is not anteposed, but included in the clause after its verb, as *ni* ‘something’ in example (120b), the subordinating value of the bare form *fil* used as existential predicate must be that of the complement clause, since this type of subordinate clause implies the complete set of arguments of the clause. In this use, a characteristic feature of this stem (*·fil(-)*) is that its argument appears in accusative case.

(121) a. *ata hilebraib rig* (Ml 40a21)

a(d)·ta	hi-lebr-aib	rig
PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	in-book-DAT.SG.M	king/GEN.PL.M

‘it is in the Books of Kings’.

b. *conrici andechur feil ettarru* (Wb 33b18)

co ^N ·r-ic-i	a ^N ·dechur
so that·PV-reach/PRES.IND-2SG.ACT	ART.NOM.SG.N-difference/NOM.SG.N

feil	ettar-ru
REL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	between-3PL

‘as far as the difference which is between them’.

c. ... *secht nernadman sòn· file isindsaltair·* (Ml 2d2)

secht ^N	ernadm-an	sòn	fil-e
seven	bond-NOM.PL.N	PROX	SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL

i^N-sind-saltair
in-ART.DAT.SG.N-psalter/DAT.SG.N
‘..., the seven bonds that are in the Psalter’.

As anticipated above, the stem (*·fil(-)*) combines with the negative declarative and negative relative conjunct particles, as in (122) and (123) respectively. The examples (122a,b) illustrate the combination with a noun in accusative case, i.e. the accusative singular *aimsir* (cf. nominative singular *aimser*) and the accusative plural *titlu* (cf. nominative plural *tituil*). As shown in (122c,d) and (123b), the persons other than the 3SG are expressed by means of the corresponding infixed pronoun. Note that *cinifil* in (122d) includes the concessive conjunction *ci^l-ni-n·fil*, which in this case takes the (negative) declarative clause type form due to the fact that the verb has a semantically justified infix, according to Section 5.5.1. In other words, the expression of the whole array of inflectional possibilities provided by the combination of person and number for those forms including the stem (*·fil(-)*) (i.e. negative declarative, positive and negative leniting

relative, positive and negative polar interrogative) involves the use of the infixed pronouns. The resulting paradigm is of a mixed character, very similar to the paradigm of the passive of simple verbs considered in Section 4.5.1, the only difference being that the passive 3PL makes use of a proper ending (slot 5), and not of the infixed pronoun, as in (122c), with *ni-s·fil*. This is clearly related to the fact that there is no difference between 3SG and 3PL in the corresponding positive form, as illustrated in (121c). Note again that the two negative relative verbal complexes in (123a,b), i.e. *nad fil* and *nachibfel*, express complement clauses, a tendency that has been observed above for the positive relative form *fil(e)*, as in example (120b).

(122) a. *nífil aimsir nadmbed* (Ml 17a15)

ní·fil	aimsir
NEG.DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	time/ACC.SG.F
nad. ^N ·be-d	
NEG.REL·REL-SUBSTV/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.IMP.F.ACT	
‘there is no time in which He was not’.	

b. *ni feil titlu remib* (Ml 2b4)

ni·feil	titl-u	rem-ib
NEG.DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	title-ACC.PL.M	before-3PL.DAT
‘There are no headings before them’.		

c. *nisfil hodie* (Sg 178b2)

ni-s·fil	hodie
NEG.DECL-3PL/DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	today
‘they are not today’.	

d. ... *cininfil lib* (Wb 16b9)

ci ^l ·ni-n·fil	li-b
though-NEG.DECL-1PL/DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	with-2PL
‘... though we are not with you’.	

(123) a. *asberat nad fil dliged remdeicsen dé dia dulib* (Ml 20c5)

as. ^L ber-at	nad. ^(L) fil	
PV·REL/say/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT	NEG.REL·(REL/)SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	
dliged	rem-deics-en	dé
reason/ACC.SG.N	pre-looking-GEN.SG.F	God/GEN.SG.M

di-a-dul-ib

to-POSS.3SG.M-creature-DAT.PL.F

‘who say that there is no law of providence of God for His creatures’.

b. *atluchur dodia cerubaid fopheccad nachibfel* (Wb 3b19)

ad-tluch-ur

do-dia

PV·DECL/thank/PRES.IND-1SG.ACT

to-God/DAT.SG.M

ce^L-ru-ba-id

fo^L-peccad

though-PERF·DECL/SUBSTV/PRET.ACT-2PL

under-sin/DAT.SG.M

nach-ib-fel

NEG.REL-2PL(/DECL)·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

‘I give thanks to God, that though you have been under sin, you are not’.

With respect to the positive declarative form with *atá(-)*, the negative with the fixed form *fil* can be considered as a clear case of Miestamo’s (2005: 81–82) asymmetric negation in the finiteness of the verbal elements, perhaps similar to the subtype in which “the F[inite]E[lement] of the negative clause is the negative verb, and again, the finiteness of the L[exical]V[erb] is lost or at least reduced.” The Old Irish negative declarative conjunct particle *ní-* cannot be taken as a verbal form in itself, though it serves to mark declarative clause type; the examples in (122) show that the infixed pronoun that expresses the person other than the 3SG, which can be considered zero-marked, appears between this conjunct particle and the stem.

This case of loss of finiteness is clearer than those considered in Section 8.6 above, and by the same token, is also to be connected to the notions of syntactic and morphological dependency, since the form used as positive relative, i.e. *f(e)il*, is also used as conjunct form after conjunct particles such as *ní-*, *nad-*, and *nach-*.

In much the same way as negative *wh*-interrogative clauses represent a rare combination of clause type and polarity, which is why there is no such a verbal complex in Old Irish, as stated in Section 8.4.2 above, in the Old Irish paradigm of the locative copula there are other combinations of clause type with affixal pronouns and/or negative polarity that are less expected. A clear case is the negative relative clause type form of the substantive verb expressing locational predicate (e.g. *The men that are not at home*), an expression which is grammatically acceptable, but which seems to have not a single example in the Glosses. However, the inflectional possibility of negative ‘relative’ verbal complex of the substantive verb does indeed exist, as shown in (123a,b), but its meaning is that of a

complement and not of a relative clause. The value of the forms in (123) as complement clause deserves a separate comment.

On the one hand, in the language of the Old Irish glosses, the locational copula has a clear tendency to express existential meaning when it is combined with negative polarity: out of 45 cases of the negative declarative form *ni-fil* attested in the Glosses, only 5 could be interpreted as having a definite main argument. The value as complement clause of *nad fil* in (123a) is therefore due to the fact that negative declarative locational predicates are most often existential, so that its ‘relative’ inflectional counterpart also tends to express complementation. On the other hand, the locational copula that includes a non-3rd person infix pronoun is also difficult to understand as a relative clause, since it includes the argument that corresponds to this intransitive predicate. This is in line with the idea of a pronominal argument structure for clause types put forward in Section 4.9.3 above, so that a verbal complex such as *nachibfel* in (123b) can only value as a complement clause, i.e. ‘(I give thanks...) that you (pl.) are not (under sin)’. This is why, in spite of the fact that the stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) mostly expresses functions proper of the leniting relative clause type, as emphasized by Thurneysen (1946: 479), it can also express complement clause, a type of subordinate clause that is expressed either by a nasalizing relative or plainly declarative clause type forms.

Example (124a) shows the combination of the stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) with the subordinating conjunct particle *co*^N- ‘so that’, which takes the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^L-* to refer to the subject of the verb, i.e. *co*^N-*id^L-fil*. In (124b), the same basic combination takes the corresponding Class C 2PL infix.

(124)a. *conidfil inindocbáil* post resurrectionem (Wb 24a33)

<i>co</i> ^N - <i>id^L-fil</i>	<i>i</i> ^N - <i>indocbáil</i>
so that-3SG.N/REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	in-glory/DAT.SG.F
<i>post resurrectionem</i>	
after resurrection	
‘so that it is in glory after resurrection’.	

b. *dobrograd condibfeil incorp crist* (Wb 24c4)

<i>do-b·ro·grad</i>		
PV-2PL/DECL·PERF-call/PRET.PASS.3SG		
<i>co</i> ^N - <i>dib·feil</i>	<i>i</i> ^N - <i>corp</i>	<i>crist</i>
so that-2PL/REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.ACT.3SG	in-body/DAT.SG.M	Christ
‘you have been called so that you are in Christ’s body’.		

The stem (*·*)*fil*(*-*) is used sporadically in subordinate clauses in which (autonomous) relative nasalization would be expected, e.g. after *amal* ‘as’, the sequence *amal file óentid eter baullu ...* ‘as there is unity among the members ...’ in example (3), after which declarative clause type forms (i.e. *atá*) can also be found, as stated in Section 5.6.2 above. More examples can be found in Ó hUiginn (1987: 181–183). The nasalizing relative clause type form *rondgab* ‘that (s)he is (in...)’, the perfect of the verb *gaibid* ‘takes’ considered in Section 10.4.4 due to its Class C infix, is also used in complement and adverbial subordinate clauses with the meaning of the substantive verb, but the tendency seems to be the opposite, i.e., only sometimes in the former and more frequently in the latter.

9.3.3 Special uses of the stem (*·*)*fil*(*-*)

As stated in the previous sections, the stem (*·*)*fil*(*-*) is regularly used in the negative declarative clause type (mostly with existential meaning), in the positive relative clause type (mostly with the value of a leniting relative clause, i.e. ‘that is here’), and in the negative relative clause type (only with the value of a complement clause, probably due to the predominant existential meaning of the combination of the locative copula with negative polarity). The stem (*·*)*fil*(*-*) is also regular in the polar interrogative and responsive clause types.

There are, however, other uses of the stem (*·*)*fil*(*-*) that depart from that basic distribution, in the sense that they enter into the field of the positive declarative clause type. Consider first the examples in (125), in which the substantive verb is combined with the conditional conjunction *ma^L* ‘if’.

(125)a. *manud fel inspirut nóib indiumsa ...* (Wb 11c1)

<i>ma^L-nu-d^L-fel</i>	<i>in-spirut</i>
<i>if-PART-3SG.N/REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT</i>	<i>ART.ACC.SG.M-spirit/ACC.SG.M</i>
<i>nóib</i>	<i>ind-ium-sa</i>
<i>holy/ACC.SG.M</i>	<i>in-1SG-NA.1SG</i>
‘if the Holy Spirit is in me, ...’.	

b. *ma nudubfeil inellug coirp crist ...* (Wb 19c20)

<i>ma^L-nu-dub-feil</i>	<i>i^N-ellug</i>
<i>if-PART-2PL/REL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT</i>	<i>in-union/DAT.SG.N</i>
<i>coirp</i>	<i>crist</i>
<i>body/GEN.SG.M</i>	<i>Christ</i>
‘if you are in the union of Christ’s Body, ...’.	

According to the general rule stated in Section 5.5.2, this conjunction (as well as the concessive *cía^L*) is followed by a declarative clause type verb, e.g. the negative form *cininfil* in (122d) above; however, as also stated in Section 5.5.1, the verb after these conjunctions must bear the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^L-* if there is no other affixal element and if the verb is in indicative mood. In verbs other than the substantive verb (and the copula), this infix *-d^L-* is added in its due manner to the corresponding form: recall, from the lexical compound *ro-cluinethar* ‘(s)he hears’, *ciarud chualatar* ‘though they have heard’ in example (74a) above, and from simple *ca-naid*, the form *cianud chanar* in (74c). As for the substantive verb, it seems that the *-d^L-* cannot be inserted in the lexical compound *at-tá-* that expresses the positive declarative clause type, i.e. there is no expression such as **ma ad-id-tá* ‘if (s)he is (in ...)’. The stem *(·)fil(-)* is used instead, probably on the basis of the negative declarative form *cininfil* just mentioned, which is regularly used after *ma^L* ‘if’ and *cía^L* ‘though’. On the basis of this negative form, the stem *(·)fil(-)* is also combined with the conjunct particle *no-* to insert the *-d^L-*, as in *manud fel* of (125a). This is the inflectional possibility that has been used for persons other than the 3SG, as in the case of *ma nudubfel* [ma^L-no-dob-fel] in (125b), in which the Class C 2PL infix is inserted. See Section 10.4.3 for a diachronic explanation of this ‘conditional’ *-d^L-*.

In some few cases such as those in (126), the absolute form *fil(-)* is used as a positive declarative clause type form with existential meaning. This use is not clearly observed in the language of the Glosses, and this is why example (120b) above receives a different interpretation to that in (126a). The inflectional possibility of this stem with a suffixed pronoun, i.e. *filus* in example (126b), has been used to express existential meaning in the positive declarative clause type, in line with the declarative clause type character of this type of affixation stated in Section 4.4.1.

(126)a. *fil tír n-aill / nadbu nesam do saigid* (EC §14)

<i>fil</i>	<i>tír^N</i>	<i>aill</i>
SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT.DECL	land/ACC.SG.N	another/ACC.SG.N
<i>nad-bu-nes-am</i>		<i>do saigid</i>
NEG.REL-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG-near-SUPERL		to seeking/DAT.SG.F
‘there is another land / that may not be the nearest to seek’.		

b. *filus trechenélæ martre ...* (*Thes.* ii 246.27–28)

<i>fil-us</i>	<i>tre^L</i>	<i>cenél-æ</i>
SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT.DECL-3PL	three	kind-ACC.PL.N

martre
 martyrdom/GEN.SG.F
 ‘there are three kinds of martyrdom ...’.

Such use of the stem (·)fil(-) is rather the outcome of a back-formation from the overwhelming existential use of the negative forms *ní·fil* and *nad·fil* observed in the previous section.

9.3.4 The use of the stem (·)tá(-) in the expression of possession

When combined with an affixal pronoun, the stem (·)tá(-) expresses possession, and in this case the pronominal affix (either suffixed or infix) refers to the possessor. The verbal complex formed with a suffixed pronoun, as *ta-ith-iunn* ‘we have’ (lit. ‘there is / it is for us’) in (127), is a positive declarative clause type according to the rule established in Section 4.4.1. In clause types other than the positive declarative one, the pronominal reference appears as infix in slot 2 of the verbal complex, as in (128a) for negative declarative and in (128b) for positive relative clause types, where Class A is used in line with Section 4.8.2. See Thurneysen (1946: 271, 477). The stem (·)fil(-) is not used in this function, which – as just observed in the previous sections – expresses locative (and existential) non-verbal predication, either alone or in combination with affixal (mostly infix) pronouns.

(127) *taithiunn dichrichide clius · ní fristarddam arnáthius* (*Thes.* ii 293.19)

ta-ith-iunn	dichrichide	clius
SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL-1PL	unlimited/NOM.SG.N	feat/NOM.SG.N
ni	fris(-a ^N)·ta-r-dd-am	
something/ACC.SG.N	towards(-OBL.REL)·PV-PERF-give/PRES.SUBJ-1PL.ACT	
ar ^N -áthius		
POSS.1PL-acuteness/ACC.SG.M		

‘we have – unlimited (is) feat-sport – something to which to apply our acuteness’.

(128)a. *níbtá torbe de* (Wb 19b10)

ní·b·tá	torbe
NEG.DECL-2PL/DECL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	profit/NOM.SG.N
de	
of/3SG.N.DAT	

‘you have no profit thereof’.

b. ... *indindocbál nobtá* in futuro (Wb 14c16)

ind-indocbál

no-b-tá

ART.NOM.SG.F-glory/NOM.SG.F

PART-2PL/DECL-SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

in futuro

in the future

‘... the glory which is in store for you in the future’.

The forms with suffixed pronoun are not found in the Glosses, in which the periphrastic combination with a conjugated preposition, either of this verb (e.g. Wb 18d4 *attaat scela linn* ‘we have tidings’, lit. ‘there are tidings for us’) or of the copula (e.g. Wb 6b22 *ní latt aní ararethi* ‘not yours is that which you assail’) seems to be preferred.

Again, there are no cases of negative relative clause type of this possessive expression, though this is an expected expression. The form would be something like **ind-indocbál nach-ib-tá* ‘the glory which is not in store for you’, as a result of the combination of the attested forms *no-b-tá* ‘that you have’ of (128b) and *nach-ib-fel* ‘that you are not (under sin)’ of (123b).

9.3.5 The stem (·)tá(-) in nasalizing relative clauses

The use of the stem (·)tá(-) in a number of nasalizing relative clause types is the topic of this section. Before proceeding to the analysis of the various uses, however, it is opportune to remember that complementation, which is typically marked with nasalization, is expressed by the stem (·)fil(-), which most often expresses the functions of the leniting relative clause type. Examples of this use and a structural justification have already been given in Section 9.3.2 above.

The uses of the stem (·)tá(-) in nasalizing relative verbal complexes (in the specific sense of Section 5.7.1 above) to be considered here are the following ones. First, the combination with the conjunct particle *i^N*- ‘in which’; second, the lexicalized use in the expression of the meaning ‘to be angry, vexed’; and third, the grammaticalized use as introducer of the standard NP in comparative constructions.

The examples in (129) illustrate the first use, i.e. *i^N.ta* ‘in which [Christ] is’ and *i^N.ta-am* ‘in which we are’, which is a frequent verbal complex in the Old Irish

texts. The second use,⁵⁹ illustrated in (130), entails the bare nasalizing relative form of the stem (·)tá(-): note that, in (130a), the absolute relative form *dathar* stands for ^N*tathar*, with the effect of relative nasalization considered in Section 4.7.4; in (130b), the corresponding relative 2PL *no*·^(N)*ta-id* is formed with the conjunct particle *no*- according to the rule established in Section 4.3.1 above for the relative paradigm of basically simple verbs. Note further that the nasalizing relative form of the verbs in (130), included in a cleft-sentence, stands against the tendency to use either leniting relative or declarative clause type morphology in such a structure, as observed in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.4 above.

(129)a. *condonroib indincoábál itá crist innim* (Wb 15b27)

có^N-don·roi-b

so that-1PL/REL·PERF-SUBSTV/PRES.SUBJ.3SG.ACT

ind-incoábál i^N·tá

ART.NOM.SG.F-g^lory/NOM.SG.F in which·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

crist i^N-nim

Christ in-heaven/DAT.SG.N

‘so that we may have the glory in which Christ is in heaven’.

b. *innaimsir hitaam* (Wb 9a9)

in^N-aimsir hi^N·ta-am

ART.ACC.SG.F-time/ACC.SG.F in which·SUBSTV/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT

‘the time in which we are’.

(130)a. *ished dathar dom* (Wb 21c9)

is-hed

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.N

^Nta-thar do-m

REL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS.REL to-1SG

‘that is why people are vexed with me’.

b. *ni nachcin aile no taid dom* (Wb 19d26)

ni-nach-cin aile

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-some-sin/NOM.SG.M other/NOM.SG.M

⁵⁹ For this interpretation, see e.g. Thurneysen (1946: 318,478). Schumacher (2004: 267–268) explains this Old Irish form *dáthar* ‘to be angry, vexed’ as derived from a different verb, related to Middle Welsh *dawr* ‘it matters’ (‘es stórt, kúmmert’), reanalyzed in Old Irish as belonging to the stem (·)tá(-).

no· ^(N) ta-id	do-m
PART·(REL)SUBSTV/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT	to-1SG

‘it is not any other fault that makes you vexed with me’.

Due to the formal complexity and variation of the forms involved, the grammaticalized use of (-)tá(-) in the comparative construction, i.e. the third use considered in this section, deserves special attention. The nasalizing relative form of the substantive verb with an antecedent other than the subject of the relative constitutes the syntactic structure of (*ol-, in-*)*daas*, which is the Old Irish regular way to introduce the Standard NP of comparison. The semantic development of this expression introduced by the preposition *ol* ‘beyond’ must have been ‘beyond what I am, you are, he is, and so on’ → ‘than me, you, he, and so on’. The Glosses offer what can confidently be regarded as a quite complete paradigm with 1SG *ol·dó(-sa)* ‘than me’, 2SG *ol·dáí* ‘than you’, 3SG *ol daas*, also *in daas* ‘than (s)he / it’, 3PL *ol date*, also *in date* ‘than they’; two examples of those forms, most often spelled as a single word, are given in (131a) and (131b); no 1PL or 2PL is found in the Glosses, save the exceptional 2PL *olambieidsi* of example (131c).

The quoted 1st and 2nd persons forms are to be interpreted as deuterotonic compounds, either of Type IIIb (i.e. *olambieidsi* [ol-(s)a^N-bie-id^l-si]) or of Type IIIc (i.e. *ol·^Ntó*) of the subordinating strategies considered in Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 respectively. The 3rd persons must be interpreted rather as a structure with the forms *ol* or *in* plus the absolute relative verbs 3SG [^Nta-as] and 3PL [^Nta-te], i.e. the subordination strategy of Type IV (Section 5.5.1). The 3rd persons may appear with either a noun such as *a-dígal* lit. ‘its vengeance’ in (131a), or a nasalizing relative verb *dontlucham* [to-^N-d^l-tluch-am] ‘that we ask it’ in (131b). For a diachronic discussion of these forms and their corresponding structures, see Thurneysen and Hertz (1936).

(131) a. *baferr oldaas adígal* (Wb 9c21)

ba-ferr	
COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG.DECL-good/COMP	
ol- ^N ta-as	a ^L -dígal
than-REL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL	POSS.3SG.N-vengeance/NOM.SG.F

‘it were better than to avenge it’.

b. *ismóa dongnísom oldaas dontlucham* (Wb 21d9)

is-móa	do- ^N -gní-som
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-big/COMP	PV-REL-make/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT-NA.3SG.M

relative nasalization of this perfect form is due to the rule stated above in Section 3.2.3. Such a syntactic structure implies the same basic conditions as in the expression used to introduce the standard NP of comparison, in which the antecedent of the relative verb is not its subject, but a predicative adjective. In this situation, the nasalized relative form of the substantive verb is used instead of the copula when the antecedent is precisely the predicate of the copula, as stated by Thurneysen (1946: 475). However, when the present indicative of the substantive verb must be expressed in that syntactic context, the nasalizing relative clause type forms of the stem (*·*)*tá*(*·*) seems to be avoided, and the corresponding declarative clause type form is used. In (132b), the initial part of the cleft-sentence must be analyzed as *massu-amnin* ‘if it is so’, where *massu* represents the combination of the conditional conjunction *ma^l* with the 3SG present indicative of the copula (see Section 9.4.7 for this expression). In example (132c), the pragmatically unmarked clause would be **huare as nintrinsecus in gním* ‘because the active is *intrinsecus*’, according to Section 5.6.2.

(132)a. *isfaittech rondboisom nant neque manebunt asrubart* (Ml 21d4)⁶⁰

is-faittech

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-careful/NOM.SG.N

ro-^N-d^L-boi-som

PERF-REL-3SG.N/REL-SUBSTV/PRET.ACT.3SG-NA.3SG.M

nant-neque manebunt

as-^L-ru-bar-t

COP.PRES.IND.NEG.REL.3SG-*neque manebunt* PV-REL/PERF-say-PRET.ACT.3SG

‘It is careful that he was that it is not *neque manebunt* that he said’.

b. (*mass*)*uamnín ataam ammicosmili frisincethir ...* (Wb 13c12)

ma-ssu-amnin

a(d)·ta-am

if-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-thus

PV-DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND-1PL.ACT

ammi-cosmil-i

fris-in-cethir

COP.PRES.IND.1PL.DECL-similar-NOM.PL.M to-ART.ACC.SG-beast/ACC.SG

‘If it is thus that we are, we are like unto the beast ...’.

⁶⁰ Note that this example includes two cleft-sentences one after another. The one commented on in the text (i.e. *isfaittech rondboisom*) has the function of an attitudinal adjunct just like the one in (134b) in Section 9.4.2, and takes a complement clause, i.e. the clause introduced by the nasalizing relative copula *nant*, which introduces a cleft-sentence in which the Latin words *neque manebunt* are focused. The combination of an attitudinal adjunct with a complement clause is not rare in Old Irish, but the latter is not usually a cleft-sentence.

- c. *huare is intrínsecus atá in gním 7 extrinsecus incésad ...* (Sg 139a3)
- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| huare | is- <i>intrínsecus</i> | |
| because | COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL- <i>intrinsecus</i> | |
| a(d)·tá | | in-gním |
| PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT | | ART.NOM.SG.M-action/NOM.SG.M |
| 7 | <i>extrinsecus</i> | in-césad |
| and | <i>extrinsecus</i> | ART.NOM.SG.M-passion/NOM.SG.M |
- ‘because the action (= active) is *intrinsecus*, and the passion (= passive) *extrinsecus*, ...’ (more lit. ‘because it is *intrinsecus* that the active is, and *extrinsecus* (that) the passive (is), ...’).

Example (132b) is also remarkable because of the contrast between the two contiguous 1PL forms, namely the substantive verb *ataam* and the copula *ammi-* dealt with in Section 9.4.3 below. More cases of this use of the substantive verb with the function of the copula can be found in Ó hUiginn (1987: 182).

This use of the declarative clause type form in present indicative forms such as the ones given in examples (132b,c), i.e. *ataam* and *atá*, is probably due to the fact that the nasalizing relative clause type forms of the stem (·)tá(-) have already been fixed (by either lexicalization or grammaticalization) to express the functions described in the previous section. This seems to be also the reason for the suppletive use of the nasalizing relative clause type form of the perfect of the verb *gaibid* ‘takes’ to express precisely the corresponding clause type form of present indicative of the substantive verb, as observed in Section 10.4.4 below.

The second use of the stem (·)tá(-) as a surrogate form of the copula involves a declarative clause type. As Thurneysen (1946: 475) observes, this happens “in the rare cases where the subject stands between [copular] verb and predicate,” a situation that is observed in example (133), a gloss referred to the Latin title *Deus noster refugium* ‘God is our refuge’.

- (133) *atá dia atach ndunni ...* (Ml 66d1)

a(d)·tá		dia
PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT		God/NOM.SG.M
atach ^N		du-n-ni
refuge/NOM.SG.N		to-1PL-NA1PL

‘God is a refuge to us ...’.

In both situations exemplified in (132) and (133), the use of the substantive verb instead of the copula is due to the fact that the unstressed copula cannot appear by itself, i.e. separated from its predicate. As illustrated at length in Section 9.4

below, the copula is an unstressed form that regularly appears before its nominal predicate, so that it cannot appear by itself in case its nominal predicate (a noun or an adjective) is located in other position. The cleft-sentence is a clear situation in which this can happen. In this case, and in contrast to other verbal predicates that are to be focused (see the *figura etymologica* quoted in Sections 3.2.1 and 4.7.2 fn.), non-verbal predicates do not need to be nominalized. When the adjective used as non-verbal predicate appears in the focused position of the cleft-sentence, any other element of the copular clause is introduced by the substantive verb, mostly with relative nasalization.

Finally, there are some few cases in which the substantive verb is used instead of the copula: Wb 8d24 *nímþha firion* ‘I am not righteous’, and Wb 12a21 *hóre nimthalaám*⁶¹ ‘because I am not a hand’; both are forms of the 3SG substantive verb, with infixed 1SG pronoun as the marker of the subject of the clause.

9.3.7 Summary

The present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb, which is regularly used to express locative and existential predicates, displays a complex distribution of the suppletive stems (·)tá(-) and (·)fil(-) in the paradigm of clause types proposed in the previous chapter, particularly in the declarative and relative clause types.

One of the most noticeable features of the Old Irish substantive verb is the variety of predicate types and meanings that it – in particular the stem (·)tá(-) – expresses by using the inflectional possibilities included in the paradigm of clause types.

The forms in Table 9.1 above that express locative and existential non-verbal predicates are given in Table 9.2 below, which only includes the available 3rd

61 In this gloss Wb 12a21, the form *nimthalaám* is preceded by two forms with the stem (·)tá(-) that practically have the meaning of the copula: *issochruidiu láam oldósa olcoss nidichorp atóosa hóre nimthalaám* ‘Hand is comelier than I’, says the foot. ‘I am not of the Body because I am not Hand’. For *ol-dó-sa* see Section 9.3.5, and for the declarative form *atóo-sa*, see Section 3.2.3. The use of the negative form *nimtha-* as a purely copular expression could therefore be due to the previous forms with copular meaning, as if it were due some sort of morphosyntactic assimilation. As Ó Máille (1911: 7–8) suggests, this Wb form *nimtha-* can be compared to chronologically later forms like *nimda* (TBC-I² 729, but manuscript Y *nidam*): *nimda* / *nidam* is clearly used as a copula and represents an innovation: the first variant could be related to the forms of the Glosses, whereas the latter may be due to the influence of the 1SG declarative clause positive *am* ‘I am’, if it is not a mere amalgamation of *nita* / *nida* with *am*; those copula forms are considered in Sections 9.4.3 and 9.4.6 below.

person forms. The foregoing description must be summarized in the following points.

(a) The stem (\cdot)*tá*(-) is a fully inflected verb in much the same way as other active verbs and basically expresses the locative and existential non-verbal predicates in the positive declarative clause type. In the positive declarative clause type, existential predicates are sometimes expressed by the stem *fil*(-) (as noted in Table 9.2), a use that is very frequent in the negative declarative forms.

Tab. 9.2: The present indicative 3SG and 3PL of the Old Irish substantive verb with locational and existential meaning

	Declarative		Relative		Wh-interr.	Polar interr.	Responsive	Imperative
Positive	<i>at-tá</i>	<i>fil</i>	<i>i-táa</i>	<i>fil(e)</i>	<i>cia fil</i>	<i>in-fil</i>	<i>fil</i>	<i>bíid</i>
	<i>at-taat</i>	<i>filus</i>	<i>i-taat</i>			?		<i>biat</i>
Negative		<i>ni-fil</i>	?	<i>nad-fil</i>		?	?	<i>na-bíd</i>
		<i>nis-fil</i>	?	?		?		?

(b) A rule that can be formulated for the stem (\cdot)*tá*(-) is that if it is combined with an affixal pronoun (this possibility is not included in Table 9.2), i.e. if that verbal complex includes two participants, it then expresses possession. In this case, the presence of pronominal affixes determines the type of non-verbal predication. The difference between positive declarative and relative clause types in this function is expressed by the formal opposition between forms with suffixed and (with the conjunct particle *no*-) infixed pronominal forms.

(c) The stem (\cdot)*fil*(-), which is most frequently found as the 3SG / 3PL absolute positive relative clause type form, has even fewer inflectional possibilities than the passive forms, which have two (i.e. 3SG and 3PL). This complies with its main use for the relative clause type, in the sense that a relative clause involves a less finite character. The notion of finiteness that is assumed here is that referred to in Section 8.6 above. In much the same way as the passive paradigm, the stem (\cdot)*fil*(-) resorts to the infixed pronouns to express persons other than the 3rd ones. Due to this less finite character, this use of the stem (\cdot)*fil*(-) is very similar to the ‘predicativizing copula’ of a non-verbal nature considered by Hengeveld (1992: 189) for the Turkish ‘copulas’ used in presentative constructions, and this explains its sporadic use in the expression of existential predicates noted in (a).

(d) The opposition between existential and locative non-verbal predicates is neutralized in the positive relative clause type expressed by the stem (\cdot)*fil*(-), i.e. the one in which the main argument of the clause is anteposed and is therefore

not in the clausal domain. This neutralization, which involves the effect of a specific clause type (the restrictive relative clause of a tautophrasal antecedent) onto two subtypes of non-verbal predicates (existential and locative), is probably a cross-linguistically general phenomenon. This point should be analyzed more in detail.

(e) The stem (*·*)*fil(-)* is also used to express complementation, probably as a consequence of the previously observed tendency to express existential predicate in negative verbal complexes. In this regard, the Old Irish substantive verb is clearly different from other verbs (including the copula), in which complement clauses are marked by relative nasalization (Section 5.3.2). As a further difference with respect to other Old Irish verbs, the stem (*·*)*fil(-)* also appears in combination with the conditional subordinating conjunction *má^l*, as noted in Section 9.3.3.

(f) The stem (*·*)*tá(-)*, basically used to express declarative clause type, is further used to express other types of (positive) relative clause type that are less subordinate and are linked to relative nasalization, as stated in Section 9.3.5.

(g) Some nasalizing relative clause type forms of the stem (*·*)*tá(-)* have been fixed in specific lexicalized or grammaticalized uses. This is probably why the corresponding (i.e. the nasalizing relative clause type) forms of the perfect of the verb *gaibid* have been suppletively used to express the functions of those forms of the substantive verb.

(h) The stem (*·*)*tá(-)* is further characterized by its use as a surrogate form of the copula under specific circumstances in which the copula, due to its unstressed character, cannot stand by itself. This use can be interpreted in terms very similar to the neutralization seen in point (d) above, though it is a specifically Old Irish phenomenon: the difference between the attributive and locative non-verbal predicates is neutralized when the nominal element of the former is anteposed to be focused in the cleft-sentence.

If the use of the suppletive stems (*·*)*tá(-)* and (*·*)*fil(-)* in relative verbal complexes is considered, there seems to be a distribution according to the functions expressed in other verbs by relative nasalization and lenition respectively. In view of the main clause-like character of relative nasalization assumed in Section 5.7 above, this agrees with the use of the stem (*·*)*tá(-)* in the positive declarative clause type. This is surely true, but does not mean that the subordinate uses of (*·*)*fil(-)* only belong to the functional field covered by relative lenition. Recall that (*·*)*fil(-)* is also used in the negative declarative clause type form, and that it also expresses complement clause, which is a matter of relative nasalization in the remaining Old Irish verbs.

In order to make sense of the previous statement, it can be said that stem suppletion in the present indicative paradigm of the Old Irish substantive verb

seems to be related to the fact that the initially expected forms are used for other purposes. This is particularly clear for the nasalizing absolute relative forms of the stem (·)tá(-), which have been fixed in lexical ('to be vexed') and grammatical uses (introducing the standard NP of comparison). The corresponding functions of the nasalizing relative clause type in the paradigm of the substantive verb are expressed by other elements: one of the possibilities is the stem (·)fil(-), especially for complement clauses; another is the nasalizing relative clause form *rondgab* 'that (s)he / it is (in...)', especially for adverbial subordinate clauses. In those two subordinated contexts, the declarative form can also be found.

But there are other forms of the stem (·)tá(-) about which one may reasonably wonder why they are not used in this paradigm of the substantive verb. As already mentioned in Section 9.3.1, neither the assumable negative declarative clause type form *ní-tá(-), e.g. *ní-taam sund 'we are not here', or *ní-taat and 'they are not there', nor the negative relative form *nad-tá sund 'that is not here' are used. Similarly, one may also wonder why there are no polar interrogative clause type forms such as e.g. *in-t/daad sund 'are you (pl.) here?', or *in-t/daat and 'are they there?'. An answer to these questions will be attempted in the diachronic part of this chapter.

9.4 The present indicative of the Old Irish copula

9.4.1 General outline of the paradigm

The Old Irish copula stands out against the remaining verbs by some exclusive and interrelated traits, the most relevant and decisive one being probably its unstressed character (Thurneysen 1946: 269). This general feature of all copula forms, not only of the present indicative, requires that they are attached to the following stressed item, regularly the bare nominal / adjectival predicate. This is why the forms in Table 9.3 below are all furnished with a hyphen, since they will always be followed by their predicate. The sequence of pretonic copula and nominal predicate should be considered a verbal complex, and as noted in *DIL s.u. is*, a fact that clearly speaks in favor of this is that the *nota augens* comes after the predicate, as in e.g. Wb 21d3 *nibadimicthe-se libsi* 'I should not be despised by you', Ml 55d11 *it firian-su* 'you are righteous'.

The non-verbal predicate formed with the Old Irish copula has no option to alternate between forms with and without affixal pronouns in the way a typical transitive verb does it. The few cases of a copula with an affixal pronoun attested in the Glosses will be considered in Section 9.4.3, but they represent a very reduced percentage of the copular forms. The important consequence of this fact is

now that, with respect to the general Old Irish paradigm of clause types considered in Section 8.3 above, the paradigm of the Old Irish copula in Table 9.3 does not include the inflectional possibility of adding a pronominal affix. Table 9.3 describes the situation in the language of the Glosses, and it relies mainly on the treatments by Strachan (1898/99) and Thurneysen (1946). To a great extent, it can be taken as the starting point of later developments treated by Ó Máille (1911).

Tab. 9.3: The paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of the Old Irish copula

	Decla- rative	Relative	Wh- interr.	Polar interr.	Respon- sive	Imperative
Positive	<i>am-</i>	<i>nonda^L-</i>		<i>inda-</i>		?
	<i>a/it-</i>	<i>nonda^L-</i>		?		<i>ba^L-</i>
	<i>is-</i>	<i>as^{L/N}- / -(d)id-</i>	<i>(cía</i>	<i>in^N-</i>		<i>ba/ed^L-, -bad^L-</i>
	<i>a/immi-</i>	<i>nondan^L-</i>	<i>cis^í-</i>	?	(see Sec-	<i>baan^L-</i>
	<i>a/idib-</i>	<i>nondad^L-</i>	<i>cid^L-</i>	?	tion 9.4.5	?
	<i>it-</i>	<i>at(a)^{L/N}- / -ndat-</i>	<i>citne)</i>	<i>indat^(N)-</i>	below)	?
Negative	<i>nita^L-</i>	?		?		?
	<i>nita^L-</i>	?		<i>cenita^L-</i>		<i>na-ba-</i> and so
	<i>ní-</i>	<i>nad^L/nand^N/nách-</i>		<i>cáni- / cini-</i>	<i>nách-</i>	on
	<i>nitan^L-</i>	?		<i>(innach-)</i>		
	<i>nitad^L-</i>	?		?		
	<i>nitat-</i>	<i>natat- / nandat-</i>		?		

Section 9.4.2 illustrates the function of the Old Irish copula as introducer of attributive non-verbal predicates; Section 9.4.3 explains the meaning of the terms ‘absolute’ and ‘conjunct’ when they refer to the copula, and Section 9.4.4 considers the problem of the *wh*-interrogative forms; Section 9.4.5 deals with the polar interrogative and responsive forms; Section 9.4.6 focuses on the copula forms with *-ta-/-da-* (i.e. the suppletive non-3SG persons of the negative declarative, positive and negative relative and polar interrogative clause types), and Section 9.4.7 includes the so-called ‘conjunct’ forms, i.e. the 3SG of negated declarative, relative, and polar interrogative clauses, as well as the 3SG of the copula combined with the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-* and *-* as forms not included in Table 9.3 – with *ma^L* ‘if’, *cía^L* ‘though’ and *bés* ‘perhaps’. Finally, Section 9.4.8 resumes the main traits of the Old Irish copula and identifies some issues to be considered in the diachronic section of this chapter.

9.4.2 The Old Irish copular clause

The bare or attributive non-verbal predication defined above in Section 9.2 is based on the non-referential predicate that acts as the host of the pretonic copula forms given in Table 9.3. This use is illustrated in practically all the cases quoted in this section. The copula is also used in two further predicate types, the cleft-sentence (Section 3.2.2) and the referential non-verbal predicate (Section 10.2), which are probably related to each other, as suggested in Section 10.2.6.

In (134a), the copular predicate including the copula and the adjective *irlam* ‘ready’ is followed by its subject *ind-anim* ‘the soul’. Needless to say, 3rd person subjects may have been stated previously in the discourse, either in a preceding clause, or as a left-dislocated topic constituent, a structure introduced in Section 3.3.2. As Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 180–182) observes, the adjectival predicate is often used in Old Irish as an ‘attitudinal disjunct’, that is to say, used to modify a whole clause occupying the place of the subject, as observed in (134b), in which the complement clause is marked with relative nasalization, i.e. [na^N(d)-máar].

(134) a. *aris irlam indanim do thuil dée ...* (Wb 5c18)

ar is-irlam		ind-anim
for COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-ready/NOM.SG.M		ART.NOM.SG.F-soul/NOM.SG.F
do ^L -tuil	dée	
to-desire/ACC.SG.F	God/GEN.SG.M	
‘for the soul is ready to (do) God’s will ...’.		

b. *isfollus didiu nanmáar bríg labrad ilbéire* (Wb 12d28)

isfollus		didiu
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-clear/NOM.SG.M		then
na ^N (d)-máar		bríg
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.REL-great/NOM.SG.F		value/NOM.SG.F
labrad	il-béire	
speaking/NOM.SG.M	many-language/GEN.PL.N	
‘it is manifest, then, that speaking many languages is not of great value’.		

A noun may be used as copular predicate in the way of the preceding examples, provided that it is referentially indefinite, as in (135a); another such case is (144a) in Section 10.2.2 below. The semantic value of some of those cases can be used in a way similar to the ‘attitudinal disjuncts’ just quoted, as in (135b).

(135)a. *itcarit domsa immurgu* (Wb 5c7)

it-car-it	do-m-sa	immurgu
COP.PRES.IND.3PL.DECL-friend-NOM.PL.M	to-1SG-NA.1SG	however

‘they are friends of mine, however’.

b. *aribés leosom indaim dothúarcuin* (Wb 10d6)

ar	is-bés	le-o-som
for	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-custom/NOM.SG.M	with-3PL-NA.3PL
in-daim	do ^l -túarcuin	
ART.NOM.PL.M-ox/NOM.PL.M	to-tread out/DAT.SG.F	

‘for it is a custom among them (for) the oxen to tread out’.

As observed by Strachan (1898/99: 49), the copular clause has predicate elements other than adjectives and nouns, such as prepositional phrases as in (136a), or nouns in genitive case, as in (136b).

(136)a. *ar isdinchorp inball* (Wb 22c18)

ar	is-d(i)-in ^l -corp
for	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-of-ART.DAT.SG.M-body/DAT.SG.M
in-ball	
	ART.NOM.SG.M-member/NOM.SG.M

‘for of the body is the member’.

b. *ammi dée huili* (Wb 6b20)

ammi-dée	huili
COP.PRES.IND.1PL.DECL-God/GEN.SG.M	all/NOM.PL.M

‘we are all God’s’.

The copular clause of (136a) seems to be related to the cleft-sentence, a structure that very often includes focused prepositional phrases, as observed in Section 3.2.1; in McCone’s (1996b: 33) words, this is a case of “suppression of the substantive verb after a prepositional phrase fronted by means of the copula.” The gloss that comes immediately before the one in (136a) precisely contains a cleft-sentence with anteposed prepositional phrases (namely, *do-crist* and *dond-eclis*), though the following verb is a copula (*is immaircide*): Wb 22c17 *hore isdocrist et dondeclis is immaircide* ‘because it is fitted to Christ and to the Church’. The structure of (136a) could then be considered as a simplification from a structure such as **is din chorp atá in ball*. These uses of the copula exemplified in (136), as well

as those in which it is directly followed by a relative verbal complex, must be deemed as rather secondary.

9.4.3 Absolute and conjunct and the positive declarative paradigm

Now that the main function of the Old Irish copula has been analyzed in some detail, it is time to look at formal properties of this paradigm by considering the way in which the terms ‘absolute’ and ‘conjunct’ may be applied to it. As noted in Section 4.2, ‘absolute’ primarily refers to the verbal form that has no pretonic element, and ‘conjunct’ refers to the verbal form that is combined with a pretonic element. Given that the Old Irish copula is not combined with lexical preverbs and that it is always a pretonic constituent, the terms ‘absolute’ and ‘conjunct’ have a related but slightly different meaning in the description of the Old Irish copula: ‘absolute’ copula forms are those that have no conjunct particle; ‘conjunct’ forms are those in which the copula form contains a conjunct particle, though in some cases, it is not clear at all whether the conjunct particle is added to any copula form, at least in view of the Old Irish situation.

Thus, among the forms in Table 9.3, the positive declarative and imperative paradigms, as well as the 3SG *as*^{N/L}- and 3PL *at(a)*^{N/L}- forms of the positive relative paradigm may be taken as ‘absolute’, while the forms *-(d)id-* (in e.g. the 3SG *condid-*) and *-^Nda-* (in e.g. the 3PL *condat-*) in the same positive relative paradigm count as ‘conjunct’ forms. For these and the remaining ‘conjunct’ forms, see Sections 9.4.5 and 9.4.6 below.

Turning to the positive declarative forms of the present indicative, the 1PL and the 3PL show the same form as the absolute declarative endings introduced in Section 4.3.1. Compare the copula forms 1PL *a/immi-* and 3PL *it-* with the ending of e.g. 1PL *cel-m(a)i* and 3PL *cel-(a)it* respectively. With a minor adjustment, the same applies to the copula form 1SG *am-*, which has basically the same nasal as other 1SG endings in *-(a)im(m)*, e.g. *caraim*. By contrast, the 2nd person copula forms (namely, 2SG *a/it-* and 2PL *a/idib-*)⁶² differ from any other 2nd person ending included in slot 5, and their final consonants (*-t* and *-b*) are exactly the same as the corresponding (Class A) infixed pronouns of slot 2 presented in Section 2.6.

⁶² For the variants *adi-* and *ada(b)-*, see the discussion in Schumacher (2004: 306–308). For a partially similar interpretation of these two 2nd persons, see Lash (2017: 91), who apparently derives the *-t-* of the 2SG *a/it-* from the tonic form *tú*. In view of the restrictions of the use of the Old Irish tonic pronouns noted in Section 10.2.1 below, the Class A affix form *-t^L-* provides a much more straightforward explanation.

This is an assumable interpretation, given the pretonic place occupied by the Old Irish copula stated in Section 9.4.1, and given that the subject of the clause is also expressed in other verbs by means of the infixes (systematically in the passive paradigm, as seen in Section 4.5.1). The positive declarative 3SG form *is* of the present indicative is different from the corresponding 3SG form of any other verb in Old Irish.

The positive declarative paradigm of the present indicative of the copula therefore represents a highly irregular paradigm, but a more specific description is possible. Whereas isolating a lexical basis for the paradigm is an actually difficult task, the identification of the forms with personal markers appearing in either slot 2 or 5 of other Old Irish verbs is straightforward, apart from the idiosyncratic 3SG form.

The idea proposed in Section 9.4.1 above, namely, that the Old Irish paradigm of clause types of the present indicative of copula does not include the inflectional possibility of the affixal pronouns, deserves a brief comment at this moment. The previous analysis of the copula forms in this section, in particular of the ‘absolute’ ones, involves the assumption of affixal pronouns in one or another way, notably, in the 2nd persons. However, the important issue is that these forms are fixed, that is to say, that they do not involve the regular alternation and the formal and semantic contrast with respect to a form without that infix. Only in a few examples is the Old Irish copula actually combined with an infix pronoun. Thurneysen (1946: 269–270, 485) and Strachan (1898/99: 65) offer the following cases. In the Glosses, Wb 10d24 *issumecen* ‘it is necessary for me’, instead of usual e.g. Ml 21b9 *isecen dam*, Wb 16c17 *nibécen* and Wb 22d12 *nibécen* ‘it is not necessary for you (PL)’,⁶³ Ml 55d21 *isatdílmainsiu* (ms. *isadílmainsiu*) ‘it is free to you’; 3rd persons are expressed by the more visible Class C infix pronouns: Ml 90d12 *issid naithrech* ‘he repents’ (i.e. *iss-id^N-aithrech*); see a parallel use of this more visible masculine infix in example (57), in Section 4.8.3. Class C is also found in relative clause type forms, as in EC §6 *asdom-moo airli / cumachtu*⁶⁴

63 This interpretation of Wb 22d12 (*nibécen naaill act resistere ...*) is defended by Thurneysen (1946: 269) and Kavanagh (2001: 585). Wb 22d12 refers to the Latin text *Induite uos armatura Dei, ut possitis stare aduersus insidias diabuli* ‘Take the armor of God, so that you may be able to stand against the attacks of the Devil’, so that a translation of the Old Irish gloss such as ‘nothing else is necessary for you but *resistere ...*’ seems reasonable. In the translation of Stokes and Strachan (‘nought else should be needful save *resistere ...*’), a 3SG present subjunctive of the copula is interpreted (as expressly stated in Strachan 1898/99: 39).

64 As McCone (2000: 147–148) notes, this form is not otherwise attested in Old Irish, but the manuscript evidence is solid enough as to propose it as the corresponding relative form of the previous *isum-*.

‘which is greater than counsel / power to me’. Again with the negative particle: *Thes.* ii 317.7 (Fiacc’s H.) *nímdil* (= *ní-m^L-dil*) ‘it is not dear to me’. These cases, which are actually exceptional, represent an attempt to express the role of the experiencer (see e.g. Croft 2001: 155–156) by means of a pronominal marker between the copula and the adjective, a role that is normally expressed in Old Irish by means of a conjugated preposition.

9.4.4 The Old Irish *wh*-interrogative copular clause

The *wh*-interrogative forms given in Table 9.3 do not need to be considered as actual forms of the paradigm of the Old Irish copula. In the description in Section 6.5.2, they have been considered as stressed forms that partly derive from the combination of a *wh*-interrogative pronoun with the corresponding 3rd person pronoun. Similarly, the 3SG *cote cate* 3PL *cotee[e]t cateet* ‘how, (of) what sort?’ (other persons are not attested, see again Section 6.5.2) do not involve the forms of the copula. According to this formal interpretation, the copular interrogative clauses in which these forms take part must be taken as forms with null expression of the verbal copula.

In Kavanagh (2001: 584), the *-d* of the form *ced / cid* ‘what’ and ‘why’ is seen as the same morphological element as the form *-(d)id* appearing in the 3SG of conjunct forms (as observed in Section 9.4.7 below). However, two objections can be raised up against this idea: (a) the other parallel forms, especially the feminine *cisí*, speak for the pronominal origin for *ced / cid*; (b) the fact that this *ced / cid* appears frequently followed by a relative clause, as in examples (86a,b) in Section 6.3.1, makes of it something different from those forms of the 3SG. It seems better to maintain all the forms of *ced / cid* ‘what?’ in the pronominal interrogative paradigm, according to the traditional view.

As in general for the thus far described verbal complex (see Section 8.5.2), the Old Irish copula has no synthetic expression for the negative *wh*-interrogative clause type, as if it were ‘who / what is not good for you?’. Such a question should be made by means of a cleft-sentence like **cia nadtabair digail* ‘who [is] who does not inflict punishment?’, an invented instance based on Ml 91a20 *intí nad tabair digail* ‘he who does not inflict punishment’. The value as ‘why-question’ of utterances like Wb 28b1 *cid natat sláin indhuli ...* ‘why are not all saved ...?’ is perhaps a derivation from that negative questions, as if it were initially ‘what is that they are not all saved?’, in line with the combination of the same interrogative pronoun with a negative verbal complex also observed in Section 8.5.2.

9.4.5 Polar interrogative and responsive

The examples in (137a,b) show the positive 1SG and 3PL forms respectively, and in (138) the negative 3SG; an example of the positive 3SG form is in (107) above. The 3SG of the negative polar interrogative copula form is normally *cani-* / *cini-* in Wb, in which the synonymous particle chain *innach-* does not seem to be used.⁶⁵ A negative 2SG form *cenita-* can be found in example (140) below.

(137)a. *indaapstal ...* (Wb 10c20)

in-da-apstal

POLINT-COP.PRES.IND.1SG-apostle/NOM.SG.M

‘am I an apostle, ...?’

b. *indat mbriathra* (Ml 44b9)

in-da-t^N-briathr-a

POLINT-COP.PRES.IND-3PL-word-NOM.PL.F

‘is it the words?’.⁶⁶

(138) *cini inonn riagul linn* (Wb 18a16)

cini-inonn

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.POLINT-same

‘is it not the same rule with us?’

riagul

rule/NOM.SG.F

li-nn

with-1PL

The 3SG present indicative negative responsive of the copula *nach-* has been observed in example (115) in Section 7.4.1 above. As for the corresponding positive responsive form, and given that the Old Irish responsive may be defined formally as the form of the polar interrogative clause type deprived from the specific mark-

⁶⁵ This is one of the few cases in which the negative version of the copula differs from the negative version of other verbs, a phenomenon considered by Eriksen (2011), and still this particle *cani-* is also attested with other verbs: see the cases of (106) in Section 7.2. For the rest, negation is much the same for the copula and for the remaining verbs.

⁶⁶ This copular predicate is the initial part of a truncated cleft-sentence in which there are only the introducing copula and the focused constituent. In line with the following gloss, Ml 44b10–11, in which this polar interrogative copular predicate is repeated and followed by *delictorum meorum* ‘of my crimes’, and by the expression of example of (116), i.e. *inmed insin furuar dait* ‘is it that that caused it to Thee?’, the glossator seems to be asking whether the words are the cause of the speaker’s tribulations. Example in (137b) should be then understood as ‘is it the words (what have caused it to me)?’.

ers of this clause type, as established in Section 7.4.4, the responsive of the copular predicate corresponds to the bare nominal predicate; in other words, the responsive of the copular predicate is the nominal clause. The examples in (139) are taken from narratives of the type included in Section 7.4.1. The same procedure is found in Breton and Welsh, as noted by Jones (1999: 30, 45–47).

(139)a. ‘*Cani sétir lat-su mo snádud airi?*’ or *Etarcomol. ‘Sétir dano’, ol Fergus* (TBC-I² 1296–1297)

cani-sétir		la-t-su
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT.NEG-possible		with-2SG-NA.2SG
mo ^l -snádud	air-i	or-Etarcomol
POSS.1SG-protection/NOM.SG.M	for-3SG.M	RSM-Etarcomol/NOM.SG.M
sétir	dano	ol-Fergus
(COP.PRES.IND.3SG.RESP/)possible	indeed	RSM-Fergus/NOM.SG.M

‘Can you not protect me from him?’, said Etarcomol. ‘I can’, said Fergus’ (lit. ‘is it not possible for you my protection ...?’ ... ‘Possible indeed’ ...’).

b. ‘*In maith ro-mberbais a m-biad?*’, ar a athair. ‘*Maith*’, olsí. (BB 71–72)

in-maith		ro ^N -berb-ais
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT-good/NOM.SG.N		PERF•REL-boil-PRET.ACT.2SG
a ^N -biad	ar-a-athair	
ART.ACC.SG.N-food/ACC.SG.N	RSM-POSS.3SG.F-father/NOM.SG.M	
maith		ol-sí
(COP.PRES.IND.3SG.RESP/)good/NOM.SG.N		RSM-3SG.F

‘‘Have you boiled the food well?’’, said her father. ‘Yes’, said she’ (lit. ‘‘Is it well that you have boiled the food?’’, said her father. ‘Well’, said she’).

c. ‘*In gaisced gebes in gilla?*’, or *Cathbad. ‘Ed’*, ol Conchobar (TBC-I² 628–629)

in-gaisced		geb-es
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT-arms/NOM.SG.N		take/FUT-3SG.ACT.REL
in-gilla	or-Cathbad	
ART.NOM.SG.M-boy/NOM.SG.M	RSM-Cathbad/NOM.SG.M	
ed		ol-Conchobar
(COP.PRES.IND.3SG.RESP/)3SG.N		RSM-Conchobar/NOM.SG.M

‘‘Is the boy taking up arms?’’, asked Cathbad. ‘Yes’, said Conchobar’ (lit. ‘‘is it the arms what the boy is taking up?’ ... ‘They’ ...’).

Note that example (139c) may be interpreted as a specific responsive form of the cleft-sentence, in which the neuter tonic pronoun *ed*, which refers anaphorically

to the focused element of the preceding polar interrogative cleft-sentence (i.e. to the neuter *gaisced* ‘arms’), stands for a cleft-sentence that can be assumed as **is ed gebes in gilla*. The Finnish example provided by Jones (1999: 25) in which the focused 3SG m. pronoun *hän* ‘he’ of the polar question is the responsive form (i.e. A: *hänkö tulee?* ‘is it him who comes?’, B: *hän* ‘yes’, lit. ‘he’) is a nice parallel of this Old Irish example.

In the language of the Glosses, in which very few responsive forms are used, there are of course nominal clauses that are no more than that, but some cases are located directly after the corresponding question and are therefore liable to an interpretation parallel to the preceding cases, as in example (140), which has been quoted also in Section 7.4.3 above. Note that this example includes the emphatic particle *écin* ‘indeed’ after the responsive form in the same way as in examples (111a), (112) and (114) given in Section 7.4.1. The element *-ta-* of the 2SG form *cenita*¹ is dealt with in the next Section.

(140) *cenita chumgabthasiu cumgabthæ écin* (Ml 84c3)

zeni-ta¹-cum-gab-tha-siu

NEG.POLINT-COP.PRES.IND.2SG-PV-exalt-PRT.PASS/NOM.SG.M-NA.2SG

cum-gab-thæ

écin

(COP.PRES.IND.RESP/)PV-exalt-PRT.PASS/NOM.SG.M indeed

‘are you not exalted? exalted truly’ (less lit. ‘are you not exalted? Yes, indeed’).

The expressive value of some nominal clauses noted by Baudiš (1913a: 319–320), who offers a number of examples of such clauses, can be put along the expressive function that the responsive may also involve, as observed in Section 7.4.2.

9.4.6 The element *-ta-/-da-* in the paradigm of the Old Irish copula

A morphological ‘conjunct’ component noted here as *-ta-/-da-* can be identified in a number of paradigms given in Table 9.3 above.⁶⁷ One may define its distribution in negative terms, namely, it appears in clause types other than the positive

⁶⁷ Since it is important for the diachronic discussion in Section 9.5.3 below, it must be mentioned that, in so-called Archaic Irish, there are three copula forms in which this element *-ta-/-da-* appears with *-e-* vocalism: (i) *Thes.* ii 246.5–6 (Cambray Homily) 1PL *oire nundem membr uili* ... ‘for we all are members ...’; (ii) *Thes.* i 713.23 3PL *donnatdet adblama inna esiu* ‘to whom

declarative, responsive, and imperative and in persons other than the 3SG, but it can also be defined in positive terms: according to the available attestation, this element *-ta/-da-* constitutes the stem of the ‘conjunct’ copula forms of the 1st, 2nd, and 3PL persons of negative declarative, (positive and negative) relative and (positive and negative) polar interrogative clause types. The coincidence in the distribution across the mentioned paradigms, which can clearly be observed in the negative declarative and positive relative clause type paradigms, as well as the intraparadigmatic contrast with the 3SG *ní-* in the negative declarative paradigm speaks for the consideration of a single morphological element, a stem which is noted as *-ta/-da-*.⁶⁸ This morphological element stands in a suppletive relationship with respect to other forms of the paradigm in Table 9.3 above, among others with respect to the positive declarative forms.

The variant *-ta-* is most frequently found in the negative declarative copula form in which it is preceded by *ní-*; *-da-* is more usual in the other clause types. In the positive relative paradigm, the 3rd person ‘absolute’ copula forms, i.e. 3SG *as-* and 3PL *at(a)-*, also stand in a sort of suppletive relationship with the ‘conjunct’ forms which include this element *-da-*, i.e. 1SG 2SG *-da^l-*, 1PL *-dan^l-*,⁶⁹ 2PL *-dad^l-*, 3PL *-dat-*. See the collection of Old Irish forms offered by Strachan (1898/99: 31–32). Due to their formal difference, the 3SG ‘conjunct’ forms *ní-*, *nad-*, *in-* as well as those with *-(d)id*, are treated separately in the next Section.

The distribution of these suppletive forms, 3rd persons *as-* and *ata-* vs 1st and 2nd persons with *-da-*, in the positive relative paradigm is very similar to the variation seen in Sections 4.5.1 and 4.9.1 between absolute and compound forms in the mixed relative paradigm of passive simple verbs. In the negative declarative and (in so far as observable) negative relative and positive polar interrogative clause type paradigms, all the forms save the 3SG include this element *-ta/-da-*.

But perhaps the most relevant issue in the distribution of the forms with *-ta/-da-* is that they match the distribution of the stems *(·)tá(-)* and *(·)fil(-)* in the paradigm of the substantive verb observed in Section 9.3.2. To be more precise,

these things are not ready’; (iii) *Thes. i 713.25 2PL cenededissidi ...* ‘although you are knowing ...’ [ce^l-no-ded-físsidi].

68 Schumacher (2004: 295–296) analyzes these forms as “*nít-a*”, “*no-n-d-a*” and so on, i.e. he assumes a stem *-a-* for these copula forms, but gives no explanation for the component(s) previous to that *-a-*, i.e. for *-t-* and *-d-*.

69 According to Thurneysen (1946: 487), and following the explanation in Section 9.4.3 above, the *-n* of the conjunct 1PL present indicative form *-t/dan^l-* (e.g. in the negative declarative form of Wb 14c41 *nidan-chumachtig ...* ‘we are not potent ...’) is secondary with respect to the isolated 1PL variant in Wb 15b21 *nitam toirsech* ‘we are not sad’, and must be explained as due to the extension of the 1PL pronominal infix.

in those clause types in which the copula uses the stem *-ta-/-da-*, the substantive verb uses the stem *(·)fil(-)*. In Table 9.4, at least a 3SG form is given for each clause type, and on most occasions another one belonging to a 1st, 2nd, or 3PL person.

Tab. 9.4: The parallel suppletive pattern in the present indicative of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb

	Copula	Substantive verb
Positive declarative clause type	<i>am irlam</i> (Wb 1b9) 'I am ready'	<i>atō occombáig</i> (Wb 26d17) 'I am contending'
	<i>is-irlam lib ade</i> (Wb 16d7) 'this is ready with you'	<i>atá brithem and ...</i> (Wb 6b25) 'a judge is there ...'
Negative declarative clause type	<i>nīta-chummese friusom</i> (Wb 20c25) 'I am not the same as they'	<i>nifil nech and ...</i> (Wb 5a25) 'there is no one therein ...'
	<i>nī-dóir farmbethu</i> (Wb 4a3) 'your life is not base'	<i>nisfil hodie</i> (Sg 178b2) 'they are not today'
Positive relative clause type	<i>amal nonda-thorisse</i> (Wb 10a28) 'as I am trustworthy'	<i>innafer fel and</i> (Wb 4c1) 'of the men that are there'
	<i>amal as mār agalar</i> (Ml 40b9) 'as his sickness is great'	
Negative relative clause type ⁷⁰	<i>amal nāt anse dúib</i> (Wb 17c11) 'as is not hard for you'	
	<i>natat beca</i> (Ml 18b6) 'that are not small'	<i>asberat nad fil dlíged</i> (Ml 20c5) 'who say that there is no law'
	<i>cruth nandat chomsuidighthi</i> (Sg 201b12) ⁷¹ 'as they are not compounded'	
Positive polar interrogative clause type	<i>in innoñ ...</i> (Wb 24d11) 'is ... the same?'	<i>in-fil na aill dí?</i> (LU 5615) 'is there anything else?'
	<i>indat mbriathra</i> ⁷² (Ml 44b9) 'is it the words?'	

⁷⁰ There are only 3rd persons of the copula in this clause type (see Thurneysen 1946: 486), which can be related directly to the defectiveness of the relative paradigm already treated in Section 8.5.2. The forms of the substantive verb attested in the Glosses are only for complement clauses, as noted in Section 9.3.2 above.

⁷¹ This gloss has been given also in example (103b) in Section 6.6 above, to which the reader is referred for further details about the form *cruth*.

⁷² This copular predicate has been given in example (137b) above, to which I refer the reader for its interpretation. Although nasalization after the polar interrogative form of the copula is not systematically noted (see e.g. the preceding 3SG form), its appearance in this 3PL form cannot be very surprising; the other case cited by Strachan (1898/99: 32 fn.1), Ml 92d13 *nīdat nescmana* 'they are not impure', is certainly strange. The 1SG form of the same positive polar interrogative paradigm is given in example (137a).

Exceptions to this distribution are the sporadic use of *·tá* as a declarative form of the copula (Section 9.3.7), and of *fil(-)* as positive declarative forms of the substantive verb (Section 9.3.4).

9.4.7 The ‘conjunct’ 3rd person singular forms

Table 9.3 in Section 9.4.1 above includes the following conjunct 3SG copula forms: negative declarative *ni-*, negative relative *nad^l-*, and polar interrogative *in-*; the polar interrogative form *cani-* / *cini-* has been observed in Section 9.4.5 above. These forms are very similar to or plainly the same as the corresponding conjunct particles used in non-copular verbal complexes. In these cases, the structural interpretation of the copula as a conjunct particle could be more than a grammatical convention, and even more than a structural coincidence; it could be said that the conjunct particle *is* the copula form. The interpretation of the verbless predicate as 3SG responsive suggested in Section 9.4.5 agrees with this characterization. Alternatively, a 3SG form such as *ni-* could be seen as case in which zero stands in a suppletive relationship with the stem *-ta-/-da-* considered in the previous section, in line with the idea of Corbett (2007: 16).

This coincidence has already been observed by Baudiš (1913a: 311), who states that “die Kopula dagegen dient nur dazu, die Nominalsätze äußerlich in die Verbalsätze umzuwandeln, im Grunde aber sind die Kopulasätze nominal” [‘the copula only serves to change nominal in formally verbal clauses, though the copular clauses are basically nominal’]. Basically the same position is defended by Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 22), Veselinović (2001: 97); for Modern Irish, Ahlqvist (1971/72: 271) observes that “the copula is a verb-making particle.”

Apart from these conjunct particle-copula forms, the present indicative of the Old Irish copula has a ‘conjunct’ form *-(d)id⁻⁷³* in the 3SG of the positive paradigm that expresses the functions of the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-* and similar forms observed in Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 above. This ‘conjunct’ 3SG form in *-(d)id-* contrasts with the ‘absolute’ relative 3SG form *as^{L/N}-* observed in Sections 9.4.3 and 9.4.6, and the same opposition can be stated between the ‘conjunct’ 3PL form *-n-dat-* and the ‘absolute’ relative 3PL *at(a)^{L/N}-*. While the ‘absolute’ relative 3SG *as^{L/N}-* and 3PL *at(a)^{L/N}-* forms express the functions of the leniting and nasalizing relative clause types, this form *-(d)id-* is included in the paradigm that

⁷³ Strachan (1898/99: 65), Thurneysen (1946: 487) consider that the initial form is *-id-* (i.e. *conid-*), and that *-did-* (in *condid-*) has been built secondarily on the basis of the forms in *-da(-)* of the same paradigm. See, for this paradigm, Table 9.5.

expresses the function of the oblique relative conjunct particle $-(s)a^N$ seen in Section 5.4.2, included i^N ‘in which’ and other subordinating conjunct particles such as co^N ‘so that’ (Section 5.4.3). The non-3SG persons of this paradigm are formed with the element $-ta/-da-$ considered in the previous section.

The resulting paradigm is exemplified in Table 9.5 with attested forms of the combination with the subordinating conjunct particles co^N ‘so that’ and i^N ‘in which’ (Thurneysen 1946: 485, Strachan 1898/99: 31–33).

Tab. 9.5: The paradigm of the present indicative of the copula with the conjunct particles co^N ‘so that, in order to’ and i^N ‘in which’

1SG	<i>conda anecne</i> ‘so that I am unwise’ (Wb 17c10)
3SG	<i>conid-ainm dunchrunn</i> ‘so that it is a name for the tree’ (Wb 8a5) <i>conid fíriánu de</i> ‘so that He is the more righteous’ (Wb 2a7) ... <i>ind labrada innid eula nech</i> ‘... of the speech in which one is skilled’ (Ml 42c4) ... <i>airm indid immaircide</i> ‘... (the) place in which it is fitting’ (Wb 12d18) = (97a)
1PL	<i>condanfíriánichthi</i> ‘so that we are justified’ (Wb 2d14)
3PL	<i>condat reli inna aicsin hisin</i> ‘so that those causes are manifest’ (Ml 51d14–15) <i>indaimser indat sláin ennaic som</i> ‘the time in which they are sound’ (Ml 76a6)

The same paradigmatic possibilities can be accepted for other forms that are only attested in the 3SG (Thurneysen 1946: 485–486, Strachan 1898/99: 31–32): Wb 12d23 *ondid accobor limsa* ‘from which I desire’ (lit. ‘from which desire is for me’); the same form with a different spelling is in Ml 51c2 *honid techtae* ... ‘with which it is fitting ...’; Ml 101a3 *arndid ñ uisse* ... ‘for which it is right ...’, Ml 37a10 *diandid tintud* ‘for which it is the rendering’, Ml 118b6 ... *diant ainm panis tantum* ‘... for which the name is *panis* only’. On the basis of these forms, and following the paradigmatic model in Table 9.5, one can assume **ondan-* ‘from which we are ...’, **arndan-* ‘for which we are ...’, **diandat-* ‘of which they are ...’ and so on.

Furthermore, when introducing a copular clause in present indicative, the conjunctions ma^L ‘if’ and $cía^L$ ‘though, if’ take $-d$ in combination with the negative preverb $ni-$, as in (141a) and (141b) respectively.

- (141)a. ... *manidfír* ut dicunt illi (Wb 13b14)
 ma^L -nid-fír *ut dicunt illi*
 if-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-true/NOM.SG.N as they say
 ‘... unless it is true as they say’.

- b. ... *cenid ed as chetnae náis* in homine (Ml 44c26)

ce^L-nid-ed

though-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-3SG.N

as^L-cetnae^N

áis

in *homine*

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-first/NOM.SG.N

age/NOM.SG.N

in the man

'... though that is not the first age in (the life of) the man'.

Apparently, there is no attestation of a non-3SG corresponding to the 3SG forms in (141), i.e. 'though you are not ...' or 'unless you are ...'; it should be something like **cenita*^L- **manita*^L-, judging from the attested 2PL positive form *cenuded*- seen in Section 9.4.6 fn. above, as well as Wb 4a10 *cenutad*- and Wb 33b8 *cenotad*-, all 'though you are...'. The polar interrogative form *cenita*- 'aren't you ...?' seen in example (140) in Section 9.4.5 may serve as a parallel, though the form *ce* of that interrogative form has a different etymology to the concessive subordinating conjunction *ce* (i.e. *cía*^L). As noted in Section 5.5.2, conditional *ma*^L and concessive *cía*^L have the remarkable positive copular 3rd person forms (3SG) *masu*-, *cesu*- and (3PL) *cetu*-, *matu*-, which do not appear in the remaining subordinating conjunctions; these copular 3rd persons are included in the same paradigm as the forms with the element *-ta/-da*- (i.e. the forms *cenutad*- and *cenotad*- just mentioned), and therefore constitute a paradigm in which 3rd and non-3rd persons differ much like the 3SG differs from the other forms of the paradigm of the present indicative of copula with *co*^N- 'so that' and *i*^N- 'in which', as observed in Table 9.5.

In relation to the previous forms, the particle *bés* 'maybe', which is a discourse particle and not a subordinating conjunction like *ma*^L and *cía*^L, shows a form in combination with the copula that is similar to that of *masu* and *cesu*, namely *besu*.⁷⁴ This form *bésu* is found in combination with concessive and conditional subordinate clauses, as in examples (142a,b) respectively.

(142)a. *bésu dagduine ciniestar cachtúari* (Wb 6b23)

⁷⁴ The 3SG copular forms *masu*, *cesu* have been explained by Thurneysen (1918: 60–61) as follows: the form *bés* 'maybe' becomes *bésu* under the influence of the syntactically close form *nibu* / *nibo*, i.e. *bés nibu* 'maybe it is not...'; the *-u/-o* of *bésu/-o* is then extended to the assumed forms **ma*-(*i*)s / **ce*-(*i*)s to give *masu* / *cesu*, that create a 3PL *matu* / *cetu* by virtue of the copular pattern of 3SG *-s* / 3PL *-t*. This explanation for the *-u/o* of *masu* and *cesu* seems to be better than that of Ahlqvist (2003: 16), who assumes a form etymologically related to the English adverb *so* (ultimately from Proto-Indo-European **swō*), which would serve as an affirmative particle with an approximate meaning 'in fact, so', similar to Ahlqvist's interpretation of the infix *-d^L-* in verbs in indicative mood introduced by the subordinating conjunctions *ma*^L and *cía*^L. However, the association of *-d^L-* with the indicative after these conjunctions seems to point to the use of the infix as a marker of syntactic dependency, as argued at length in Section 10.4.3.

bésu	dag-duine
maybe.COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL	good-man/NOM.SG.M
ci ^l -ni-es-tar	cach-túari
though-NEG.DECL.eat/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT	each-food/ACC.SG.F

‘he may be a good man, though he eat not every food’.

b. *massued béso mó afius dúibsi* (Wb 19b11)

ma-ssu-ed	bésu	
if-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.N	maybe.COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL	
mó	a ^l -fius	dú-ib-si
big/COMP	POSS.3SG.N-knowledge/NOM.SG.M	to-2PL-NA.2PL

‘if so, greater may be the knowledge of it that you have’.

The form *-d* appearing in the copula forms combined with the conditional and concessive conjunctions in the examples of (141) above (i.e. *manid-fir* and *cenid-ed*) is surely related to the use of the Class C 3SG n. infix with these two conjunctions considered in Section 5.5.1, and this is also the most probable origin of the component *-(d)id-* of the 3SG forms of the type *con(d)id-* ‘so that (s)he / it is ...’ considered above in Table 9.5. These diachronic issues are dealt with in Sections 9.5.4 and 10.4.3 below.

9.4.8 Summary

The Old Irish copula primarily serves to mark bare or attributive non-verbal predicates, but it has also the function of a focusing element, as stated in Section 3.2.2.

From a formal perspective, the present indicative of the Old Irish copula included in Table 9.3 above represents some morphosyntactic strategies considered by Hengeveld (1992: 185–188) for the copula. In the positive declarative paradigm of the copula, the 1PL, 3PL, and, possibly, the 1SG have the same form as the absolute declarative endings of other verbs observed in Section 4.3. This is very similar to Hengeveld’s (1992: 185–186) ‘zero-1 construction’, in which the non-verbal predicate has the same inflectional markers as an intransitive verbal predicate. The adduced declarative endings, however, are used in both transitive and intransitive verbs and, in this sense, Old Armenian provides a good parallel, in which the ending of a verb like 1SG *berem* ‘I bring’, 2SG *beres*, 3SG *berē* is regularly the same as the copula form (i.e. 1SG *em* ‘I am’, 2SG *es*, 3SG *ē*). In the 2nd persons of the same Old Irish copular paradigm, one can identify without effort the corresponding (Class A) infixed pronouns (namely, *-t-* and *-b-*), and this is quite similar

to the Old Irish passive, in which infixed pronouns express the grammatical subject (see Section 4.5.1). The positive declarative 3SG form *is* stands apart from those forms.

A number of forms of the copula may be accounted for as instances of the aforementioned ‘zero-1 construction’, again with the difference that the markers are those applied to every Old Irish verb, whether transitive or intransitive: the 3SG negative declarative *ni-*, the 3SG negative relative *nad^l-*, *nach^l-* (leaving aside the form *nand-*, which is more usual as a copula form), as well as the 3SG positive polar interrogative *in-*; the negative polar interrogative particle *ceni-* (and variants) is more usual as copula form.

The same applies to some other ‘conjunct’ 3SG copula forms mentioned in Section 9.4.7 above such as *con(d)id-* ‘so that ... is ...’, *in(d)id-* ‘in which ... is ...’, *diand-* ‘for which ... is ...’. These forms are the same as the string [1 - 2] including the same conjunct particle plus the Class C 3SG n. infixed pronoun of other verbal complexes: e.g. *conid-* in *conidfil* ‘so that it is (in...)’ (of the substantive verb), quoted in (124); *condid-* in Wb 30a19 *conditucce* ‘so that you may understand it’ (of *do-uicci*); *indid-* in Wb 4b26 *indid epiur* ‘in which I say it’ (of *as-beir*), quoted in example (84); *diand-* in Ml 46c7 *diandrerchoil* ‘to whom (God) has decreed it’ (of *as-rochoili* ‘defines’). Some other such ‘conjunct’ 3SG copula forms mentioned in Section 9.4.7 formed with a preposition, however, have no direct counterpart in the other verbal complexes, at least according to the available evidence. This is the case of the copula forms *diandid-* ‘for which ... is ...’, which has the shorter counterpart *diand-* just observed, and *arindid-*, which is different from the form *arind-* of other verbs, cf. Ml 35a8 *arinrogab* ‘for which (David) sang it’, in which *arin-* stands for *arind-*.

Though there are some forms of the present indicative of the Old Irish copula that are specific, in particular the 1SG and 2SG forms, it is noteworthy that quite a number of the forms included in the paradigm of clause types of this verb, in particular the 3SG forms, are the same as the corresponding conjunct particle of other verbs. This situation can be considered in the light of Hengeveld’s (1992: 205–208) consideration of tense, mood, aspect, and person as triggers of the use of a copula. Given that the present indicative is the less marked paradigm of the verbal system, both in general and in Old Irish, and given that the category of clause typing is an essential and pervasive category in the Old Irish verbal complex, the conclusion, as also suggested by Lash (2011: 125), seems plausible that the present indicative of the Old Irish copula mainly expresses the categories of clause typing (for most 3SG forms) and clause typing plus person (for the other persons).

9.5 Diachronic aspects of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb

This section on diachronic aspects of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb will focus on the paradigms analyzed in the two previous sections, i.e. those belonging to the present indicative that show a suppletive pattern according to clause type distinctions.

That clause type distinctions are relevant for the non-verbal predicates was observed in the conclusion of the previous sections. To give a clear example, it was stated above in Section 9.3.7(d) that the (leniting) relative clause type neutralizes the difference between existential and locative predicate.

Since the main point of this diachronic section is the assumption of a diachronic relationship between the present indicative paradigms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb, Section 9.5.1 considers the similarity in the tenses and moods other than the present indicative of these two Old Irish verbs as an initial argument. Section 9.5.2 deals with the etymological origins of the stems (·)tá(-) and (·)fil(-) of the substantive verb and, in particular, with the semantic basis and pathways by which the latter has come to be used as a suppletive form of the former. The proper reason for the use of (·)fil(-) can be found in Section 9.5.3, in which the origin of the morphological element *-ta/-da-* in the paradigm of the copula is considered. Section 9.5.4 analyzes the origin of the ‘conjunct’ 3SG forms other than the positive declarative in the present indicative paradigm of the copula. This diachronic section does not consider the specific developments that go from the Proto-Indo-European present indicative copular forms to the Old Irish ‘absolute’ positive declarative forms (i.e. *am-*, *a/i(t)-*, *is-*, *a/immi-*, *a/idi(b)-*, *it-*); some issues related to these forms have already been stated in Section 9.4.3 above.

9.5.1 The non-present indicative forms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb

The Old Irish copula and substantive verb are remarkably similar in paradigms other than the present indicative. Table 9.6 offers some attested forms of these two Old Irish verbs, the present and past subjunctive, the future, and the preterite. The formal differences are mostly attributable to the unstressed character of the copula, which explains the more reduced character of the form if compared to the corresponding forms of the substantive verb. Note that the absolute forms of the substantive verb are absolute declarative forms.

Tab. 9.6: Paradigms of the Old Irish copula and substantive verb other than the present indicative

	Substantive verb		Copula	
	Absolute	Conjunct	'Absolute'	'Conjunct'
Present subjunctive	<i>beu</i>	· <i>béo</i>	<i>ba</i>	- <i>ba</i>
	—	· <i>bee</i>	<i>ba</i>	- <i>ba</i>
	<i>beith</i>	· <i>bé</i>	<i>ba</i>	- <i>b</i> , - <i>bo</i>
	<i>beimmi</i>	· <i>bem</i>	—	- <i>ban</i>
	<i>beithe</i>	· <i>beith</i>	<i>bede</i>	- <i>bad</i>
	<i>beit</i>	· <i>bet</i>	—	- <i>bat</i>
Past subjunctive		· <i>beinn</i>	—	- <i>bin</i> , - <i>benn</i>
		· <i>betha</i>	—	- <i>ptha</i>
		· <i>beth</i>	<i>bid</i>	- <i>bad</i> , - <i>pad</i> , - <i>bed</i>
		· <i>bemmis</i>	<i>bemmis</i>	- <i>bemmis</i>
		· <i>bethe</i>	—	—
	· <i>betis</i>	<i>betis</i>	- <i>bdis</i> , - <i>ptis</i>	
Future	<i>bia</i>	—	<i>be</i>	—
	<i>bie</i>	—	<i>be</i> , <i>ba</i>	- <i>be</i> , - <i>ba</i>
	<i>bieid</i>	· <i>bia</i>	<i>bid</i> , <i>bith</i>	- <i>be</i> , - <i>pa</i>
	<i>beimmi</i>	· <i>biam</i>	<i>bemmi</i>	—
	<i>bethe</i>	· <i>bieid</i>	—	- <i>beth</i>
	<i>bieit</i>	· <i>biat</i>	<i>bit</i>	- <i>bat</i>
Preterite	—	· <i>bá</i>	<i>basa</i>	- <i>bsa</i> , - <i>psa</i>
	—	· <i>bá</i>	<i>basa</i>	—
	<i>boí</i>	· <i>boí</i>	<i>ba</i>	- <i>bo</i> , - <i>po</i>
	<i>bammar</i>	· <i>bámmar</i>	—	- <i>bommar</i>
	—	· <i>baid</i>	—	—
	<i>batir</i>	· <i>bátar</i>	<i>batir</i> , <i>batar</i>	- <i>btar</i> , - <i>ptar</i>

Despite the lack of attestation for some forms, the conclusion that both forms represent two variants of the same paradigm can be taken for granted. See Bisagni's (2012) recent explanation of the preterite forms, and Lash (2017: 92). The comparative evidence strongly supports the idea that the stem in *b-* represents the Proto-Indo-European root **bhuh₂-*, which is used in many Indo-European languages as the suppletive root used for paradigms other than the present of the verb 'to be'. The present indicative, and other associated tenses (imperfect) and moods (subjunctive and optative) of that paradigm of the Indo-European verb 'to be' are formed on the stem **h₁es-* (from which the positive declarative Old Irish copula forms *am-*, *a/i(t)-*, *is-*, *a/immi-*, *a/idi(b)-*, *it-* are derived). As explicitly stated in García-Castillero (2017e), the Proto-Indo-European verb based on the root **h₁es-* expressed the three non-verbal predicates introduced above in Section 9.2, i.e. the bare or attributive, locative, and referential ones.

With respect to that situation, and focusing now on the bare and locative non-verbal predicates, Old Irish shows the outcome of a process of paradigmatic split in the sense that these two functions previously expressed by the same paradigm come to be expressed by two more or less different paradigms. One important innovation the exact details of which are difficult to determine is the generalization of the unstressed pretonic character of the copula as the form that expresses bare non-verbal predicates. Another innovation is the specialization of the stressed stem (*·*)*tá*(*-*) to express locative predicates in the present indicative. The resulting opposition between unstressed copula (for bare) and stressed substantive verb (for locative predicates) spreads to the remaining forms and creates a simple distinction between unstressed and stressed *b*-forms in the remaining tenses and moods.

In this sense, Hengeveld (1992: 234) has established that languages that distinguish the categories of verb, noun, and adjective ('specialized languages' in Hengeveld's terminology), and use the same expression for all the non-verbal predicates, two features which can be assumed for Proto-Indo-European and pre-historical phases of the Irish language, display a certain tendency to innovate their copular system and "the first step these languages may take is to gradually introduce a new expression format in localizing predications." The subsequent steps are the topic of the next section.

9.5.2 On the origin of the stems (*·*)*tá*(*-*) and (*·*)*fil*(*-*) of the substantive verb

Despite some uncertainties on the formal side noted by Roma (2003), the Proto-Indo-European root **steh₂-* 'to stand (up)' is still the best etymology for Old Irish (*·*)*tá*(*-*) (Schumacher 2004: 623–626): its use as location verb (Section 9.3.2) requires the assumption of a certain loss of its original meaning, with the obvious parallel of Romance languages like Modern Spanish *estar* 'to be (in a place, in a situation)', derived from Latin *stare* 'to stand'.

The same stem (*·*)*tá*(*-*) combined with a suffixed pronoun, what constitutes an absolute declarative verb according to Section 9.3.4, is exclusively used for expressing possession. With the exception of *i-tá*(*-*) 'in which SUBJ is', the use of this stem in verbal complexes other than the positive declarative one implies a meaning different from the locational copula: either possessive (with negative declarative preverb *ní-*, see Section 9.3.4), lexicalized with the meaning 'to be angry, vexed' (Section 9.3.5), or copular (to introduce the Standard NP of comparison, as observed in Section 9.3.5, and in other circumstances, see Section 9.3.6).

For the remaining positive clause types except the imperative, and for the negative declarative form, the locational meaning is regularly expressed by the stem (*·*)*fil(-)*, which clearly represents a Goidelic innovation. As generally acknowledged, see Schumacher (2004: 669–675), this Old Irish verb form can be derived from a verb etymologically comparable to Middle Welsh *gwelet* ‘to see’.

The specific origin of the forms (*·*)*fil*, (*·*)*feil* and *file* has been discussed by Schumacher (2004: 672–673), who rightly argues that the imperative must be rejected as the original function of the stem (*·*)*fil(-)* in the paradigm of the substantive verb, mainly because this Old Irish paradigm has a different imperative form, namely *bi-* (see Table 9.1). Schumacher’s attempt to explain the difference between the conjunct forms *·fil* and *·feil* as the original 2SG and 3SG forms respectively, cf. the 2SG *·cil* ‘you hide’ and 3SG *·ceil* ‘(s)he hides’ in Section 4.3.1, is formally acceptable, but it cannot be forgotten that *·fil* and *·feil* have the same value in Old Irish, i.e. that they are only formal variants. As for the absolute relative form *file*, Schumacher’s (2004: 674) assumption of a previous absolute relative 2SG form (with *fil* as a reduction thereof) is problematic because such an absolute relative 2SG form is not otherwise attested in Old Irish; see the absolute relative forms collected in Section 4.3.2. The ending *-e* of *file* ‘that is (in...)’ may well be analogous to *tête* ‘that goes’, so that the original form of the verb would be (*·*)*fil* or (*·*)*feil*.

In order to justify the change from the meaning ‘to see’ to these of the Old Irish stem (*·*)*fil(-)*, one may consider Modern English expressions like *Do you see (the) headings?* and *You don’t see the headings*, which may give rise to the meanings *Are there headings?* and *There are no headings* respectively (Veselinović 2003: 92–93). The 2SG is a good starting point to explain the fixed form for all three persons in singular and plural, and the meaning of the verb agrees with the accusative case that (*·*)*fil(-)* takes, and with the use of infixes, including the 3PL one, as observed in example (122c) above. In this sense, the Old Irish expressions of (122b,c), namely *ni feil titlu* ‘there are no headings’ and *nisfil* ‘they are not (in...)’, can be derived from *‘you see no headings’ and *‘you don’t see them’ respectively.⁷⁵ The polar interrogative, and especially the negative declarative clause types are good places in which the stem (*·*)*fil(-)* entered into the paradigm of the substantive verb. In Corbett’s (2007: 13–14) terminology, this suppletive use of the stem (*·*)*fil(-)* would be a case of incursion.

⁷⁵ The French variant in Québec provides a parallel in clauses like *Le voilà content* ‘(He is now happy)’ or *Ah! te voilà?* ‘(Ah! is it you?)’, in which “the accusative pronoun ... has been interpreted as the subject, although it has the form – and the syntactic distribution – of a clitic pronoun which elsewhere acts as an object” (Morin 1985: 810).

On the basis of various structural relationships, this stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) spread thereafter to other clause types. The extension from polar interrogative to responsive is straightforward, according to the close relationship between these clause types considered in Sections 7.2, 7.4.1, and 8.5.1, and the same values for the *wh*-interrogative *cia·fil* (*sund*) ‘what is (here)?’, if this form is not original, that is to say, if it does not come directly from *‘what do you see (here)?’. Similarly, there is one single step from the negative declarative to negative relative forms such as *nachibfel* in (123b), which also shows the use of an infix pronoun.

Once the previous forms have been established, there are various ways to arrive at the absolute positive relative *f(e)il*, which is the most frequent form in the language of the Glosses. An important aspect to be considered is the structural relationship between the newly established locative copula *-fil*, which expresses non-3SG forms by means of infix pronouns, and the passive paradigm described in Section 4.5.1. Bearing in mind the regular equivalence in the passive paradigm between absolute (positive) relative clause type form (i.e. *carthar* ‘who is loved’) and conjunct form (i.e. *ní·carthar* ‘(s)he is not loved’, *in·carthar* ‘is (s)he loved’), one may assume that *ní·fil* and *in·fil* gave rise to the absolute relative form *fil*. A *wh*-interrogative form such as *cia·fil* (*sund*) ‘what is (here)?’ is another potential source for *fil* (*sund*) ‘that is (here)’ by virtue of the relationship between *wh*-interrogative and relative clause considered in Sections 6.6 and 8.5.1.

Finally, the sporadic use of *fil-* as positive declarative clause type verb may be seen as an extension process alternative to that leading to the use as absolute relative form. From *ní·fil* ‘there is not’ → *fil* ‘there is’; the form *filus* was built directly upon this new absolute declarative form *fil* with the addition of the 3PL suffixed pronoun *-us*, which is cataphorical in example (126b) and seems therefore to be an attempt to have a distinct 3PL form. The inherent declarative character of the Old Irish verbs with suffixed pronoun has been perhaps a factor. Schumacher’s (2004: 674) alternative interpretation of this form *filus* as a previous **fili-us*, i.e. 2SG + 3PL suffixed pronoun is formally possible, but it is necessary to recall that this combination is otherwise not attested in Old Irish for a suffixed form, as stated in Section 4.4.1.

The negative declarative clause type form *ní·fil* is therefore one of the forms in which the use of the stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) has been introduced in the paradigm of the substantive verb, though it does not need to be necessarily the only one. Why this stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) has entered the paradigm of the substantive verb is considered in the next section.

9.5.3 The element *-ta-/-da-* in the paradigm of the present indicative of the copula

This section is aimed at explaining the use of the morphological element *-ta-/-da-* of quite a number of non-3SG forms in the present indicative of the copula as derived from the Old Irish substantive verb. Reference is made here to forms like the negative declarative 1SG form *níta^L* ‘I am not (...)’, the nasalizing relative clause 1SG *nonda^L* ‘that I am (...)’ and so on described in Section 9.4.6, which express the non-3SG persons of the negative declarative, positive relative (with the exception of the ‘absolute’ 3PL *at(a)^{L/N}*, in addition to 3SG *as^{L/N}*), negative relative, and polar interrogative clause type verbs. This distribution is clearly observed in Table 9.3.

Before presenting my own proposal, I will briefly refer to previous accounts for those Old Irish copula forms with *-ta-/-da-*. Kortlandt (1998/2000: 144) equates the *-ta-* of the negative declarative form with that of the positive (relative) *-da-*, but he supposes for this form a previous 3PL **ne est de senti* > **nēst de senti* > **nīh d(e) (h)ēt-* > *nítat-*. Leaving aside now the declarative clause type particle **est* proposed by Kortlandt, which is not discussed in this study, that argument is problematic because such an initial form includes the clitic connective **de* that, in Old Irish, is assumed in forms expressing relative clause type, namely, the *-d-* of the Class C infixed pronouns and of the negative relative conjunct particle *nad-*. A similar objection applies to Schrijver’s (1994: 186) derivation of *nítat-* as < **nīθ’δēd* < **ne-eti-de-sent(i)*, which also includes the declarative clause type particle **eti(-)* assumed by him, and apparently to Schumacher’s explanation of the element *-ta-/-da-* after particles like *nī-*, *no^(N)-*, *in-*, who assumes the direct outcome of the paradigm based on the root **(h_i)es-*.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ As already noted in Section 9.4.6 above, Schumacher proposes an analysis such as “*nít-a*”, “*nít-at*”, “*no-n-d-a*”, in which *-a-* would be outcome of the copula form based on the root mentioned in the text. In this sense, Schumacher grants special relevance to three forms with *-e-* vocalism in this element *-ta-/-da-* also quoted in Section 9.4.6: (i) the nasalizing relative 1PL *nundem-* ‘(because) we are ...’; (ii) the 3PL *donnatdet-* ‘to whom they are not ...’, with elision of the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* before the negative particle, as in *dinadricthe* of example (64c); and (iii) the 2PL *cenuded-* ‘though you are ...’, with the conjunction *ce^L* and the semantically void preverb *no-*. Certainly, there is a change [*e* > *a*] in pretonic elements, about which McCone (2000: 35) states: “Presumably, then, retraction [*e* > *a*] and depalatalization [in pretonic elements] had already affected proclitics by the time that the [Cambray] homily was composed but too recently for the written language to represent them regularly”; see also McCone (1996a: 135). However, the spelling of these manuscripts is very irregular and sometimes does not agree with the usual spelling in other Old Irish texts. The *Epistula Petri* II, in which *donnatdet-* and *cenuded-* are found, has *Thes.* i 713.23 *inna esiu* ‘these ones’ instead of expected and regular *inna isiu*; in *Thes.* i 713.23 *freddercci* ‘present’, the post-tonic vowel is spelled as <e> in spite of the

The explanation proposed in this section for the Old Irish copula forms with *-ta-/-da-* is based on Thurneysen's (1946: 487) suggestion that this element after *ni-* (*cami-*) and *sechi-* (i.e. the copula forms *nita-*, and 3PL *sechitat*) is derived from the stem *·tá(-)* of the substantive verb. In fact, as stated in Section 9.3.6 above, this verb also expresses the meaning of the copula in some syntactic environments, mainly in the cleft-sentence focusing on the bare non-verbal predicate. In the diachronic explanation proposed in this section, which considers (i) the syntactic, (ii) accentual, and (iii) structural aspects of the change, not only the negative declarative, but the other forms quoted at the beginning of this paragraph are included.

(i) The allosentential link between cleft-sentence and basic order observed for Old Irish above in Section 3.2.1 is here applied to the relationship of the cleft-sentence seen in Section 9.3.6 above. Put concretely, a cleft-sentence like **ní-bi/ecc at-táat* 'it's not small that they are', analogous to those in (132), was reversed to **ní-táat bicc* 'they are not small'. This change can be seen as a secondary univerbation, as far as it affects the compound forms of the copula. Cases like *atá día atach ...* 'God is refuge ...' quoted in (133) could be seen as a sporadic extension of the preceding procedure, parallel to the use of *fil* as absolute declarative form seen in Section 9.3.3.

(ii) Thereby, the copular paradigm acquires more perceptible forms, once the old verbal forms were vanishing or losing their phonological identity by the effect of the phonetic changes proper to the pretonic elements of the verbal complex. Basically the same reason, the acquisition of a more perceptible form, is considered by Veselinova (2004: 114) for the introduction of the preterite *went* into the paradigm of the English verb *to go*. An undoubtedly central verb like the copula supplies very often those especially weak places of its paradigm by taking the form of a semantically similar verb.

usual <a> in other sources, as in e.g. Wb 32c18 *frecndaircc*, Sg 153b5 *frecndairc*. In my opinion, Stifter's (2014: 212–217) strong skepticism on the value of the spellings with *-u-* in the same type of Old Irish texts for the etymological discussion of pretonic elements, such as the lexical preverb *to-* or the conjunct particle *no-*, is also to be considered for the present case. It is therefore not inconceivable that the doubtful status of a pretonic *-e-* that is changing to *-a-* could be applied to pretonic original *-a-*, as apparently happens with the conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* seen in Section 5.4.2, in particular its form *ara^N* seen in Section 5.4.3, the original *-a-* of which may be spelled also as *-e-* in the Cambray Homily. In the same sentence of *Thes.* ii 244.24–28 ... *are n-índarbe a dualchi óod ocus a pecthu ocus ara tinóla soalchi ocus are n-airnema futhu ...* '... that he banish from him his vices and his sins, and that he gather virtues and receive stigmata ...', this pretonic form *ara^N* is spelled once as *ara-* and twice as *are-*.

The stressed stem $\cdot t\acute{a}(-)$ of the proposed form $*n\acute{i}\cdot t\acute{a}at$ then loses its accent in so far as it is reanalyzed as a copular form: $*n\acute{i}\cdot t\acute{a}t\ bicc \rightarrow nitat\text{-}bicc$ ‘they are not small’. A secondary process of stress reassignment within the Old Irish verbal complex can be assumed in some cases of externalization of the conjunct particle *ro-* to the pretonic part of the deuterotonic compound, a change mentioned in Section 1.5.2. For instance, the ambiguous form Wb 24d2 *nirógabsam* ‘we have not taken’, which may be either [ni-ro-gabs-am] or [ni-ro^l-gabs-am], may also be seen as a place in which *ro-* came from the stressed to the pretonic part of the verbal complex, a change in progress during Old Irish times. In the case of both the new copula and the new conjunct particle, the accentual reassignment runs parallel to (or comes immediately after) the grammaticalization process. The forms with *-da-* (e.g. *nonda-*), more normal in relative clauses, are to be explained by the effect of nasalization on the *-ta-* of the original form of the substantive verb. The *-n-* is due to the secondary insertion of nasalization onto the unstressed form, and this is probably the same process that has led to the negative form *nand-*, which is more frequent in the copular paradigm.

(iii) As observed in Table 9.4 in Section 9.4.6, the stem $(\cdot)fil(-)$ of the substantive verb has the same distribution as the stem *-ta-/da-* of the copula. This is in line with the idea of the recruitment of forms of the stem $(\cdot)t\acute{a}(-)$ into the paradigm of the copula. In diachronic terms, the introduction of the stem $(\cdot)fil(-)$ into the clause types of the present indicative of the substantive verb is a way to express the functions (i.e. to occupy the cells) of that paradigm that were left empty in the clause types in which the stem $(\cdot)t\acute{a}(-)$ became a copula form. This is the answer to the question posed at the end of Section 9.3.7 above.

The stem *-ta-/da-* represents a more perceptible form for some forms of the copula that were in the process of being lost. It is basically used to express the non-3SG persons by means of a distinguishable form and it primarily expresses no clause type; only secondarily, the phonological difference marked by means of the graphic distinction between *-t- /d/* and *-d- /ð/* became a marker of clause type associated to the corresponding conjunct particle.

9.5.4 The 3SG of clause types other than positive declarative

The Old Irish 3SG copula form of the negative declarative (*ní-*), negative relative (*nad-*, *nach-*), and polar interrogative (*in^N-*) clause types show the same form as the corresponding particle when used as pretonic element in a non-copular verbal complex. According to the description in Section 9.4.7, it can be said that they

are actually conjunct particles attached to the following nominal predicate. Consider now the parallel verbal complexes in Table 9.7.

Tab. 9.7: Conjunct particles and 3SG copula ‘conjunct’ forms

Clause type	Copula	Substantive verb	Other verbs
Negative declarative	<i>ní·bec</i> ‘it / (s)he is not small’	<i>ní·fil and</i> ‘it / (s)he is not there’	<i>ní·beir</i> ‘it / (s)he doesn’t bear’
Negative relative	<i>nad·bec</i> ‘that is not small’	<i>nad·fil and</i> ‘that is not there’	<i>nad·beir</i> ‘that doesn’t bear’
Positive polar interrogative	<i>in·mbeic</i> ‘is it / (s)he small?’	<i>in·fil and</i> ‘is it / (s)he there?’	<i>in·mbeir</i> ‘does it / (s)he bear?’
Negative polar interrogative	<i>cani·bec</i> ‘is it / (s)he not small?’	<i>cani· / innad·fil and</i> ‘is it / (s)he not there?’	<i>innad·beir</i> ‘doesn’t it / (s)he bear?’

The usual assumption of a sequence of negative particle plus the unstressed copula 3SG (Proto-Indo-European or Proto Celtic **ne-esti* > **nēsti* > Proto-Insular Celtic **nīsti*) as the origin of the Old Irish negative form *ní·* ‘it / (s)he is not’ is plausible, and it may have modeled the corresponding negative form of the remaining verbal complexes: this means a rightward analogical extension for the row of the negative declarative clause type in Table 9.7. Other scholars, such as Schrijver (1994: 186) and Schumacher (2004: 311), put forward instead an initial sequence **ne eti esti*.⁷⁷

The remaining forms in Table 9.7, especially *nad·* and *in·*, have received less attention in the literature. McCone (2006: 99) derives the 3SG copula form *nad·* ‘which is not’ from **ne-d(e)-est-*, different therefore from the negative relative conjunct particle *nad·*, which is usually derived from **ne-de-*. However, McCone must assume that the copula form *nad·* has secondarily adopted lenition by analogy with the conjunct particle *nad·*. This may well be right, but at a certain moment a general equation between 3SG ‘conjunct’ forms of the copula and conjunct particle must be acknowledged by virtue of the structural equivalence between both types of pretonic elements. Thus, a leftward analogical extension can also be assumed for other rows in Table 9.7, the whole process being a ‘prefix extension’ from the usual verbal complex to the copular non-verbal predication. This

⁷⁷ This copula form (**ne-esti* > **nēsti* > **nīsti* >) *ní·* has been taken by some scholars as the origin of so-called Cowgill’s particle, namely, a particle which prevented the expected mutation effects in the deuterotonic boundary (see Section 2.4.3 for this notion) of the declarative clause type forms in lexical compounds, as noted in Section 4.7. The form **eti-* in Schrijver’s and Schumacher’s proposals is such a particle. I refrain from discussing this diachronic issue in this study.

equation of conjunct particles and 3SG copula forms is to be connected to the observations on the similarities between positive declarative copula forms and the functionally corresponding absolute endings, in Section 9.4.3.

The ‘conjunct’ 3SG present indicative copula form in *-(d)id*, which appears in the pretonic strings *con(d)id-* ‘so that (s)he / it is ...’, *indid-* ‘in which (s)he / it is ...’, *arindid-* ‘for which (s)he / it is ...’, and so on seen in Section 9.4.7, has basically the same form as the corresponding pretonic element of the remaining verbal complexes furnished with the Class C 3SG m./n. infix. Table 9.8 has the same structure as the previous one, and it includes the form of the substantive verb of example (124a) above and an example of other verbs similar to those given in Sections 4.8.1 and 9.4.7.

Tab. 9.8: The conjunct particle *coⁿ-* in the 3SG present indicative forms of the copula and of other verbs

Copula	Substantive verb	Other verbs
<i>conid-bec</i>	<i>conid-fil and</i>	<i>conid-beir</i>
‘so that it / (s)he is small’	‘so that it / he is there’	‘so that it / (s)he brings it’

If it is assumed, as already advanced in Section 9.4.7, that 3SG *conid-* → *condid-* under the influence of the forms of the non-3SG of the same paradigm (i.e. 1SG *conda-*, 1PL *condan-* and so on, see Table 9.5), it is once again easy to suppose a leftward analogical extension from other verbs to 3SG copula forms such as *conid-*. The form of the substantive verb, in which the object infix can be justified from a diachronic perspective, according to the explanation above in Section 9.5.2, has probably exerted a decisive influence. Copula forms such as *conid-* are the origin of the negative 3SG copula forms *manid-* and *cenid-* also considered in Section 9.4.7, as well as of the use of the Class C 3SG n. form *-d^l-* after the conjunctions *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cia^l* ‘though’. These two uses are treated below in Section 10.4.3.

Other explanations for this form are in my opinion not satisfactory: Schumacher (2004: 311) explains only that they are “nicht Formen der Wurzelsilbe der Kopula, sondern Überbleibsel diverser Partikeln, die ursprünglich vor der Wurzelsilbe standen” [‘not forms of the root syllable of the copula, but rests of various particles which originally stood before the root syllable’].

9.6 Concluding remarks: Clause types and non-verbal predicates in Old Irish

This chapter has analyzed the various forms corresponding to the present indicative of the Old Irish substantive verb and copula, according to the general paradigm of clause types presented in Chapter 8. The remarkable morphological feature of the resulting paradigms is suppletion. To some extent at least, this chapter may well be a contribution to the comprehensive study that Schumacher (2002: 300) considers necessary for the corresponding copula forms in Insular Celtic.

As stated in Section 9.2 above, existential, locative, possessive, bare or attributive, and referential non-verbal predicates make up a *continuum* usually associated with the copula. From these types, existential, locative, possessive, and some bare non-verbal predicates are expressed in Old Irish by means of the substantive verb; the Old Irish copula is mostly used to express bare non-verbal predicates, and is also a basic constituent of referential non-verbal predicates. Since the latter involve the use of tonic pronouns in Old Irish, this type is left for Chapter 10. The basic innovation observed in Old Irish is the paradigmatic split between locational and bare non-verbal predication, a change that has clear parallels in other Indo-European languages.

The stems of the Old Irish substantive verb (*·*)*ta*(*·*) and (*·*)*fil*(*·*) express locative and existential non-verbal predicates, apart from a number of grammaticalized and lexicalized expressions: possession, marker of the standard NP of comparative constructions, and specific meanings such as ‘to be vexed’. Roughly speaking, the stem (*·*)*ta*(*·*) expresses positive declarative and some functions expressed by the nasalizing relative clause type of the locative and existential predications, and has adopted all the grammaticalized and lexicalized functions mentioned. The stem (*·*)*ta*(*·*) has therefore abandoned most functions of the proper paradigm of clause types of the locative and existential copula, which are occupied by the stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*). But this does not explain the whole set of clause types of the locative and existential copula occupied by (*·*)*fil*(*·*), because some assumable uses of the stem (*·*)*ta*(*·*) such as the negative declarative, the negative relative, or the polar interrogative forms have not been grammaticalized or lexicalized in the way stated above. The stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) has a rather non-finite profile, with no differentiations by means of inflectional endings in slot 5. In line of the general observations on negation in the Old Irish paradigm of clause types in Section 8.5, this lack of inflection of the stem (*·*)*fil*(*·*) agrees with its use in all negative clause types, in which it tends to express existential non-verbal predicates; and also with its use in relative clause types, in which it must be in 3rd person. The negative relative clause type with (*·*)*fil*(*·*) tends to express complementation.

The non-finite stem (\cdot)*fil*(\cdot) therefore fits in well into the clause types of the paradigm of the present indicative of the locative-existential in which it appears, but the reason for its introduction seems to be rather that the stem (\cdot)*ta*(\cdot) has abandoned its proper, original function in order to fulfill other functions, as already suggested: these are functions of the copula, in particular in the forms of this verbal paradigm that include the element *-ta/-da-*, which are just those clause types in which (\cdot)*fil*(\cdot) is used in the paradigm of the substantive verb. As observed in Section 9.5.1, there is a clear paradigmatic link between the Old Irish copula and substantive verb in tenses and moods other than the present indicative.

The main reason for this change (\cdot)*tá*(\cdot) \rightarrow *-ta/-da-* is probably the loss of formal distinctivity in the non-3SG forms in so-called ‘conjunct’ forms of the copula, which became a pretonic element and occupied the same place as the conjunct particles of other verbal complexes. The function as marker of bare non-verbal predicates is directly related to this structural feature and is why a good deal of 3SG copula forms have a very similar to or simply the same shape as conjunct particles and, in general, pretonic strings, used in other verbs, such as *ni-*, *nach-*, *in^N*. The corresponding non-3SG forms are mostly expressed by the new forms with the stem *-ta/-da-*.

One of the remarkable points in the configuration of various aspects of the copula and substantive verb is the relationship to the paradigm of the passive verbs. This is basically due to the fact that all these three paradigms only have one core argument. By virtue of this structural relationship, a number of innovations have taken place in the substantive verb and copula. In the substantive verb, the creation of the absolute relative *fil(e)* on the basis of the conjunct form in forms such as *nifil* or *infil* is a consequence of the same principle seen in Section 5.3.1, which assumes that morphological dependent forms are used to express syntactic dependency in Old Irish. In the copula, the use of the 2nd person pronominal infixes in the positive declarative clause type paradigm aims at having a clearer expression of the corresponding persons and is ultimately a consequence of the iconic advantage of the infixed forms noted in Section 4.4.3.

10 Personal pronouns and clause typing in Old Irish

10.1 Introductory remarks

Chapter 4 demonstrated the relevance of the basic distinction between declarative and relative clause types for the pronominal markers of the verbal complex, which are not only the affixal pronouns in slots 2 and 6, but also the inflectional endings in slot 5. Consequently, the Old Irish paradigm of clause types proposed in Chapter 8 includes the expression of pronominal affixes. In line with this general idea, this chapter analyzes in some detail some secondary uses of pronominal forms, including tonic pronouns, which are directly related to the expression of clause types in Old Irish.

It is important to bear mind that the Old Irish pronominal forms are used according to a quite regular distribution. The most general one is the distribution of the tonic and affixal pronouns. As observed in Section 3.2.1, the Old Irish tonic pronouns never appear the stressed finite verbal complex in order to express whichever syntactic NP function; they have a marked pragmatic function. Correspondingly, as noted in Section 2.2.1, the person markers of the verbal complex, i.e. the affixal pronouns (Section 2.6) and the inflectional endings (Sections 4.3, 4.5, 4.6 and 7.3), constitute the only manner to express the intraclausal, pragmatically unmarked subject and object functions for a pronominal reference. The regular character of the association of the affixal character of the pronominal reference with the intraclausal function is corroborated by the fact that the oblique NP functions for pronominal references are expressed by the so-called conjugated prepositions, in which the pronoun takes the form of an affix.

This regular distribution constitutes the starting point for the specific uses of pronominal references considered in this chapter, which also discusses the diachronic origin of all these uses. In fact, the more or less grammaticalized use of those pronominal forms is explained as derived from the canonical and normal uses previously depicted. Section 10.2 deals with the tonic pronouns included in referential non-verbal predicates. In particular, it establishes the basic structures of this type of non-verbal predicate in which the tonic pronoun is a defining constituent and the structural reason for the use of the tonic pronouns in this predicate type. Section 10.3 inspects the cataphoric use of object affixal pronouns, i.e. affixes that are followed in the clause by a correferential nominal object. While the pronominal markers considered in the two previous sections still maintain some of their referential value, Section 10.4 considers a number of uses in which

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-010>

this loss of referential value is clearer: the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l* is used in some cases as a sort of marker of a ‘reiterative’ verbal complex; on other occasions, it appears in the verbal complex after the subordinating conjunctions *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cía^l* ‘though’; it is used with the perfect form of *gaibid* ‘takes’ to express the nasalizing relative clause type of the substantive verb; finally, this section also considers some phonotactically advantageous uses of the Old Irish pronominal affixes which have a clear impact in the distinction of clause types.

This chapter does not include all the cases in which pronouns, especially affixal pronouns, are apparently used without any reference. For instance, the 3SG n. infix is a constitutive element of two Old Irish verbs meaning ‘to die’ irrespective of the clause type: consider e.g. the positive declarative Wb 4d15 *atbail* ‘he dies’, with Class B infix (the non-infixed form would have been **as·bail*), as well as the nasalizing relative clause type form of the same verb in Ml 36d10 *asind-bathatar* ‘that they have died’, and with the conjunct particle *co^N* in Ml 91d2 *conid apail* ‘till it dies’, both with the Class C form. The synonymous Sg 145b1 *arachrinim* ‘I perish’ also has this 3SG n. infix, in this case, with the Class A form in combination with the lexical preverb *ar-*.

Nor does this chapter refer to the *notae augentes* mentioned in Section 2.2.2 and included in many of the examples hitherto analyzed, even though some of them have the form of the corresponding tonic pronoun. This is the case of the *notae augentes* 3SG f. *-si*, 1PL *-ni* and 2PL *-si*, and it seems clear that at least those forms represent a secondary use of the tonic forms. However, the use of the *notae augentes*, which have been considered a clitic that stands outside the structure of the verbal complex, does not seem to be determined by clause type distinctions, since they can be found with all the Old Irish clause types.⁷⁸ The rules of their use are not completely clear, in particular, when they are used and when not. Interestingly, when they are used in verbal complexes including a 3rd and a non-3rd pronominal reference they regularly express the latter, as noted by Griffith (2008). In addition, the Old Irish *notae augentes* may well serve, at least in part, to disambiguate the exact reference of some pronominal markers, as suggested by Roma (1999: 20). This can be observed in example (143), which contains three

⁷⁸ Some cases observed in this study are, with a declarative verb, (1PL) *nonlíntar-ni* in (38b); with a relative verb, (1PL) *prídchimme-ni* in (97f); with a polar interrogative verb (2PL) *innádcualaid-si* in (105); with a *wh*-interrogative verb, (2SG) *cétaí-siu* in Section 7.3.2; with a responsive verb, (1SG) *tiag-sa* in (117a); with an imperative verb, see the form *dénad-si* in (143) commented on in the text, with feminine singular *nota augens*.

notae augentes, *-si* in the verbal complex *dénad-si*, *-si* in the possessive NP *a-altram-si*, and *-sem* in the conjugated preposition *doib-sem*, in addition to the proximal *-sidi* in the verbal complex *dorigensat-sidi*.

(143) *amal dorigensat sidi aaltramsi dénadsi goiri doibsem* (Wb 28d19)

amal	do-rí-gen-s-at-sidi	
as	PV-DECL?/PERF-make-PRET.ACT-3PL.ACT-PROX	
a-altram-si		dé-na-d-si
POSS.3SG.F-nurture/ACC.SG.N-NA.3SG.F		PV-make-3SG.ACT.IMPV-NA.3SG.F
goiri	do-ib-sem	
nurturing/ACC.SG.F	to-3PL-NA.3PL	

‘as they have nurtured her (so) let her maintain them’ (more lit. ‘as these [scil. the parents of the widow] have done her nurturing, let her do maintenance for them’).

In (143), the *-sidi* of *dorigensat-sidi* refers to the previously (in the Latin text) mentioned *parentes* ‘parents’; the *-si* of *a-altram-si* serves to disambiguate the prefixed 3SG feminine possessor marker *a-* ‘her’, which could be interpreted in that position as the corresponding 3SG masculine form *a^l-* ‘his’ as well; the *-si* of the imperative form *dénad-si* states unequivocally in that context that the implied person is the widow; finally, the *-sem* of *doib-sem* refers then to the other 3rd person NP previously expressed, i.e. the parents.

10.2 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates

This section rounds off the treatment on Old Irish non-verbal predicates with an analysis of the referential type. The formal feature of this type of non-verbal predicate in Old Irish, and also the reason why it is considered in this chapter, is the initial sequence of copula (in 3rd person, whether singular or plural) and tonic pronoun. That the definite meaning of the predicate is directly related to the use of the tonic pronouns in the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates has been already observed by scholars such as Thurneysen (1946: 492) and Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 62). Typically, if the tonic pronoun is in 3rd person, then the two definite NPs (the subject and the predicate) follow, though one of those two NPs can also appear as left-dislocated constituent before the group of copula and tonic pronoun.

After an introductory mention of the other functions of Old Irish tonic pronouns in Section 10.2.1, Section 10.2.2 establishes the semantic and pragmatic traits of this type of non-verbal predicate and illustrates the difference between

this and the bare or attributive non-verbal predicate in Old Irish. Section 10.2.3 deals with the structures with two referential lexical NPs appearing after the introducing sequence of copula plus 3rd person tonic pronoun and, in Section 10.2.4, the situation is considered in which only one of the two referential NPs appears after the sequence of copula plus tonic pronoun. Several reasons justify a more detailed treatment of this type of predicate, but perhaps the most important of them is the relevance of this type of copular predicate for clause typing, a point that will be dealt with in Section 10.2.5. The diachronic relationship to pragmatically marked structures of the Old Irish language is left for Section 10.2.6. Finally, Section 10.2.7 resumes the main points of this section.

10.2.1 The pragmatic use of the Old Irish tonic pronouns

In García-Castillero (2013b), the Old Irish tonic pronouns are described as fundamentally extraclausal constituents expressing pragmatically marked functions in contrast to the exclusively intraclausal and, thereby, pragmatically unmarked character of the non-stressed pronominal references mentioned in the previous section.

The most frequent use of the Old Irish tonic pronouns is as (a) the focused constituent of the cleft-sentence, as illustrated in Section 3.2.1. Lambrecht's (1994: 336) general principle of the stressed character of focus is to be considered here: "while a topic element is often unaccented or phonologically null, a focus element is always accented and overtly expressed." Moreover, tonic pronouns have been observed (b) in the *wh*-interrogative clause type, clearly as the subject of the question, a point considered in Section 6.4; the nominal questions observed in Section 6.5.2, which also seem to include a tonic pronoun, according to the diachronic suggestion in Section 6.6(e), can be left aside at the present moment. The syntactic structures of both (a) and (b) are related to the use of tonic pronouns in the expression of the non-verbal referential predicates and are considered in Section 10.2.6 below.

Further cases of Old Irish tonic pronouns with an assumable pragmatically marked function are found (c) after indefinite particles such as e.g. Wb 15b1 *sechi-é cretes* 'whoever is he who believes' (which are quite similar to focused forms in cleft-sentence, see García-Castillero 2013b: 19–21), (d) (rarely) as detached or left-dislocated topical NPs, (e) (rarely) as vocative NP, (f) as contrastive topics introduced by the particle *os-/ot-*, as exemplified in García-Castillero (2013b: 23–27), (g) in the so-called Reported Speech constituent introduced by *ol-* (e.g. *olsí* 'said she', see García-Castillero 2013b: 27–29 and 2017a), (h) after *ocus* 'and' in equative

expressions, and (i) after *acht* ‘except’ and *cid* ‘even’ (García-Castillero 2013b: 29–32). These uses are of no bearing for the expression of clause types in the verbal complex.

The Old Irish tonic pronouns therefore have an extraclausal function, mainly associated to marked focus, and are also characterized by the complementary distribution with finite verbs. A structural (and diachronic) explanation of the use of tonic pronouns in referential non-verbal predicates should establish how these two features of the Old Irish extraclausal tonic pronouns (namely, their pragmatic value as focus and their non-finite character) fit in with the expression of this type of non-verbal predicate.

10.2.2 Basic features of the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates

By way of introduction, I offer a quasi-minimal pair of bare and referential non-verbal predicates. Both clauses included in (144), which stand very close to each other in the Würzburg manuscript, are about Abraham, who is named in the Latin text to which each gloss is attached and must be considered the subject (or NP1, see later) of each clause. In (144a), the noun *athir* ‘father’ appears directly after the form of the copula, and is used in a non-referential manner, just like the cases observed in Section 9.4: that predicate says that Abraham has the property of ‘being father of’ some people. In (144b), the NP *ar^N-athir* ‘our father’ appears after the sequence *is-hé* and is clearly a referential non-verbal predicate, i.e. ‘our father’.

(144) a. *acht is athir som innaní techte foirbthetith ...* (Wb 2c11)

acht	is-athir-som	
but	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-father/NOM.SG.M-NA.3SG.M	
innaní	tech-te	foirbthet-ith
LHEAD/GEN.PL	possess/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT.REL	perfection-ACC.SG.M

‘but he is father of those that possess perfection ...’.

b. *ishé ar^N-athir iarcolinn ...* (Wb 2b23)

is-hé	ar ^N -athir
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M	POSS.1PL-father/NOM.SG.M
iar-colinn	
after-flesh/ACC.SG.M	

‘he is our father according to the flesh, ...’.

As with other general types of non-verbal predicates (e.g. the temporal and permanent property subtypes in the bare non-verbal predicate), some subtypes have also been proposed in the linguistic literature for the referential non-verbal predicate. Thus, Geist (2006: 17–19) distinguishes the identity (or equative), identificational and specificational subtypes, according to the ‘relative reference strength’ of each NP involved. If the subject (NP1) is more definite than the referential non-verbal predicate (NP2), there is then an identificational type, whereas the other way round implies a specificational type. Since Old Irish makes no formal distinction between these subtypes, only one single type will be considered here, i.e. the referential one. However, I will maintain the notations NP1 and NP2 of Geist’s study since the role of subject and predicate in this type of non-verbal predicates has more to do with pragmatic roles such as topic (for the NP1 or subject) and focus (for the NP2 or predicate) than with semantic roles such as agent and patient. The notation ‘NP1’ is therefore intended as a reference to the subject of this non-verbal predicate with a clear topical profile.

There are two formal variables that are relevant for the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicate, namely (a) the use of a tonic person pronoun, whether a 1st/2nd (i.e. a non-3rd) or a 3rd person, and (b), if it is a 3rd person pronoun, the presence of one or two lexical NPs in the clause apart from that 3rd person tonic pronoun. As for (a), cases with non-third persons are rare in the language of the Glosses, but not unknown. Example (145) includes the 2PL tonic pronoun, and is attached to the Latin text *Templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis uos* ‘Therefore, God’s temple, which is you, is sacred’.

(145) *ississi intempul sin* (Wb 8d7)

is-si-ssi

in-tempul-sin

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-2PL-NA.2PL ART.NOM.SG.M-temple/NOM.SG.M-DIST

‘you are that temple’ (or, perhaps better, ‘that temple is you’).

The Old Irish glossator has translated the appositive clause introduced by *quod* with a clause in which the non-verbal predicate *is-sissi* is followed by the NP1 *intempul sin*, ‘that temple’ mentioned in the Latin text. The alternative translation proposed for (145) is based on the idea that it represents a pragmatic gloss in which the glossator tries to establish the informational status of the NPs that mean ‘that temple’ and ‘you’.

Most cases of referential non-verbal predicates in the language of the Glosses, however, have a 3rd person pronoun. The two possibilities referred to in (b) are considered in turn in the two next sections, which follow Mac Coisdealbha’s ([1976] 1998: 47–61) analysis.

10.2.3 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with two lexical NPs after COP-PRON

Since the Old Irish finite verb regularly appears in the first position of the clause, the case in which the two referential NPs appear after the sequence of copula and 3rd person tonic pronoun is considered the basic structure of the referential non-verbal predicate in Old Irish. This frequent structure can be preliminarily formulated as in (146).

(146) COP-3RD.PRON – referential NP – referential NP

There are two points that must be further determined about the structure of (146). First, it seems that the NP1 and NP2 assumed for the referential non-verbal predicates have no fixed position in that structure. On many occasions, NP1 comes first, as in the examples of (147) below. However, there are other cases in which NP2 appears before what can be assumed to be NP1, as in (148a,b), and even other cases in which a decision is not easy, as exemplified in (148c) below. Second, the tonic pronoun shows number and gender variation and, in fact, it agrees with one of the two NPs, though it is not immediately clear with which of them, i.e. whether with NP1 or NP2. The examples of (147) and (148) are instances of the general schema in (146) and illustrate the three singular tonic pronouns, the neuter form *ed* ‘it’ in (147a), the feminine *sí* ‘she’ in (147b), (148a), and the masculine (*h*)*e* ‘he’ in (148b) and (148c).

(147)a. ... *acht ised annert foirbthe imgabail cech huilc 7 denum cech degnima* (Ml 35d14)

<i>acht</i>	<i>is-ed</i>		<i>a^N-nert</i>
<i>but</i>	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.N		ART.NOM.SG.N-virtue/NOM.SG.N
<i>foirbthe</i>		<i>imgabail</i>	<i>cech-huilc</i>
perfect/NOM.SG.N		avoiding/NOM.SG.F	every-evil/GEN.SG.N
<i>7</i>	<i>denum</i>		<i>cech-de(g)-gnim-a</i>
<i>and</i>	making/NOM.SG.M		every-good-action-GEN.SG.M
‘..., but the perfect virtue is to avoid every evil and to do every good work’.			

b. *issí achiall inso sí* (Ml 51b11)

<i>is-sí</i>		<i>a^L-ciall</i>
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.F		POSS.3SG.N-sense/NOM.SG.F
<i>inso sí</i>		
PROX	below	

‘Its meaning is this below’.

In (147a), the Old Irish NP *annert foirbthe* ‘the perfect virtue’ (where *nert* has neuter gender), which translates the Latin NP *perfecta uirtus*, is the subject (or NP1) about which something is predicated. In this case, the Old Irish neuter tonic pronoun *ed* agrees with the Old Irish NP1, whereas the two other (verbal) nouns in (147a) have a different gender, *imgabail* ‘to avoid, avoiding’ is feminine and *denum* ‘to do, doing’ masculine. In (147b) the feminine tonic pronoun *sí* agrees in gender with the NP1 *achiall*, ‘its meaning’ (cf. *ciall* ‘sense, meaning’).

As anticipated above, the order NP2 – NP1 is also possible in the Old Irish referential non-verbal clauses, as in (148a,b); example (148c) represents a dubious case in this sense.

(148) a. *issí inso sís a chiall* (Ml 50c1)

is-sí	inso	sís
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.F	PROX	below
a ¹ -ciall		
POSS.3SG.N-sense/NOM.SG.F		
‘Its meaning is this below’.		

b. *níceilsom tra asné crist inlie asrubart* (Wb 4d16)

ní-ceil-som	tra
NEG.DECL-conceal/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT-NA.3SG.M	then
as ^N -é	crist
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL-3SG.M	Christ
in-lie	as ¹ -ru-bar-t
ART.NOM.SG.M-stone/NOM.SG.M	PV·REL/PERF-say-PRET.ACT/3SG
‘so he conceals not that the stone he has mentioned is Christ’.	

c. *ishe armbethoni farfoirbthetusi* (Wb 25a24)

is-he	ar ^N -beth-o-ni
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M	POSS.1PL-life-NOM.SG.M-NA.1PL
far-foirbthet-u-si	
POSS.2PL-perfection-NOM.SG.M-NA.2PL	
‘Your perfection is our life’.	

The gloss in (148a), which is attached to the Latin text *est sensus* ‘... is the sense’, differs from (147b) above in that *inso* appears before *a chiall*, though the interpretation of both examples must be the same, i.e. as NP2 and NP1 respectively. Note

that the form *inso* ‘this’ (and *insin* ‘that’) makes no gender distinction, and Thurneysen (1946: 302) takes them as neuter forms, so that the feminine pronoun *sí* of (148a) agrees with *a chiall*. Example (148b) is interesting because the referential non-verbal predicate is included in a complement clause. As Isaac (in Mac Coisdealbha [1976] 1998: 242–245) comments on this example, the Latin text to which (148b) refers is *pono in Sión lapidem offensionis, et petram scandalī* ‘I lay in Sion a stone of stumbling, a rock of scandal’, and this means that the NP1 must be *inlie asrubart* ‘the stone he has mentioned’ (i.e. the Latin expressions *lapidem offensionis* and *petram scandalī*); the predicate (or NP2) must therefore be *crīst* ‘Christ’. The translation is based on this pragmatic assignment.

The gloss in (148c), referred to Latin *Quoniam nunc uiuimus, si uos statis in Domino* ‘because we are now alive, if you remain in God’, represents a reasonably doubtful case. The problem is basically that it is not clear whether the glossator takes the idea of ‘being alive’ of *nunc uiuimus* as the starting point of his statement, in which case *ar^N-betho-ni* ‘our life’ would be the NP1, or this role is played by the idea of ‘being in God’ (*uos statis in Domino*), the expression to which the gloss is properly attached. Both *bethu* ‘life’ and *foirbthetu* ‘perfection’ are masculine nouns, so that both can agree with the Old Irish tonic pronoun *he*.

To sum up, as for the first issue on the structure of (146) above, the Old Irish referential sentences with initial sequence of COP-3RD.TON.PRON can have the two basic structures in Table 10.1.

Tab. 10.1: Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with two NPs after the V1

	Structure	Example
1	COP.-TON.PRON. + NP1 + NP2	Examples (147a,b)
2	COP.-TON.PRON. + NP2 + NP1	Examples (148a,b)

Which of the two sequences is more frequent in Old Irish is, to some extent, an irrelevant question at the present moment since both structures have enough attestations in the Glosses. As for the second issue on the structure of (146), it seems that the tonic pronoun agrees most often with the following NP, whether the NP1 or the NP2, though example (148a) shows that it can also agree with the NP appearing in second position.

10.2.4 Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with one lexical NP after cop-PRON

In addition to the structures considered in the previous section, there are also others in which there is only one NP after the initial constituent formed with a copula and a 3rd person tonic pronoun. In such cases, the other referential NP is mentioned in the previous context, either in a separate sentence or as a left-dislocated constituent directly anteposed to the copula. The first possibility was already considered in example (144b) above, and this means that the Latin text to which the gloss is attached, a text in which Abraham (i.e. the NP1) is mentioned, constitutes the linguistic context of the Old Irish expression concerned, much in line with the observations in Section 1.3.1 above. The structure represented by that example (144b) implies that the NP2 is the constituent that appears after the sequence of copula and 3rd person tonic pronoun, i.e. *arnathir* ‘our father’.

This section will consider cases in which one of the NPs appears as a left-dislocated constituent in the Old Irish sentence. The general phenomenon of left-dislocation has already been observed in Section 3.3 above for other types of predicates. Of course, the other types of non-verbal predicates can also have a left-dislocated NP, in this case the subject. Recall, in example (62), the structure *mofáiltese bid fáilte dúibsi* ‘my joy, it will be joy for you’, in which *mo^l-fáilte-se* ‘my joy’ is the left-dislocated subject NP of the bare non-verbal predicate *bid-fáilte*. The same sentential structure with a left-dislocated NP preceding the sequence of copula and 3rd person tonic pronoun is attested in the examples of (149).

(149) a. *mad inæclis tra inchoss ishé óis achtáil et indlaám ishé óis achtáil asmáa alailiu* (Wb 12a23)

ma-d-i ^N -æclis		tra	
if-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG-in-church/DAT.SG.F		then	
in ^l -coss		is-hé	óis
ART.NOM.SG.F-foot/NOM.SG.F		COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M folk/NOM.SG.M	
achtáil	et	ind-laám	
active/NOM.SG.M	and	ART.NOM.SG.F-hand/NOM.SG.F	
is-hé		óis	achtáil
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M		folk/NOM.SG.M	active/NOM.SG.M
as- ^l máa		alail-iu	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL/big/COMP		other-DAT.SG.M	

cenchorin is the translation thereof that must be then interpreted as the NP2, i.e. as the predicate of the sentence.

Finally, (149c) refers to the Latin expression *estis ciues sanctorum* ‘you are the citizens of the saints’ and the glossator is working with the notion of *ciues* and the concept implied or suggested by it, i.e. the Latin *ciuitas* implied in the Old Irish NP *in-chathir* ‘the city’ (with the feminine noun *cathir*). This NP *inchathir* is therefore the NP1, and *críst* clearly the NP2.

As stated in Section 3.3.1, left-dislocated NPs are usually topical constituents that state what the predication that comes thereafter is about. This interpretation is straightforward in the case of *in-choss* and *ind-laám* in (149a). On some occasions, however, the pragmatic value of the left-dislocated NP with respect of the whole sentence is different: *ambith cenchorin* ‘their being without a (bridal) crown’ in (149b) and *críst* in (149c) constitute the informatively important element that the glossator wants to make clear.

It seems therefore that the variable order of NP1 and NP2 observed in the previous section is also possible when one of the two NPs of the referential non-verbal predicate is left-dislocated or, simply, when it is mentioned in the preceding context. Note that, in all three examples of (149), the tonic pronoun agrees with the NP that comes immediately thereafter, whether the NP1 or the NP2.

Tab. 10.2: Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with left-dislocated NP

	Structure	Example
1	NP2 + COP.-TON.PRON. + NP1	Examples (149b,c)
2	NP1 + COP.-TON.PRON. + NP2	Example (149a)

These two possibilities are considered in Table 10.2, where the structure in which the left-dislocated NP is the NP2 appears first. The next section makes clear why this disposition is so.

10.2.5 Referential non-verbal predicates, clause types, and cleft-sentences

An important feature of referential non-verbal predicates, both in Old Irish and in general, is that they can hardly be used as (restrictive) relative clauses. Take the classical examples of referential non-verbal predicates in English given in (150).

(150) a. *The Morning Star is the Evening Star.*

- b. *John is the president of the club.*
- c. *The president of the club is John.*

The use of the predicates included in these examples of (150) as restrictive relative clauses produces an awkward result, to say the least. Sentences like ?*The star that is the Evening Star is shining* or ?*The man that is the president of the club told me that story* are perhaps grammatically acceptable, but most speakers (if not all) will probably say that *The star that is ...* and *The man that is ...* are superfluous and can or even should be omitted. This preference becomes the rule in the case of **The man that is John told me that story* or even **The man that is he told me that story*.

I assume that this restriction has general, i.e. cross-linguistic value, and therefore that such referential non-verbal predicates cannot be used in restrictive relative clauses; in Old Irish terms, they cannot appear as marked with relative lenition. Note, however, that Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates can be used as complement clauses, as observed in example (148b) above (i.e. *asné crist inlie asrubart* ‘that the stone he mentions is Christ’), which is marked with relative nasalization. Clearly, this is due to the main clause-like character of the complement clause stated in Section 5.7.

Since tonic personal pronouns are a constitutive component of referential non-verbal predicates in Old Irish, and this predicate type inherently has main clause character (or, to view it differently, non-relative character), this type of non-verbal predicate constitutes a further case in which pronominal references are involved in the expression of clause types. This general idea has been considered in Section 8.5.3 above, though in that case the pronominal references were those of the affixal pronouns attached to the verbal complex. On this occasion, it is the tonic pronoun appearing after the unstressed copula form that is somehow related to the main clause character of the predicate. This initial impression may be further substantiated if the cleft-sentence is introduced into the picture. Recall that the introductory copula of the cleft-sentence, as noted in Section 3.2.2, is not expected with leniting relative clause type marking either.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the relationship between the cleft-sentence and the referential non-verbal predicate in Old Irish, it is worth remembering the main clause effect of the cleft-sentence observed in Section 5.6.2, in which the use of declarative morphology instead of regular nasalizing relative marking in the copula after the conjunction (*(h)óire* ‘because’ was clearly associated with the use of the copula as introducer of a cleft-sentence. After that conjunction, when the 3rd person form of the copula introduces a bare non-verbal predicate, relative nasalization turns out to be predominant.

The specific idea I would like to propose here is that the use of tonic pronouns in the expression of referential non-verbal predicates in Old Irish is most directly connected to the use of the tonic pronouns in the cleft-sentence. In fact, both structures seem to be mixed in some cases in Old Irish. Two representative examples of this phenomenon are given in (151).

(151) a. *ishé día aséola indium sa* (Wb 8d23)

is-hé	día	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M	God/NOM.SG.M	
as- ^(L) éola		ind-ium-sa
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-(REL/)	knowledgeable/NOM.SG.M	in-1SG-NA.1SG
'it is God who is knowledgeable about me'.		

b. *ishé inpeccad rogéni anuile comaccobor* (Wb 3c25)

is-hé	in-peccad	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.M	ART.NOM.SG.M-sin/NOM.SG.M	
ro- ¹ géni	a ^N -uile comaccobor	
PERF-REL/made/PRET.ACT.3SG	ART.ACC.SG.N-all desire/NOM.SG.N	
'it is sin what has wrought every concupiscence'.		

The gloss in (151a) comments on the Latin text *neque me ipsum iudico* 'I do not even judge myself', so that a certain contrastive value can be perceived in the Old Irish form *día* 'God', in so far as the idea is approximately 'I do not judge myself; it is God who does it, because it is He who is knowledgeable about me'. A simple cleft-sentence such as **is dia aseola indiumsa* 'it's God who is knowledgeable about me' would have been enough in order to express that idea. A possible interpretation in this sense is that the initial expression was **is hé aseola indiumsa* 'it's he who is knowledgeable about me', and that the word for 'God', *dia*, has been appositionally inserted to make clear the specific reference of the pronoun: 'it's he, God, who is knowledgeable about me'.⁸⁰

80 An anonymous reviewer suggests assuming a headless relative clause introduced by *as-éola* and *rogréni*, so that these two examples would represent referential non-verbal predicates: 'God is (the one) who is knowledgeable about me' and 'the sin is (that) what has wrought every concupiscence'. However, this interpretation implies that every Old Irish cleft-sentence with an anteposed (i.e. focused) subject or object NP entails a headless relative clause. Certainly, this is in line with the idea of the similarity between referential non-verbal predicate and cleft-sentence in Old Irish, but I prefer to talk about headless relative clauses for the situation in which the corresponding relative verb is not involved in a cleft-sentence, namely, when it is clearly a dislocated NP or when it is the subject or the object of a transitive verb or of an intransitive verb

A look at the Latin text that the gloss of (151b) refers to allows us to state that *in peccad* is the focused element of the Old Irish sentence: *peccatum ... operatum est in me omnem concupiscentiam* ‘the sin has made every concupiscence in me ...’. It seems that, in this Latin clause, the subject role of *peccatum* is not completely clear, so that this can be the reason for the explanatory Old Irish gloss, in which this grammatical link is stressed: ‘it is it, the sin, what has wrought every concupiscence’.⁸¹

From a functional perspective, the justification of this relationship between referential non-verbal predicate and cleft-sentence is that the former implies an assertion that involves some sort of unexpected information, at least in the specificational type in which the NP2 is more referential than the NP1, e.g. *The president of the club is John* in (150c) above. My contention is that this situation involves a mismatch between the typical situation in which the more referential element is the subject (i.e. the NP1), on the one hand, and the specific situation in which the more referential NP is precisely the NP2, on the other. This character of unexpected referentiality in a predicate (at least in a non-verbal predicate) results in a focused character. This observation is in line with Stassen’s (1997: 111) idea that ‘identity statements’ (i.e. the clauses which include a referential non-verbal predicate) “may feature topic / focus marking devices in a more obligatory way than other sentence types do.”

10.2.6 On the diachrony of the Old Irish referential non-verbal predication

Table 10.3 below includes the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicates with a 3rd person tonic pronoun hitherto observed in this section, i.e. it aggregates Tables 10.1 and 10.2 above. The assumption is that there is a certain allosentential

other than the copula. In these contexts, however, headless relative clauses are very rare in Old Irish, and the corresponding NP is introduced by a light head such as the stressed and fully inflected form *inti aní* or by the unstressed and paradigmatically isolated neuter singular form *a^N*, two demonstrative elements that are specifically used for that purpose.

81 In Section 4.7.3 above, I observed that the use of relative nasalization after m./f. sg. antecedents with object NP_{rel} function is more frequent when the antecedent constitutes a tautophrasal unit with the relative verb, i.e. when that antecedent is not the focused element of a cleft-sentence. Two of the structures considered in that analysis, M1 77b6 and M1 94d4, which have been interpreted as cleft-sentences with nasalization in the relative verb (i.e. Type B1 in Table 4.10), represent structures parallel to those in (151), in the sense that they have the structure COP-TON.PRON – NP – relative verb. Note that the nominal elements after the tonic pronoun in (151) have subject NP_{rel} function in the (leniting) relative verb that comes after.

correspondence between the structures of each row. The notion of allosentence has been introduced in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.3 above, and in the specific situation of Table 10.3, it implies that the difference between the A types and the B types is that the left-dislocated element of the former appears in the final position of the latter. As with other cases of left-dislocation in which the NP involved appears always in nominative case, the change in the position of this NP is the only difference between the A and the B types.

Tab. 10.3: Old Irish allosentential pairs of referential non-verbal predicates with left-dislocated NP and with V1 order

	A. Left-dislocated NP	B. V1 order
1	NP2 + COP.-TON.PRON. + NP1	COP.-TON.PRON. + NP1 + NP2
2	NP1 + COP.-TON.PRON. + NP2	COP.-TON.PRON. + NP2 + NP1

The above disposition does not mean that every case of Type A has a correlate in the corresponding row of Type B or the other way round. For instance, the demonstrative *inso* ‘this’ of example (147b) *issí achiall inso síis* ‘Its meaning is this below’, i.e. Type B1 in Table 10.3, or of example (148a), i.e. Type B2 in Table 10.3, seems to be avoided as a left-dislocated constituent or in the focused position of cleft-sentences. As a result, the Type B1 of (147b) would have no A1 counterpart (something like **inso síis issí achiall*). However, in other instances of the structure A1, e.g. *críst didiu issí inchathir* of (149c), an allosentential structure B1 such as **issí inchathir críst* seems to be acceptable in Old Irish.

Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 58–59) and Roma (2000: 140) explain the structure B2 on Table 10.3 as a derivation from Type B1. They start with the situation in which the tonic pronoun in B1 was a cataphoric reference to the predicate NP2 appearing after the NP1, which was originally a sort of apposition, and was latter integrated in the sentence once the cataphoric value of the tonic pronoun was lost.

There remain some unclear points in this explanation. First, gender agreement between tonic pronoun and the immediately following NP is too strong a tendency in the available examples to be considered as completely secondary; in other words, even though there remain examples in which a cataphoric tonic pronoun refers to the NP2 located after the NP1, a diachronic explanation that deals with a structure in which the pronoun agrees with the immediately following NP would be advantageous. Second, it is not clear how the cataphoric value of the tonic pronoun was lost in the initial type (i.e. in B2); moreover, it is not clear whether the cataphoric value has been lost at all, since the gender agreement

points at least to a certain reference value of the pronoun. Third, it remains unclear why and how the scheme COP-TON.PRON + NP1 + NP2 (= B1) was changed to COP-TON.PRON + NP2 + NP1 (= B2).

These obstacles can be overcome if we include in the picture the structures with tonic pronouns quoted in Section 10.2.1 above, i.e. the cleft-sentence and the *wh*-questions, as well as the structure with left-dislocation, i.e. the Type A in Table 10.3. To begin with, the inherently focused character of referential non-verbal predicates stated above in Section 10.2.5 is clearly why they acquired in Old Irish a structure quite similar to the cleft-sentence, that is to say, why tonic pronouns were incorporated into their expression. Cleft-sentences of the type illustrated in the examples of (151), in which a lexical NP seems to have been added additionally to the tonic pronoun and in which the tonic pronoun and the NP therefore agreed in gender and number, may be a starting point. In this structure, the tonic pronoun and the following NP are the focal part of the utterance and this means that this NP is the NP2; if the backgrounded part of the cleft-sentence, which usually corresponds to a relative clause when the focused element is a tonic pronoun, is substituted by an NP, then it will be the NP1. Structures of Type B2 such as *asné crist inlie asrubart* ‘that the stone he has mentioned is Christ’ in (148b) above are thus directly explained. The allosentential relationship between Types A and B in Table 10.3 above allows us to derive an A2 structure such as **inlie asrubart is é crist* ‘the stone he has mentioned, it is Christ’, parallel to the case with left-dislocated NP1 of (149a) above, i.e. *inchoss ishé óis achtáil* ‘the foot is the practical folk’. The gender agreement between the tonic pronoun and the immediately following NP in this Type A2 in Table 10.3 is thereby directly explained.

However, this is not the only structure at play. The *wh*-questions in which tonic interrogative pronouns such as *cisí* were used, i.e. structures of the type *cisí chomairle* ‘what is the counsel?’ observed in example (101a) in Section 6.5.2, provide a further basis for the agreement pattern between the tonic pronoun and the adjacent NP. That there may be some relationship between this type of question and the structure of the referential non-verbal predicate can be assumed on the basis of pairs such as the one in (152a,b), two expressions that are textually close, though they certainly do not constitute a sequence of question and answer. In (152c) the same gloss includes a nominal *wh*-question that is answered with a structure of Type A2 in Table 10.3 above.

(152) a. *cisí digal didenach dumberaesiu* (Ml 100d5)

<i>cisí</i>	<i>digal</i>	<i>didenach</i>
WH.SG.F	punishment/NOM.SG.F	final/NOM.SG.F

du.^N-ber-ae-siu

PV-REL-bring/FUT-2SG.ACT-NA.2SG

‘which is the final punishment which you will inflict?’

b. *rogiuil ambiad innambragait 7 at batha samlid issi indigal insin* (Ml 98b8)

ro-giuil

a^N-biad

PERF·DECL/adhere/PRET.ACT.3SG

POSS.3PL-food/NOM.SG.N

i^N-a^N-brag-ait

7

a-t-bath-a(tar)

in-POSS.3PL-throat-ACC.SG.F

and

PV-3SG.N/DECL·die/PRET.PASS-3PL

samlid

is-sí

thus

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-3SG.F

in-digal

insin

ART.NOM.SG.F-punishment/NOM.SG.F

DIST

‘their food stuck in their throat and they died thus; that is the punishment’.

c. *cit né briathra robatar it háe æm inso .i. quando morietur rl.* (Ml 61b7)

citné

briathr-a

ro-^lba-tar

WH.3PL

word-NOM.PL.F

PERF·REL/SUBSTV/PRET.ACT-3PL

it-háe

æm

inso

.i. *quando morietur rl.*

COP.PRES.IND.3PL.DECL-3PL

then

PROX

i.e.

‘what were the words? they are these, i.e. *quando morietur etc.*’.

Note that (152b) is a case of Type B1 in Table 10.3 above, i.e. COP-TON.PRON – NP1 – NP2: the two clauses in the text *rogiuil ... samlid* are referred to by the demonstrative *insin*, which is the NP2 of the clause *issi indigal insin*. This example (152b) is a possible answer to a question such as the one in (152a): in (152b), the glossator begins by directly answering a question such as ‘which is the punishment?’ with the two clauses included in *rogiuil ... samlid*, and the pragmatic character of answer of those two clauses is clarified with the expression *issi indigal insin*, which replicates that assumed question in which the -sí of *cisi* and *digal* agree in gender, and where *insin* refers to the two clauses. In the referential non-verbal predicate of (152c), which is of Type A2, the NP1 of *it háe æm inso .i. quando morietur rl.* is the plural *briathra robatar* ‘the words that there were’ mentioned in the preceding question, while the NP2 is *inso* ‘these’, which is further explained with the Latin words.

By the same token, an example such as *crist didiu issi inchathir* ‘Crist, the city is him’ in (149c), i.e. Type A1 in Table 10.3, may well be interpreted as the answer to a question like **cisi in-chathir* ‘what is the city?’ (in the sense of ‘what does the

city represent?'). In the referential non-verbal predicate of (149c), the left-dislocated NP *críst* represents the direct answer to that question followed by the positive declarative version of the question, *issí in-chathir*. By virtue of the previous allosentential relationship, a Type A1 structure such as the one in (149c) can easily be changed into its B1 counterpart by merely putting the left-dislocated NP2 after the NP1, something like **issí in-chathir (didiu) críst* 'the city is Christ' (in the sense of 'the city represents Christ'). The Old Irish structures of the Types A1 and B1, and the observed agreement between the tonic pronoun and the immediately following NP, are thereby explained.

The four structures encoded in Table 10.3 can therefore be explained starting from two well-known and prominent Old Irish structures that involve the use of tonic pronouns or, alternatively, focused constituents. Both structures, the nominal *wh*-question and the cleft-sentence, have a direct connection to the referential non-verbal predicate: the former is the question corresponding to such a predication, while the latter includes a focused component that is inherent to this type of non-verbal predication, and could also be a possible answer to the same *wh*-question type.

Once those two types, i.e. Type 1 (COP-TON.PRON. – NP1) and Type 2 (COP-TON.PRON. – NP2) in Table 10.3 above have been established, the change or transition from one to another, much in line with Mac Coisdealbha and Roma's idea of above, becomes much easier to conceive, so that one may easily imagine a change from *issí achiall inso síis* in (147b) to *issí inso síis a chiall* in (148a).

10.2.7 Summary on tonic pronouns and referential non-verbal predicates

The Old Irish expression of referential non-verbal predicates requires the use of a tonic pronoun after the 3rd person of the copula both when the predicate is a 1st or 2nd person, and when it is a 3rd person. The unstressed character of the Old Irish copula, which needs to be attached to another element, represents the basic condition of this rule, but the use of tonic pronouns, especially when the predicate is a 1st or 2nd person, agrees with the focused character of such a referential non-verbal predicate.

The fact that the 3rd person pronoun must be expressed when the two NPs of the referential non-verbal predication are in the same post-verbal position points to a certain grammaticalized character of the pronoun. However, the gender (and number) agreement between the tonic pronoun and one of the NPs included in the Old Irish expression of referential non-verbal predicates points to a certain

maintenance of some referential value in the pronoun, and therefore, to the conclusion that the grammaticalization is not complete.

This somewhat grammaticalized use of the tonic pronoun as a marker of referential non-verbal predicate in combination with the form of the copula is in line with other cases in which the presence of a canonical pronominal reference also serves as the marker of declarative clause type (recall the suffixed pronouns considered in Section 4.4.1), and this parallel is all the more significant in view of the predominantly declarative (i.e. non-relative) character of the referential non-verbal predicates in general. The inherently focused nature of this type of non-verbal predicate points to a diachronic connection to two further structures in which tonic pronouns are involved, the *wh*-question and the cleft-sentence.

On the one hand, the basic structure implied in Type 1 in Table 10.3 above (i.e. COP-TON.PRON. – NP1) is clearly similar to Old Irish non-verbal *wh*-questions. In fact, that there is some structural link between questions and answers, especially an influence from the former to the latter, has already been assumed in Section 7.4.4 for the rise of the responsive as a distinct clause type in Old Irish. In this case, the starting point would be a question such as **cisi in chathir* ‘what is the city?’, and the left-dislocated NP *críst* in (149c) and, in the allosentential variant, the NP appearing at the end of the sentence, is the focused answer.

On the other hand, Type 2 in Table 10.3 (i.e. COP-TON.PRON. – NP2) is based on cleft-sentences such as *ishé día ...* ‘it’s he, God, ...’ in (151a): this is the basis for *asné críst inlie ...* ‘that the stone ... is Christ’ in (148b). In such a case, the NP1 appears after the NP2, but it can also appear as left-dislocated NP: an example is (149a), where the allegorical interpretation of the topical left-dislocated NPs *inchoss* ‘the foot’ and *indlaám* ‘the hand’ is given.

In cases of this sort, the allosentential relationship between a structure with left-dislocated NP and another in which the same NP is put at the end of the clause is an easy way of arriving at the structure in which two referential NPs appear after the clause initial sequence of copula and tonic pronoun. The same relationship between allosentential variants is to be considered in the next section.

10.3 The cataphoric use of the Old Irish affixal pronouns

This section centers on a specific use of the affixal pronouns included in the verbal complex, a use that has traditionally been considered redundant, proleptic, or pleonastic. In order to make clear the extent to which this use represents a deviation from the regular use of these affixes, Section 10.3.1 restates the main

traits of the morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic features of the affixal pronouns included in the verbal complex. Section 10.3.2 then inspects a selection of cataphoric uses of these affixal pronouns, and Section 10.3.3 considers again the allosentential relationship between the clauses in which these cataphoric pronouns are included and sentences with left-dislocated object NPs, much in the same way as the previous section. This is the place to state clearly that, while tonic pronouns are a regular constituent of the referential non-verbal predicates, the cataphoric use of the infixal pronouns observed in this section is a well-known phenomenon in Old Irish, but it is far from being a regular use.

10.3.1 Affixal pronouns in the verbal complex

This section merely restates the main morphological, morphotactic, syntactic and pragmatic issues of the affixal pronouns widely considered up to this point in the present study. The forms and concomitant mutations were given in Section 2.6. Section 2.2.2 established that the Old Irish affixal pronouns are restricted to two mutually exclusive positions in the verbal complex, either in slot 2, i.e. the pretonic position (in which case they are always preceded by a pretonic lexical preverb, conjunct particle or, more rarely, deadjectival preverb), or in slot 6.

When infixal, the pronoun regularly appears as the rightmost element of the pretonic part of the deuterotonic compound, just before the tonic part of the verb, and regardless of the elements that make up that pretonic part of the verbal compound: e.g. the 1SG pronominal infix *-m^l-* comes after the first lexical preverb of a given compound: e.g., from *do-beir* ‘brings, gives’, *dom-beir* ‘(s)he brings me’; but when that compound verb must be combined with (that is to say, preceded by) a pretonic conjunct particle such as the negative declarative, the infixal pronoun will be located after that pretonic element and not where it appears in the corresponding positive verbal form (i.e. *ním-thabair* ‘(s)he does not bring me’). For basically compound verbs, pronoun infixation is one of the reasons for the deuterotonic articulation, apart from the bare expression of declarative and relative clause types as observed in Section 2.4.4. Of course, this is in line with the fact that such infixal pronouns can differentiate by themselves those two clause types, as illustrated in Section 4.8.

When combined with simple verbs, affixal pronouns have two inflectional possibilities. One is suffixing, which brings about a different inflection: compare *beirthi* ‘he applies it’ in example (24) with *beirid* ‘(s)he brings’, both declarative clause type forms, the former with and the latter without pronominal affix. The other is the use of the compound strategy, as in the declarative form *nos-cara*

‘(s)he loves her’, of the simple *caraid* ‘(s)he loves’. The combinations expressed by suffixing and infixing forms can be found in Section 4.4.

Syntactically, the affixed pronoun included in the verbal complex expresses a central argument of the clause, either the object or the subject. Examples in which it expresses the direct object of the active (and deponent) verb can be found in Section 4.4.2;⁸² cases of 1st and 2nd person form as the subject of the passive verb are given in Section 4.5.1; such affixes also express the possessor in combination with the substantive verb, as observed in Section 9.3.4. Affixed pronouns attached to verbs denoting movement also express the directional object, as in (153), where *doda·ic* (sic) [to-da-ing] has *-da-* as the Class C 3PL infix. See Breatnach (1977: 90).

(153)... *nanní do uisciu doda·ic* (Ml 123d3)

na-nn ^í	do-uisci-u
any/ACC.SG.N-thing/ACC.SG.N	of-water-DAT.SG.N
do-da·ic	
PV-3PL/REL·COME/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	
‘... whatever water comes to them’ (lit. ‘whatever of water which comes to them’).	

Pragmatically, these affixal pronouns are unmarked topic expressions, according to the description of Lambrecht (1994: 172–173): “unaccented pronominals are by far the most frequently used topic expressions in natural discourse.” Lambrecht’s observation on the character of the pronominal affixes as a natural class is relevant for the Old Irish pronominal system and its strict distribution, because it clearly shows “a general correlation between the grammatical form and the pragmatic relation of an argument expression.” The relation assumed by Lambrecht between this pragmatic function and the morphosyntactic features of the unaccented (or plainly affixal) pronouns may also be applied to the Old Irish case.

For the preferred-topic expression it is functionally speaking more important to be in close association with the predicate than to appear in clause-initial position, since it is the pred-

82 This includes the use of the object affixal pronoun as reflexive, as also observed in Section 4.4.2. The combination of a transitive verb with a reflexive pronoun of that type can even be the corresponding intransitive: see e.g. *anatammresa* ‘(when) I will arise’, quoted in (85a), where the meaning ‘I arise’ comes from ‘I raise myself’.

icate that governs the semantic and syntactic relations in the clause. Unaccented pronominal topics therefore tend to occur in or near the position in which the verb itself occurs, i.e. towards the beginning of the clause in verb-initial or verb-second languages ...

(Lambrecht 1994: 201)

According to the previous observations, the uses of the Old Irish affixal pronouns, both those attached to the verbal complex and those of the conjugated preposition, offer a quite coherent picture. The Old Irish affixal pronouns attached to the verbal complex are formally very relevant in the sense that they imply either a decidedly different inflection (in declarative forms of basically simple verbs) or the obligatory deuterotonic character of the verb. In each case, this is the only possibility to express those pronominal references.

10.3.2 Cataphoric pronominal affixes in the Old Irish verbal complex

In Old Irish, a lexical object in postverbal position can be referred to cataphorically in the verbal complex by means of a 3rd person pronominal affix. In the examples of (154) and (155) below, which are taken from the collections of Breatnach (1977: 87–88) and Lucht (1994), the cataphoric pronominal affix of the verbal complex refers to an NP and a complement subordinate clause respectively.

(154)a. *foilsigthi inspirut andsom arrath dobeir do* (Wb 12a7)

foilsig-th-i	in-spirut
manifest/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.DECL-3SG.N	ART.NOM.SG.M-spirit/NOM.SG.M
and-som	a ^N -rath
in/3SG.M-NA.3SG.M	ART.ACC.SG.N-grace/ACC.SG.N
do· ^h beir	do
PV·REL/give/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	to/3SG.M

‘the Spirit manifests in him the grace which it gives him’ (lit. ‘the Spirit manifests it in him, the grace which it gives him’).

b. *air nísfail lium innabriathrasin* (Ml 44b10–11)

air	ní-s·fail	li-um
for	NEG.DECL-3PL/DECL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	with-1SG
inna-briathr-a-sin		
ART.ACC.PL-word-ACC.PL.F-DIST		

‘for there are not with me those words’.

c. *indí adidroillisset commór inclóini nísin dutairciud doib* (Ml 61b17)

(154c) and (154d) include a verbal noun (*dutairciud* and *diatichtin* respectively) that are functionally similar to complement clauses. In (155a) below, the complement clause anticipated by the Class A 3sg n. infix *-a^l-* in *rafetarsa* [r(o)-a^l-fet-ar-sa] bears relative morphology, i.e. *as^{-N}peccad*; in (155b), the same infix in *damunetarsom* [t(o)-a^l-mun-etar-som] refers to a verb with declarative morphology, i.e. *is-fo-sodin*. See Lucht (1994: 95–97) for similar cases.

(155)a. *isindectsa rafetarsa aspeccad comaccobor hore adrograd* (Wb 3c22)

is-indectsa	r-a ^l -fet-ar-sa
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-nOW	PV-3SG.N/DECL.find/PERF.ACT-1SG.ACT-NA.1SG
as ^{-N} peccad	comaccobor
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.REL-REL/sin/NOM.SG.M	desire/NOM.SG.N
hore	ad-ro-grad
because	PV·(REL?)PERF-forbid/PRET.PASS.3SG

‘it is now I know it, that concupiscence is sin because it has been forbidden’.

b. *damunetarsom is fosodin rogabad* (Ml 35b10)

d-a ^l -mun-etar-som
PV-3SG.N/DECL·think/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT-NA.3PL
is-fo-sodin
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-under-ANAPH/ACC.SG.N
ro-gab-ad
PERF·DECL/utter-PRET.PASS/3SG

‘they think it is of that that it was uttered’ (lit. ‘they think it, that it is ...’).

The cataphoric use of the affixal pronouns considered in this section is similar to the use of the 3rd person tonic pronouns in the referential non-verbal predicates considered in Section 10.2 in two respects. On the one hand, in both cases the predicate has a semantically definite lexical NP; on the other, the allosentential interplay of left-dislocating structure and normal order plays a role. The next section looks at this interplay in the case of the cataphoric use of the pronominal affixes in the verbal complex.

10.3.3 Cataphoric pronouns and left-dislocated object NPs

Section 3.3.2 above provided examples in which the left-dislocated NP counts as the subject or the object of the clause that appears thereafter. The cases with left-

dislocated object are relevant at this point, since these sentences include an object pronominal reference in the declarative verbal complex appearing after the left-dislocated NP. Take example (23a), repeated here in (156), in which the NP *na comaccobor ararograd irect* ‘any concupiscence which had been forbidden in (the) Law’ is referred to anaphorically by the Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^L-* included in *ragéni* [r(o)-a^L.géni].

(156) *na comaccobor ararograd irect ragéni peccad in mé* (Wb 3c25)

<i>na</i>	<i>comaccobor</i>	<i>ar-a^L.ro-grad</i>
any/NOM.SG.N	desire/NOM.SG.N	PV-REL·PERF·forbid/PRET.PASS.3SG
<i>i^N-rect</i>	<i>r-a^L.géni</i>	
in-law/DAT.SG.N	PERF-3SG.N/DECL·make/PRET.ACT.3SG	
<i>peccad</i>	<i>in mé</i>	
sin/NOM.SG.M	in me	

‘any concupiscence which had been forbidden in (the) Law sin has wrought it *in me*’.

The structure of (156), with anaphoric Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^L-*, represents the allosentential variant of structures such as those in the previous section, in particular of that in example (155a), which is textually and semantically very close and has the Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^L-* with cataphoric value. In cases with neuter object NP such as the one in example (156), and also in (154a), the allosentential variation involves no more than the simple change from the beginning to the end of the sentence, as in the cases with subject lexical NP considered in Section 3.3.3. This allosentential interplay suffices to explain the rise of the cataphoric use of the infixed pronoun, which changes its phoric orientation, i.e. from anaphoric to cataphoric character.

This diachronic relationship, which has been assumed in Section 10.2.5 above on referential non-verbal predicates, requires the two following observations. First, the change from left-dislocated position to the allosentential variant with V1 order has not brought the expected elimination of the pronominal object in the verbal complex, with should then be considered redundant. Second, once the structure with cataphoric object pronoun has been established, it can be assumed that it achieved some degree of independence and received some specific uses. In this, the situation is much the same as in the case of the allosentential relationships leading to the creation of some referential non-verbal predicates considered in the previous section.

The referential character of the cataphoric pronominal affixes considered in this section is clear, and this point has also been stressed for the tonic pronoun

used in referential non-verbal predicates. However, it can further be noted, following Lucht (1994: 81–82), that the cataphoric pronouns typify the clause that is introduced by the verbal complex in the sense that the latter advances an important feature of its syntactic structure. Though there are exceptions, see e.g. (154c), in which the verbal complex that includes the cataphoric affix is clearly relative, the cataphoric pronoun in Old Irish is usually a correlate of the declarative clause type character of the verb.

It is important to stress that the cataphoric use of the object pronominal references considered in this section is far from being usual in Old Irish. Nevertheless, this use is also observed in Middle Irish; see Lucht (1994: 108–115).

10.4 Desemantized pronominal affixes

10.4.1 General remarks on the desemantized use of pronominal affixes

The cases that will be described in this section are taken from the treatments of Sommer (1897: 216–222), Breatnach (1977: 89–92) and from Thurneysen's chapter 'Special uses of infix pronouns' (Thurneysen 1946: 266–269). Partly following Thurneysen's classification, I will consider four main groups. First, in the cases considered in Section 10.4.2, the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* is a sort of marker of the fact that the verb or the action involved has been mentioned previously, as if it were a 'reiterative' marker. Second, Section 10.4.3 considers the same pronominal infix associated to the use of two subordinating conjunctions, concessive *cía^l* 'though' and conditional *ma^l* 'if'. Third, Section 10.4.4 considers again the same infix 3SG n. pronoun in the form *rondgab* '(s)he / it is (in...)', which is used as the nasalizing relative clause type form in the paradigm of the substantive verb. And fourth, the use of the pronominal affixes (both infix and suffixed) considered in Section 10.4.5 is justified on the basis of the morphophonological structure of the verb.

In those four groups, which represent quite a number of the uses of the pronominal affix at stake (most often the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-*, that is to say, the infix Class that is used to mark relative clause type), the infix has lost its proper referential meaning and serves for other purposes. The basic assumption is that those desemantized uses derive in one or another way from their proper, i.e. referential use.

10.4.2 The ‘reiterative’ use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-*

On some occasions, the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* is attached to a verb that already has been expressed or that is implied in the preceding context; in these cases, no clear referential value can be detected in this pronoun, at least, the typical and widely attested value as a reference to a previously stated or implied NP. Thurneysen (1946: 266–267) acutely observes that this infixed pronoun is then used “like the article with the noun, to indicate that the action or state expressed by the verb has already been mentioned and more specifically defined.” This meaning or function is translated by ‘so’ or ‘thus’ in the instances of (157), which are taken from Thurneysen.

(157)a. *dosnicfa cobir cidmall bithmaith immurgu intain dondiccfa* (Wb 5c5)

do-s ^N .ic-f-a		cobir
PV-3PL/DECL.come-FUT-3SG.ACT		help/NOM.SG.F
ci-d-mall		bi-th-maith
though-COP.PRES.SUBJ.3SG-slow/NOM.SG.N		COP.FUT-3SG.DECL-good/NOM.SG.N
immurgu	intain	do- ^N -d ^l -icc-f-a
however	when	PV-REL-3SG.N/REL.come-FUT-3SG.ACT

‘help will come to them, though it will be slow: it will be, however, good when it will so come’.

b. *bid sochaide atrefea indiutsiu 7 bid failid nachóin adidtrefea* (Ml 107a15)

bi-d-sochaide		a(d). ^(U) tre(b)-f-ea
COP.FUT-3SG.DECL-multitude/NOM.SG.F		PV-(REL)dwel-FUT-3SG.ACT
ind-iut-siu	7	bi-d-failid
in-2SG-NA.2SG	and	COP.FUT-3SG.DECL-joyful/NOM.SG.M
nach-óin		ad-id ^l .tre(b)-f-ea
every-one		PV-3SG.N/REL.dwell-FUT-3SG.ACT

‘many will dwell in you, and joyful will be every one that shall so dwell’.

c. *as beir som iustos doib cia ingabtar airis menic dondecmaing* (Ml 54a7)

as-beir-som		<i>iustos</i>
PV-DECL/say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT-NA.3SG.M		<i>iustos</i>
do-ib	cia ^l	in-gab-tar
to-3PL	though	PV-DECL/reprove/PRES.SUBJ-3PL.PASS
air-is-menic		
for-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-often		

do-^N-d^L-e-cm-aing

PV-REL-3SG.N/REL·PV-PV-happen/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

‘he calls them *iustos* though they are reprov’d, for it often happens thus’.

d. *fadidmed aicned acht dondecmaing anisiu* (Sg 137b5)

f-a^L-didm-ed

aicned

acht

PV-3SG.N/DECL·suffer/FUT-3SG.IMP.F.ACT

nature/NOM.SG.N

save

do-^N-d^L-e-cm-aing

anisiu

PV-REL-3SG.N/REL·PV-PV-happen/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT

PROX

‘nature would have suffered it, save this so happens’.

e. *ciasidfiadat som dundicfet infochaidi...* (Ml 19b11)

ci^L as-id^L-fiad-at-som

though PV-3SG.N/REL·tell/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT-NA.3PL

du-^N-d^L-ic-f-et

in-fochaid-i

PV-REL-3SG.N/REL·come-FUT-3PL.ACT

ART.NOM.PL.F-tribulation-NOM.PL.F

‘though they say that the afflictions will come so...’.⁸³

In (157a), the infixed 3PL pronoun of *dosnicfa* [to-s^N-ingf-a] expresses the goal of the verb of movement *do-icc* ‘comes’ in a so-to-speak regular manner (see Section 10.3.1 for this use), but the second form of the same verb, the nasalizing relative form *dondicfa* [to^N-d^L-ingf-a], has the Class C 3SG n. infix -d^L-, instead of the expected nasalizing relative form **doniccfa* without infix.

In line with Thurneysen’s observation, the Class C 3SG n. pronoun of that case and of the others in (157) must be viewed as a sort of anaphoric reference to a previously stated clause. In (157b), the infix -d^L- of the final form *adidtrefea* [ad-id^L-treb^f-a] refers to the preceding clause in which the future *atrefea*, also from *ad-treba* ‘dwells’, appears. In (157c), the final form *dondecmaing* [to-^N-d^L-e(ss)-c(o)m-ing], 3SG present indicative of *do-ecmaing* ‘happens’, resumes at once the preceding sentence including a main declarative (*as-beir*) and a concessive clause (*cia ingabtar*), and in (157d) the same form refers to what the Latin text to which the Sg gloss is attached says, i.e. the case in which a given verb is defective by chance. Finally, in (157e) the pronominal infix refers to an action mentioned in the Latin text.

If such verbal complexes including the infix -d^L- with an ‘adverbial’ anaphoric value had been frequent in Old Irish, one would have said that they represent something like a ‘reiterative’ clause type, a sort of clause type that repeats a

⁸³ The same situation is to be found in Ml 68a1.

clause appearing previously in the context. Such a function would be parallel to the responsive clause type, in the sense that both refer to a preceding verb, the difference being that the responsive is typically referred (and opposed) to the verb uttered by another speaker. The remainder of this section is devoted to the diachronic elucidation of this ‘reiterative’ use.

As stated above, the origin of this secondary use of the pronominal affix *-d^l-* is to be sought in the use in which the pronoun refers to a previously mentioned NP, as in the cases of (158).

(158)a. *ní dilgaid anancride dogníther frib act atgairith* (Wb 9c22)

<i>ní·di·lg·aid</i>		<i>a^N·ancride</i>
NEG.DECL·PV·forgive/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT		ART.ACC.SG.N·injury/ACC.SG.N
<i>do·^lgní·ther</i>	<i>fri·b</i>	<i>act</i>
PV·REL/make/PRES.IND-3SG.PASS	towards-2PL	but
<i>a·t^l·gair·ith</i>		
PV-3SG.N/DECL·complain/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT		

‘you forgive not the injury that is done to you, but you complain about it’.

b. *is mou dundrigensat inda as conidrairlecissiu* (Ml 87a8)⁸⁴

<i>is·mou</i>
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL·big/COMP
<i>du·^Nd^l·ri·gen·s·at</i>
PV·REL-3SG.N/REL·PERF·make-RET.ACT-3PL.ACT
<i>in·^Nta·as</i>
than-REL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT.REL
<i>con·id^l·r·air·lec·is·siu</i>
PV-3SG.N/REL·PERF·PV·leave-RET.ACT.2SG·NA.2SG

‘They have done it more than you have permitted it’ (lit. ‘It is more what they have done it than what you have permitted it’).

In (158a), the Class B pronoun of *atgairith* anaphorically refers to the preceding lexical NP *anancride* ‘the injury’. In (158b), the Class C pronoun of *conidrairlecissiu* [com-id^l-r(o)-ar(e)-lecis^l-siu], with the 2SG perfect of *con-airléci*, refers to the pronominal expression included in the preceding form *dundrigensat*, and seems to be somewhat redundant. It is in cases of this type, which are not rare, that Breatnach (1977: 90) says that “[t]he frequent occurrence of these uses would

⁸⁴ Similar cases with repetition of the clitic pronoun can also be found in e.g. Wb 15b14, Ml 42b18, Ml 45a3, Ml 50a10, Ml 124b3, i.e. example (9d).

seem to suggest that in Old Irish, as in many other languages, there was much less freedom as regards ‘object-deletion’ in transitive verbs than there is, for example, in English.”

A further step in the process leading to the ‘reiterative’ use of *-d^l-* may well be that the semantic link of the anaphoric object pronoun with its antecedent is sometimes distorted, and the infix form that is used is the 3SG n., as in (159).

(159)a. *dogéna sáibfirtu et sáibairde amal dondrigénsat druid triitsom* (Wb 26a20)

do·gén-a	sáib-firt-u	et
PV·DECL/make/FUT-3SG.ACT	false-miracle-ACC.PL.M	and
sáib-airde	amal do ^N -d ^l -ri-gén-s-at	
false-sign/ACC.PL.N	as PV-REL-3SG.N/REL·PERF-make-PRET.ACT-3PL.ACT	
druid	tri-it-som	
wizard-NOM.PL.M	through-3SG.M-NA.3SG.M	

‘he (Antichrist) will perform false miracles and false signs, as wizards have done it through him’.

b. ... *arangé dilgud 7 arandena aithrigi amal dundrigni ezechias* (Ml 51a16)⁸⁵

ara ^N .gé	dilgud	7
so that·pray/PRES.SUBJ.3SG.ACT	forgiveness/ACC.SG.M	and
ara ^N .de-n-a	aithrigi	
so that·PV-make/PRES.SUBJ-3SG.ACT	repentance/ACC.SG.F	
amal du ^N -d ^l -ri-gni	ezechias	
as PV-REL-3SG.N/REL·PERF-make/PRET.ACT.3SG	Hezekiah	

‘... that he pray for forgiveness and make repentance, even as Hezekiah did’.

c. *airintain asbir dies is derb alín lathe diandapir* (Sg 66b10)⁸⁶

air	intain	as·bir	dies
for	when	PV·DECL?/say/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT	dies
is-derb		a ^N -lín	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-clear/NOM.SG.N	ART.NOM.SG.N-number/NOM.SG.N		
lathe	di-a ^N -d ^l -a-pir		
day/GEN.PL.N	of-OBL.REL-3SG.N/REL·PV-say/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT		

⁸⁵ Similarly, example (54b), Ml 68b4, Ml 103b13, Sg 9a21.

⁸⁶ Similar cases with *as-beir* ‘says’ in e.g. Ml 56b3, Ml 62c2, Sg 208b5; with another verb in Sg 214a5; in Ml 94b3, two verbs are repeated with the corresponding pronoun.

‘for when you say *dies* the number of days of which you so speak is certain’ (lit. ‘of which you say it (i.e. the word *dies*)’).

In (159a), partially quoted in (46a), the 3SG n. infix of the perfect *dondrigénsat* can be interpreted as referring to the whole action of performing those false things, and not to that plural object, and this reading may also be applied to (159b), which also has a form of *do·gní*. In the example of (159c), the contrast between the translation of *diandapir* [di-(s)a^N-d^L-e(ss)-bir^J] in the *Thes.* (‘of which you so speak’) and the one that can be deemed as more literal (‘of which you say it’) gives us a good clue about the way in which the syntactic structure consisting of two forms of the same verb *as·beir* ‘says’, the second of which bringing an anaphoric 3SG n. infix, is extended to similar diptych structures containing, nevertheless, an intransitive (that is, a typically objectless) verb.

Finally, for a large group of cases, it seems that the pronoun, though not deprived of referential meaning, could also be left unexpressed, as is usually observed in the translation of the *Thes.* Consider the examples in (160).

(160)a. *amal asinbeir sunt issamlid is immaircide ...* (Ml 27d22)

amal	as-i ^N -(d ^L)-beir	sunt
as	PV-REL(-3SG.N/REL)-say/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	here
is-samlid	is-immaircide	
COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-thus	COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-suitable/NOM.SG.N	

‘as he says it here, it is thus it is suitable ...’.

b. *ruuc cách arainn dísin· amal dundgniat geinti dinaib brataib bertae hodie* (Ml 63c18)⁸⁷

r-uuc	cách	a-rainn
PERF-(DECL/)bring/PRET.ACT.3SG	each/NOM.SG.M	POSS.3SG.M-part/ACC.SG.F
dísin	amal	du- ^N -d ^L -gni-at
of/3SG.N-DIST	as	PV-REL-3SG.N/REL-make/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT
geint-i	di-naib-brat-aib	
Gentile-NOM.PL.M	of-ART.DAT.PL-spoil-DAT.PL.F	
ber-tae	hodie	
bring/PRES.IND-3PL.ACT.REL	today	

‘each took his share of it, as do it the nations of the spoils that they carry off today’.

⁸⁷ Similarly in Ml 32d2, Ml 39a3, Ml 53b27, Ml 89d6, Ml 105b9.

The previous selection of cases can be understood as a diachronic sequence such as (158) → (159) → (160) that ended with the creation of this ‘reiterative’ affixal pronoun observable in the cases of (157). First, the infix neuter pronoun appears in a clause that is connected to another clause, though not necessarily in a strict hypotactic relation. Second, the semantic link between infix pronoun and antecedent is blurred. Finally, the pronoun is felt rather as a marker of the relationship of the verb to the precedent context, and – in this syntactic sense – it may be used even with verbs that constitutively are less prone to take an infix object pronoun, i.e. with intransitive verbs. The basic assumption is that they have been reinterpreted or reanalyzed as the concomitant marker of the specific syntactic context in which the verb repeats a verb or even a whole clause already uttered in the preceding context. In more specific terms, the idea is that the pronominal reference included in the second clause of the equivalent of the English expression *They do it as I have done it* has been introduced in cases equivalent to *I will go tomorrow, as they went (it) yesterday*.⁸⁸

10.4.3 The use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* after the conjunctions *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cía^l* ‘though’

Section 5.5.1 above presented the use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* in the verbal complex preceded by the conjunctions *ma^l* ‘if’ and *cía^l* ‘though’ if this verbal complex has no other affix and if it is in indicative mood. The examples offered in this section have been taken from the treatment of Thurneysen (1946: 268–269), and the collections of Sommer (1897: 218–219) and Strachan (1900).

88 The same use of the Class A 3SG n. infix *-a^l-* can be detected with verbs of movement, as in Ml 38b2 *noch dachotar coirp immurgu* ‘however, bodies nevertheless went thus’, in which the pronominal form *-a^l-* of [d(e)-a^l-] indicates that the verb of motion of the Latin text (namely, *discendit*) is somehow referred to. With the verb *do-meil* ‘eats, consumes’, the imperative *nach thoimled* ‘let him not so partake’ in example (110a) must also be interpreted in this manner; see Section 2.6 for the form of this pronoun. Finally, Ml 33b15 *cenithaisid ar ois daregaid ar ecin* ‘unless you (pl.) come thus willingly, you shall come thus perforce’ represents a curious case in which the Class A 3SG n. *-a^l-* infix appears in both forms of *do-tét* ‘comes’ of the conditional sentence. Note that the form of the infix in the verbal complex after the conjunction *cía^l* ‘though, if’ is the Class A form, and not the Class C observed in the next section. The use of the Class A 3SG n. *-a^l-* infix in the cases quoted in this footnote, which is rare, is perhaps a derivation from the use established for the Class C 3SG n. *-d^l-* infix, which is more frequent in the language of the glosses.

As for the diachronic origin of this use of the infix *-d^l-*, which is observed in the language of the glosses, one could assume that it is due to a process of desemantization analogous to the one seen in the previous section. In fact, in some cases given in (161) below, the infix *-d^l-* may be interpreted as having reference, as perhaps *ciadodrigénsid* [cia^l-de-d^l-ro-géns-id^l], of *do-gní*, in (161a). Furthermore, the infix in forms such as *ciasidbiursa* [ci^l-ess-id^l-biur-sa], of *as-beir*, in (161b) and *manidchomalnid* [ma^l-ni-d^l-comaln-id^l], of *comalnaithir*, in (161c) could have cataphoric value in the way of the examples in Section 10.3.2 above, though this is by no means obligatory. In many other examples such as (161d,e,f), the infix *-d^l-* has no meaning at all. In example (161d), which has a feminine object (*dígail*), the *-d^l-* cannot be interpreted as cataphoric, in the same manner as in (161e). Example (161f), which repeats example (125a), shows a form of the substantive verb in which the infix is not expected given that there is a lexical object.

(161)a. *ciadodrigénsid cosse* (Wb 20d3)

cia ^l	do-d ^l -ri-gén-s-id	co-sse
though	PV-3SG.N/REL-PERF-make-PRET.ACT-2PL.ACT	to-PROX.ACC.SG.N
'though you have done it hitherto'.		

b. *ciasidbiursa non imputabatur* (Wb 3a2)

ci ^l	as-id ^l -biur-sa	<i>non imputabatur</i>
though	PV-3SG.N/REL-say/PRES.IND.1SG.ACT-NA.1SG	<i>non imputabatur</i>
'though I say, ' <i>non imputabatur</i> ' (or perhaps 'though I say it, ' <i>non imputabatur</i> ').		

c. *act manidchomalnid arproidchad dúib* (Wb 18b7)

act	ma ^l -ni-d ^l -comaln-id	
but	if-NEG.DECL-3SG.N/REL·fulfil/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT	
a ^N -ro. ^(L)	pridch-ad	dú-ib
LHEAD/ACC.SG.N-PERF. ^(REL)	preach-PRET.PASS.3SG	to-2PL
'unless you are fulfilling what has been preached unto you' (or 'unless you are fulfilling it, what ...').		

d. *manidtabair digail ...* (Ml 91a17)

ma ^l -ni-d ^l -ta-bair	digail
if-NEG.DECL-3SG.N/REL·PV-bring/PRES.IND.2SG.ACT	punishment/ACC.SG.F
'if you do not inflict punishment ...'.	

e. *madudrignius ní donaib remeperthib* (Ml 23c27)

ma^l $du-d^l\cdot ri-gni-us$ $ní$
 if PV-3SG.N/REL·PERF-make-PRET.ACT.1SG something/ACC.SG.N
 $do-naib-remeperth-ib$
 of-ART.DAT.PL-aforementioned-DAT.PL.N
 ‘if I have done anything of the aforementioned things’.

f. *manud fel inspirut nóib indiumsá ...* (Wb 11c1)

$ma^l-nu-d^l\cdot fel$ in-spirit
 if-PART-3SG.N/REL·SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT ART.ACC.SG.M-spirit/ACC.SG.M
 $nóib$ $ind-ium-sá$
 holy/ACC.SG.M in-1SG-NA.1SG
 ‘if the Holy Spirit is in me, ...’.

Nevertheless, the use of the infix $-d^l-$ after the conjunctions ma^l ‘if’ and $cía^l$ ‘though’, which I term ‘conditional’ $-d^l-$, differs from the ‘reiterative’ $-d^l-$ in the previous section in some important respects. (a) Within its limitations, ‘conditional’ $-d^l-$ is regular, whereas ‘reiterative’ $-d^l-$ is not. (b) While ‘reiterative’ $-d^l-$ appears in the second of two consecutive verbal complexes, this being precisely its basic justification, ‘conditional’ $-d^l-$ appears more usually in the first clause of typical conditional or concessive sentences; see example in (157e) in the previous section, in which both this and the ‘reiterative’ $-d^l-$ appear in the same gloss. (c) ‘Conditional’ $-d^l-$ is combined with the indicative and not with other verbal moods. The ‘conditional’ use of the infix $-d^l-$ is definitively something different from the ‘reiterative’ use, in the sense that it does not seem to be based on the syntagmatic link to another verbal complex appearing in the same period or sentence; on the contrary, its association with the indicative mood seems to play a relevant role, since such a link between relative morphology and indicative mood in subordinate clauses is not unparalleled in Old Irish. Recall the situation observed in Section 5.6.2 in which the copula after the subordinating conjunction *amal* ‘as’ appears with relative or declarative morphology depending on the indicative or subjunctive mood of the verb respectively.

The use of the infixed pronoun $-d^l-$ in the verbal complex with indicative mood after ma^l and $cía^l$ must be sought in the paradigmatic association of those forms with the corresponding forms of the copular paradigm, namely, with the ‘conjunct’ forms considered in Section 9.4.7 above, in particular, with the negative 3SG present indicative forms that have precisely this $-d$, as in e.g. *ma-nid-fir* ‘unless it is true’ in example (141a). The positive version of these ‘conjunct’ present indicative copula forms with the conjunctions $cía^l$ and ma^l has ‘synthetic’ 3SG and 3PL forms, i.e. 3SG *cesu / ciasu* ‘though it / (s)he is’, *masu* ‘if it / (s)he is’

and 3PL *cetu* ‘though they are’, *matu* ‘if they are’. As also observed in Section 9.4.7, the *-d-* is also in the positive copular forms that imply the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-*, and functionally similar conjunct particles such as *co^N-* ‘so that’ or *i^N-* ‘in which’, as in e.g. *conid-ainm ...* ‘so that it is a name ...’. The copula forms *conid-* and similars have been derived in Section 9.5.4 from the forms of the remaining verbs.

Specifically, I assume that the *-d* of copula forms such as *conid-* ‘so that it / (s)he is ...’ has spread first over copula forms with the conjunctions *ma^L* and *cía^L*. The first step in this analogical extension involves the creation of the negative 3SG present indicative forms of the copula *manid-*, *cenid-* (instead of expected **mani-* ‘unless it / (s)he is...’ and **ceni-* ‘though it / (s)he is not...’), and due to the common feature of subordinate forms of the copular paradigm. Recall that, as also noted in Section 9.4.7, the positive paradigms of the present indicative of the copula with the conjunctions *ma^L* and *cía^L* and with conjunct particles such as *co^N-* ‘so that’ and *i^N-* ‘in which’ are both formed with the element *-ta/-da-*. The innovative step leading to ‘conditional’ *-d^L-* starts from those negative copula forms *manid-*, *cenid-*, which analogically extend their *-d^L-* to the conjunct particle strings *mani-* and *ceni-* when followed by an indicative form of any other verb: this arrives at a verbal complex such as *manidtabair* ‘if you do not inflict’ (from *do-beir*) in (161d) above.

Thereafter, this *-d^L-* spread to positive forms in indicative mood after the same conjunctions *cía^L* and *ma^L*, which initially had the scheme [*cía^L*, *ma^L* + declarative verbal complex], i.e. to structures similar to (161e) above, in which the infix *-d^L-* is inserted onto the positive indicative form *do-rigniús* ‘I have done’. This analogical extension is summarized in Table 10.4, which displays a schema similar to those already used in Section 9.5.4 for the copula.

Tab. 10.4: Extension of infix *-d^L-* from the 3SG present indicative of the copula to other verbs in indicative mood

	3SG copula indicative forms with <i>co^N-</i> ‘so that’ <i>ma^L</i> ‘if’, <i>cía^L</i> ‘though’		Indicative forms in verbs other than the copula with <i>ma^L</i> ‘if’, <i>cía^L</i> ‘though’
Positive	<i>conid^L-</i>	<i>masu-</i> <i>cesu-</i>	<i>manud^L-</i> / <i>ma^L</i> Lexical preverb <i>-d^L-</i> <i>cenud^L-</i> / <i>ce^L</i> Lexical preverb <i>-d^L-</i>
Negative		↘ <i>manid^L-</i> <i>cenid^L-</i>	→ <i>manid^L-</i> <i>cenid^L-</i> ↗

This derivation of the ‘conditional’ *-d^L-* from the copula paradigm allows for a straightforward account of its relationship to the indicative mood, because the copular forms that have such a *-d^L-* belong precisely to the present indicative. The

extension within the forms of the copula may be explained as a way of acquiring a more visible verbal form, since the present indicative is precisely the form of the paradigm in which there are no ‘overt’ forms; however, the above justification based on the complementary distribution of syntactic dependency (relative marker) and subjunctive mood is already a good explanation for copula forms such as *manid-* and for the use of *-d^l-* in verbs other than the copula.

The analogical extension from the paradigm of the copula to other verbs may have occurred through particular cases similar to the two syntactic structures included in (162), which constitute a quasi allosentential pair. In (162a), the form *manid* is the introducing copula of a cleft-sentence in which the post-focus verb is *rocretis* (of *creitid*), whereas in (162b) the form *manid* is the pretonic sequence of a verbal complex formed with the same simple verb, i.e. *ma^l-ni-d^l-cret-id*.

(162)a. *manid coséitchi rocretis natuic séitchi iarcretim* (Wb 10a30)

ma^l-nid-co-séitch-i

if-COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-with-wife-DAT.SG.F

ro·cret-is

na·t-uic

PERF·DECL/believe-PRET.ACT.2SG NEG·IMPV·PV-bring/2SG.ACT·IMPV

séitch-i

iar-cretim

wife-ACC.SG.F

after-believing/DAT.SG.F

‘if you have not believed with a wife, take not a wife after believing’ (lit. ‘if it is not with a wife that you have believed, ...’).

b. ... *manidchretid esséirge crist* ... (Wb 13b19)

ma^l-ni-d^l-cret-id

if-NEG.DECL-3SG.N/REL·believe/PRES.IND-2PL.ACT

esséirge

crist

resurrection/ACC.SG.N Christ

‘... unless you believe the resurrection of Christ ...’.

The specific assumption is that the *-d^l-* of an indicative form such as *manidchretid* in (162b), instead of the initially expected **manicretid*, is due to the allosentential relationship to structures such as *manid coséitchi rocretis* in (162a), in which *manid* is a form of the copula. In other words, the *-d^l-* of the copula in indicative mood used in the cleft-sentence *manid* ... *rocretis*, by virtue of the allosentential relationship to the V1 order, was also used in the verbal complex introduced by the pretonic sequence *ma-ni-* considered in Section 5.4.4.

The outcome of the extension of the *-d^l-* from structures such as (162a) to others such as (162b) is that a form of the (pretonic) copula becomes similar to a form

of the (pretonic) conjunct particle (or, more accurately, a chain of conjunct particles), in line with the general tendency for Old Irish assumed in Section 9.4.8 above. The analogical extension of a given feature from negative to positive has been observed in Section 9.3.3, in which the use of the stem (*·fil(-)*) in the positive form *manudfel* ‘if [the Holy Spirit] is ...’ has been attributed to the presence of this stem in the negative form *cininfil* ‘though we are not ...’. With respect to those cases, the difference is that the *-d^l-*, by virtue of its character of marker of syntactic dependency, is further used with other non-copular verbs in indicative mood after *ma^l* and *cia^l*, since subjunctive verbs in the same syntactic context already have a sign of dependency.⁸⁹

Section 5.7.3 above on the variation between (nasalizing) relative and declarative morphology after the conjunction *amal* ‘as’ concluded that the relative marking was original after that conjunction, and that declarative morphology was introduced for subjunctive verbs. The previous explanation for the ‘conditional’ use of the infix *-d^l-* leads to the conclusion that, initially, the conjunctions *cia^l* ‘though’ and *ma^l* ‘if’ were followed by declarative verbal complexes and that the introduction of the Class C 3sg n. infix *-d^l-* in indicative forms is secondary.

89 As an assumption related to his proposal for the copula forms *masu* and *cesu* considered above in Section 9.4.7, Ahlqvist (2003: 14–15) assumes that the infix *-d^l-* under discussion in this section represents the use of the original particle **de*, which meant ‘previously expressed or conceived’ (according to a proposal by Schrijver 1997: 140). This particle was reinterpreted as a sort of affirmative element with the approximate meaning ‘as a matter of fact’, which is the meaning assumed by Ahlqvist for this infix combined with indicative mood. However, and apart from the fact that the semantic reconstruction and development assumed by Ahlqvist is quite dubious (the cognate Greek particle *de* is a connective with the basic meaning ‘and’, and this suffices to explain the subordinating function clearly observed in Old Irish), Ahlqvist’s synchronic interpretation of this use of the infix *-d^l-* contradicts the well-attested use of the Old Irish reflex of that particle **-de-* as subordinating marker, namely, in the negative relative conjunct particle *nad-*, and in the Class C infixes. By contrast, the diachronic proposal defended in this section is based on facts that are clearly observed in Old Irish. First, it works with the assured function of *-d^l-* in Old Irish, which is basically a marker of relative clause type (i.e. a marker of syntactic subordination). Second, the use of relative or declarative morphology after a subordinating conjunction depending on the indicative or subjunctive mood of the verb respectively has a good parallel in the variation of the copula form after *amal* ‘as’, as observed in Section 5.6.2.

10.4.4 The form *rondgab* ‘that (s)he / it is (in...)’ in the paradigm of the substantive verb

The perfect *ro·gab*, of the verb *gaibid* ‘takes’, furnished with the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^L-* and relative nasalization, expresses the present indicative of the substantive verb in nasalized relative forms, and provides an alternative to expressions such as *ma nudubfeil* ‘if you are (in the union)’ in example (125) above. Example (163a) includes the two forms standing in a suppletive relationship, namely *rongab* for the nasalizing relative and *atá* for the declarative clause types. The infix *-d^L-* is not properly expressed in (the 7 cases of) Wb, where apparently only relative nasalization is marked; see examples (163a,c). Nevertheless, it seems better to consider those Wb cases with Strachan (1898/99: 59), Kavanagh (2001: 484) and, apparently, Sommer (1897: 220) in the same way as the forms of the remaining collections of Glosses, in which the infix *-d^L-* is used, as in (163b,d), though not regularly. It is noteworthy that those nasalizing relative forms also appear in non-3SG persons, e.g. 1SG in (163c) and 3PL in (163d).

(163)a. *amal rongab comadnacul duún atá comeisseírge* (Wb 27a15)

amal	ro- ^N (-d ^L)-gab	com-adnacul
as	PERF-REL(-3SG.N/REL)·take/PRET.ACT.3SG	co-sepulture/NOM.SG.N
du-úin	a(d)·tá	com-eisseírge
to-1PL	PV·DECL/SUBSTV/PRES.IND.3SG.ACT	co-resurrection/NOM.SG.N

‘as there is co-sepulture to us, (so) there is co-resurrection’.

b. *arnaroib amal rondgab inpopul truagsa* (Ml 118c5)

ar-na·roi-b	amal
so that-NEG.REL·PERF-SUBSTV/PRES.SUBJ.3SG	as
ro- ^N -d ^L -gab	in-popul
PERF-REL-3SG.N/REL·take/PRET.ACT.3SG	ART.NOM.SG.M-people/NOM.SG.M

truag-sa
bad/NOM.SG.M-PROX
‘that he may not be as this wretched people’.

c. ... *ceín rongabus icarcair* (Wb 23b18)

ceín	ro- ^N (-d ^L)-gab-us	i ^N -carcair
so long as	PERF-REL-(3SG.N/REL)·take-PRET.ACT.1SG	in-prison/DAT.SG.F

‘... so long as I am in prison’.

d. *is follus rundgabsat terchoiltisiu indiumsa* (Ml 74d7)

is-follus

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.DECL-clear/NOM.SG.N

ru-^N-d^L-gab-s-at

PERF-REL-3SG.N/REL·take-PRET.ACT-3PL.ACT

t-erchoilt-i-siu

ind-ium-sa

POSS.2SG-decision-NOM.PL.M-NA.2SG

in-1SG-NA.1SG

‘it is clear that your determinations are in me’.

Thurneysen adds further sporadic cases of the same paradigm such as the preterite *rondboi* (only in Ml 21d4 = (132a), Ml 136b7), as well as others of the preterite of the copula (Ml 102d4 *lasinrubu*, i.e. *lasin(d)rubu* [la-s(a)^N-d^L-ru-bu-] ‘for which it was ...’), and the case *dondecmaing* quoted in (157c) above. Two issues must be considered in the diachronic consideration of *rondgab* as a form of the present indicative of the substantive verb in nasalizing relative clauses, namely, the paradigmatic dimension and the semantic change that brought about that outcome.

First, the introduction of *rond·gab* ‘that is (in...)’ in the paradigm of the substantive verb as a nasalizing relative form is surely motivated by the fact that the stem (·)tá(-) has adopted other functions in that syntactic context: on the one hand, the meaning ‘to be vexed, angry’ (e.g. *dáthar* in Section 9.3.5); on the other, it has acquired the function of the copula and has thereby been introduced in that paradigm, as proposed in Section 9.5.3. See Mac Coisdealbha ([1976] 1998: 154–155), Veselinović (2003: 96).

Second, it is usually assumed that the initial meaning of the perfect *rond·gab* was ‘that (s)he has taken it’. In this sense, Veselinović (2003: 96) proposes a semantic development such as ‘hat es genommen’ [‘(s)he has taken it’] → ‘hat es’ [‘(s)he has it’] → ‘ist’ [‘(s)he is’]. However, Strachan’s (1898/99: 59–60) alternative proposal based on the intransitive use of *gaibid* as ‘to set up at a place’, also held more recently by Lash (2011: 51–52), who adduces typological parallels of this semantic change, is to be considered seriously. In this account, the expression of other persons such as the 1SG in (163c) and the 3PL in (163d) above by means of the inflectional endings in slot 5 is directly explained. The Class C infix pronoun would be then secondary in some manner, the uses of -d^L- considered in the two previous sections being a good basis for the extension of this marker to this subordinate form. On the one hand, the ‘reiterative’ uses observed in Section 10.4.2 appear in much the same syntactic environment in which *rondgab* of (163b) appears, i.e. after a subordinating conjunction such as *amal*; recall the case of *dondecmaing* (157c) just quoted. On the other, in Section 10.4.3 the -d^L- included in the copula has been assumed to spread to other verbs as a marker of dependency.

10.4.5 Phonotactically advantageous pronominal affixes

The use of pronominal affixes for what can be dubbed cosmetic purposes is far from being a trivial issue. Section 4.4.3 on the paradigmatic shape of the active (or deponent) declarative forms of simple verbs including a pronominal affix has considered the advantage of separating the two pronominal references that can be expressed in the Old Irish verbal complex, one of the object in slot 2 and the other of the subject in slot 5, as a favorable factor for the avoidance of some combinations of subject in slot 5 and object pronominal reference in slot 6 of the verbal complex. In Section 4.8.3, the Class C 3SG n. infix *-(i)d^l-* of *nachidchualatar*, quoted in example (57), is used instead of the expected Class A form (i.e. instead of **nachchualatar*) as a means of expressing more clearly that pronominal reference.

This idea that there may be a certain tendency for a better distinction of elements included in the verbal complex is also the starting point of the cases considered in this section. The first is the use of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* as a means of avoiding hiatus in the deuterotonic boundary of lexical compounds functioning as relative clause type forms, a use that can be termed ‘euphonic’ *-d^l-*. The second is the use of the pronominal suffix *-(i)t* to get a formally clearer (absolute) declarative ending, a case already mentioned in Chapter 4.

On the one hand, ‘euphonic’ *-d^l-* is found with some consistency to express the leniting relative form without object pronominal reference of the verbs *do-esta* ‘is lacking’ and *fo-fera* ‘causes’, two verbs in which the expected leniting relative form would have a hiatus in the deuterotonic boundary, i.e. **do-esta* ‘what is lacking’ and *fo-era* ‘which causes’; this deuterotonic hiatus is dealt with in Section 2.4.2. The form *do-d^l-esta* ‘which is wanting’ is used three times in Wb (Wb 1a9, Wb 23d17, Wb 26d8) instead of regular *do-esta* or even prototonic *testa*, two forms actually attested, though as declarative clause type verbs, in Ml 35d20 and Ml 65d6 respectively. More forms of this verb may be found in García-Castillero (2015a: 92, 94). An example of ‘euphonic’ *-d^l-* with *fo-fera* is (164), in which *fodera* [fo-d^l-fer-a] is used instead of regular *fo-era*; this form *fo-era* shows the regular, but not frequent lenition of the sound /f/ in that position of the verbal complex, as noted in Section 2.5.2. The same use of *fodera* is found in Ml 55d11 and Sg 120a4; see Sommer (1897: 220–221) for more examples.

(164) *ined fodera báas domsa atimne sainemail sin* (Wb 3c33)

in-ed

fo-d^l-(f)er-a

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.POLINT-3SG.N

PV-3SG.N/REL-cause/PRES.IND-3SG.ACT

báas	do-m-sa	a-timne
death/ACC.SG.N	to-1SG-NA.1SG	ART.NOM.SG.N-command/NOM.SG.N
sainemail-sin		
excellent/NOM.SG.N-DIST		

‘is what causes death to me that excellent commandment?’ (lit. ‘is it what causes death to me, that excellent commandment?’).

The same use of the pronominal form *-d^l-* is found occasionally in other verbs, as noted by Strachan (1903: 65): Ml 27d23 *duduccai* ‘that he brought’, Ml 67a3 *dud uic* ‘which he has cited’, both instead of the frequent *tu(i)c / du-u(i)c*; for this verb, see also García-Castillero (2015a: 91–101). This insertion of *-d^l-* as ‘relative marker’ becomes more usual in Middle Irish, as noted by McCone (1979: 175). Note that, while the infix *-(i)d^l-* of the just mentioned *nachidchualatar* ‘who do not heard it’ stands for the corresponding Class A *-(a)^l-* form and therefore has pronominal meaning, the infix *-d^l-* in verbs like *do-esta* ‘is lacking’ and *fo-fera* ‘causes’ only expresses relative clause type. This use has a propitious context in the cataphoric construction considered in Section 10.3 above, so that a sentence such as *ined fodera báas domsa ...* ‘is it what causes death to me, ...?’ in (164) could previously have meant ‘is it what causes it, death, to me, ...?’.

On the other hand, the 3SG m./n. suffixed pronominal form *-(i)t* considered in Section 4.4 is initially the outcome of adding the 3PL verbal ending *-t* onto the suffix form *-i*. For instance, Wb 13a16 *bertit* ‘they take it’ is based on a previous, not attested form **berti* ‘they take it’. Compare this to the form *beirthi* ‘he applies it’ in example (24). As Breatnach (1977: 104) convincingly argues, the new form is a way of distinguishing the 3PL from the similar 3SG, especially in verbs with stem ending in dental plosive or nasal, in which the 3PL and 3SG form with a suffixed pronoun become homophonous: e.g., in contrast to the pair *canid* ‘(s)he sings’, *canit* ‘they sing’, the form *cainti* would be both ‘(s)he sings it’ and ‘they sing it’. This loss of formal distinctivity of the suffixed forms was also considered in Section 4.4.3.

The process by which the final *-(i)t* appears in the 3PL verb with a 3SG m./n. suffixed pronoun, must have started from a situation analogous to the one assumed in Table 4.12 in Section 4.9.1, in which the contrast between declarative and relative clause type is crosscut with the feature [\pm pronominal affix]. This situation for the 3PL active forms of *beirid* is presented in Table 10.5 below, which is an excerpt of the paradigm of clause types proposed in Chapter 8, e.g. of Table 8.3 representing the active forms of a simple verb.

In Table 10.5, the declarative verb combined with a suffixed pronoun (**berti*) takes the *-t* of *berit*, so that it can be said that the *-t* ending of the 3PL is once again

added: **berti* → *bertit* (see Pedersen 1913: 149). The new form is thus more similar to the declarative *berit* and more different from the relative *berte*, though all three forms are still absolute. The same structure as in Table 10.5 has been assumed in García-Castillero (forthc.) for the diachronic explanation of the Class B of infixed pronouns.

Tab. 10.5: Positive 3PL present indicative active forms of *beirid* ‘brings’

	Declarative clause type form	Relative clause type form
– Pronominal affix	<i>berit</i> ‘they bring’	<i>berte</i> ‘who bring’ / ‘whom they bring’
+ Pronominal affix	* <i>berti</i> → <i>bertit</i> ‘they bring it / him’	<i>nod.¹berat</i> ‘who bring it’ <i>nod.^Nberat</i> ‘who bring him’

This new suffixed pronoun form *-(i)t* spread then to the 1PL present, the 1PL future, and – in the later language – to the 1SG future, which show only this suffixed pronoun form, as also observed in Section 4.4.1. The creation of the 1st person forms with *-(i)t* is to be sought in the 1PL, and – according to the suggestion in Section 4.9.1 – the existence of absolute relative 1PL forms in *-me* may have played a role in the creation of this absolute 1PL form with *-mit* in the paradigm of the declarative clause type with pronominal affix. The 3PL forms involved in Table 10.5, but also the assumable 1PL forms just mentioned, maintain a subtle equilibrium between paradigmatic cohesion (in this case, in the absolute character) and distinctivity. The same equilibrium is invoked for the diachronic explanation of the Class B infix forms just mentioned.

Importantly, the *-(i)t* of those renewed forms loses its referential value, so that – in terms of the template of the verbal complex proposed in Section 2.2.2 – this change implies that the scheme [4 - 5 - 6] is reinterpreted as [4 - (5 + 6 =)5^{ABS}]. In this sense, as noted by Breatnach (1977: 105), not only the creation of *-(i)t* in the 3PL, but especially its spread to other forms, has served to distinguish “more clearly the [declarative, my addition] 1PL pres[ent] and fut[ure] from their respective relative forms”.

The only case attested in the Glosses in which this desemantization of *-(i)t* could be assumed is *guidmit* in (165), for which Breatnach (1977: 106) notes that even a rendering like ‘thus’ or ‘so’ would be unnecessary.

(165)*niar nert indomuin guidmit act isarchrist* (Wb 15d18)

ni-ar-nert

in-domuin

COP.PRES.IND.3SG.NEG.DECL-for-might/ACC.SG.N

ART.GEN.SG.M-world/GEN.SG.M

referential non-verbal predicates, and ‘conditional’ *-d^l-*, while other uses are only sporadic, e.g. the cataphoric object affixal pronouns and ‘reiterative’ *-d^l-*, or are restricted to some specific forms, such as the fossilized suffixed forms, euphonic *-d^l-* or the use of the same infix in the perfect *rond·gab*. At any rate, it is important to state that these secondary uses of the stressed pronouns and of the Class C 3SG n. infix *-d^l-* represent all a non-dismissible percentage of the corresponding attested forms in the language of the Glosses.

As regards the interplay of the pronominal forms with the expression of clause types, however, the secondary uses considered are not so heterogeneous. On the one hand, the tonic pronouns of the referential non-verbal predicates and the cataphoric object affixes are implied in the expression of non-relative, typically declarative clause types. The suffixed form *-(i)t* serves to mark more clearly an absolute declarative ending. On the other hand, the ‘reiterative’, ‘conditional’ and euphonic *-d^l-* express some sort of syntactic dependency or simply relative clause type. The use of *-d^l-* in the form *rond·gab* is less clear, but it apparently does not contradict this general interpretation of the desemantized *-d^l-* as a secondary marker of syntactic dependency.

The main point of this chapter, the interplay of pronominal references and clause typing, is therefore corroborated, to the extent that this chapter may well be taken as a continuation of Chapter 4 on the declarative and relative clause types, Chapter 5 on subordination and, in view of Section 10.2.6, Chapter 6 on the *wh*-interrogative clause type. As also noted in Section 7.1, pronominal affixes are much less relevant in the expression of the Old Irish polar interrogative, responsive and imperative clause types.

There are basically two types of diachronic processes that have been adduced for these secondary uses of pronominal references, to wit, (i) the creation or reshaping of structures and forms on the basis of functionally similar or opposed structures and forms, and (ii) the loss of the referential meaning of the pronominal reference concerned in favor of its syntactic connotations.

The assumed allosentential link between the normal V1 order and the pragmatically marked structures considered in Chapter 3, i.e. cleft-sentence and left-dislocation, provides the basis for the first type of change. These two structures play a relevant role in quite a number of situations directly related to the marking of clause types in Old Irish.

In this chapter, the cleft-sentence is important to explain two uses. First, in association with the structure of the nominal *wh*-question, it provides the basis for the use of tonic pronouns as the constitutive element of referential non-verbal

predicates (Section 10.2.6). Second, the allosentential link between the cleft-sentence and its pragmatically unmarked counterpart enables the extension of ‘conditional’ *-d^l-* from the copula to the remaining verbal complexes (Section 10.4.3).

The allosentential relationship between left-dislocation and normal order provides a natural way to arrive at the cataphoric use of pronominal affixes that are associated with the declarative clause type character of the verbal complex (Section 10.3.3). In both this and the previous case of the tonic pronouns (see again Section 10.2.6), the initial situation entails a left-dislocated definite NP that is anaphorically referred to by a pronominal form that comes thereafter. With the transposition of this NP to the end of the clause, the pronominal reference acquires a cataphoric value that lends itself easily to some process of grammaticalization on the basis of its secondary or concomitant value. In the case of the tonic pronouns used in referential non-verbal predicates, this concomitant value is the focused and therewith main clause character of the structures in which these pronominal forms appear.

As already stated, the ‘conditional’, ‘reiterative’, and even euphonic uses of *-d^l-* coincide in that they mark some sort of syntactic dependency. The loss of referential value is caused by different reasons on each occasion. These cases, as well as the use of *-(i)t* as a declarative clause type marker, are important to realize the functional relevance of affixal pronouns in the verbal complex.

The conclusion above that this chapter may well be taken as a continuation of Chapters 4 to 6 could be brought one step further by saying that the diachronic explanation of the cases considered in this chapter may also serve as a guide to afford the diachronic elucidation of some of the clause type markers considered in these chapters. Such an enterprise, however, lies beyond the scope of this study.

11 Conclusions

11.1 Structure of the chapter

This concluding chapter formulates a concise answer to the questions (i) to (iii) posed at the beginning of this study according to the detailed analysis of the previous chapters:

- (i) What are the Old Irish clause types distinguished in the verbal complex and what are the formal means expressing them?
- (ii) How are Old Irish clause types formally and functionally related to each other?
- (iii) Which other linguistic structures and domains are relevant for or interact in some significant manner with clause typing in Old Irish?

While question (i) involves the morphological expression of clause types, question (ii) refers to the paradigmatic dimension of clause typing in Old Irish. The answer to question (iii) was already guided by the reference to four domains, namely, (a) subordination, (b) pragmatically marked structures, (c) non-verbal predication and (d) pronominal references. The close relationship of clause typing to these domains is surely a general linguistic issue.

In general terms, a quite exhaustive answer to question (i) is to be found in Parts I and II of this study, question (ii) is also sufficiently answered in Part III, whereas question (iii) receives a relevant, but probably not exhaustive answer in Parts II and III. In this concluding chapter, I would like to focus on the relationship between the system of clause types expressed in the Old Irish V1 verbal complex, on the one hand, and domains (a) to (d), as well as on the relationships between those domains, on the other.

Sections 11.2 to 11.4 are devoted to the morphological elements and strategies used in the expression of clause typing in Old Irish, i.e. they offer a synthesis of the results of this study related to question (i). Section 11.5 resumes the main aspects of the paradigmatic dimension of clause typing in Old Irish. Finally, Sections 11.6 to 11.9 deal with points (a) to (d) above.

Even though the available documentation in Old Irish is to be sought in specific types of texts preserved in manuscripts dating from the 8th and 9th centuries, I think that the reader will now agree with the idea defended in Chapter 1 regarding the richness and reliability of the Old Irish linguistic evidence provided by the contemporaneous manuscripts as a basis for an investigation on the relationship between morphology, syntax and pragmatics.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-011>

On the basis of the fairly robust philological tradition in the Old Irish language, this monograph offers a coherent view of a number of forms and phenomena that classical grammatical treatments have not considered as belonging to the same category, namely, clause typing. The two basic ideas on which this contribution is based are, first, the recognition of the verbal complex as a morphological unit that comprises more elements and expresses more grammatical categories than the typical Indo-European finite verbal expression and, second, the systematic consideration of clause typing as a grammatical category.

11.2 The Old Irish verbal complex: structure and components

The arguments for the consideration of the Old Irish verbal complex as a grammatical or morphosyntactic word were given in Sections 2.2 and 2.7. It is true that not every verbal complex has a pretonic part, but the need to consider this pretonic segment as an inherent component of the verbal complex stems from the fact that a good deal of grammatical categories involves the use of these pretonic elements, the presence of which has relevant consequences for the configuration of the tonic part of the verbal complex, among others, the alternation between the deuterotonic and prototonic versions of the lexical compounds considered in Section 2.4. These categories are the non-3rd persons of every passive paradigm (diathesis, as well as person and number), the declarative and relative clause type forms of the imperfect (tense), the past subjunctive and the conditional (mood), as well as most perfective forms marked with the conjunct particle *ro-* (aspect). This study has also shown that the list of grammatical categories obligatorily expressed in the pretonic part of the verbal complex must also include polarity (i.e. negative polarity), and clause typing (e.g. every polar interrogative and a good deal of relative clause types are obligatorily expressed by means of pretonic conjunct particles, in addition to the ones just mentioned). The list of grammatical categories expressed in the verbal complex is given in Section 8.3. According to the description of the copula offered in Section 9.4, attributive non-verbal predicates also constitute a verbal complex with a pretonic component, with the exception of the positive responsive clause type form.

On the basis of the previous observation, the template of six slots introduced in Section 2.2.2 constitutes the basis for the description of the formal possibilities of the finite verbal expression in Old Irish. This template has two main possible forms, depending on whether the pretonic slots are occupied or not. There are two pretonic slots, slot 1 for conjunct particles, lexical preverbs or deadjectival preverbs and slot 2 for pronominal infixes. If slot 2 is occupied, then slot 1 is also occupied. It is necessary to work with a slot 3, which bears the main stress of the

verbal complex in its first syllable and which, depending on a number of stipulations, may be occupied by a lexical preverb, a deadjectival preverb, or the conjunct particle *ro-*. If one of slots 1 to 3 is occupied, then slot 6 is empty. Though, as stated above, some grammatical categories involve the use of one or more of the three initial slots, it may also be the case that none of them is occupied. Slot 4 is the place for the verbal stem. After this slot, slot 5 includes the inflectional endings that express person and number, but also other grammatical categories such as mood, tense and diathesis and, sometimes, clause type. Although it is not very frequently used, a further slot, slot 6, must be assumed to include an affixal pronoun the presence of which implies that slots 1 to 3 are not occupied. The components included in slots 1, 2, 3, and 6 were systematically analyzed in Chapter 2.

To those scholars interested in complex morphological structures, the Old Irish verbal complex provides a good opportunity to consider a case for which many diachronic details are recoverable with a considerable degree of reliability. At the same time, the notion of verbal complex proposed for the Old Irish verbal expression represents a descriptively adequate starting point for scholars working in Indo-European and Celtic linguistics. The necessary separation of synchronic and diachronic analysis is also the main idea in the next section.

11.3 The morphological strategies of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex

Section 2.6 offers an admittedly unusual description of the various pronominal affixes that can appear in either slots 2 or 6 of the verbal complex. This is a direct consequence of the deliberately synchronic approach to the point at issue, based on the assumption that this was a set of procedures applied by the Old Irish speakers regardless of their diachronic roots. Of course, these affixes come from ‘conventional’ clitic pronouns, either alone or in combination with particles that mostly have a clear Indo-European etymology, but this fact stands in no contradiction with the previous description. Quite the contrary, this sharp distinction between synchronic situation and diachronic origin is an important condition for diachronic investigation, as emphasized by Joseph (2004) in the following quote:

..., I suggest that the following is what we should aim for in doing historical linguistics, within any framework: ...

(5) a. the best analysis of the starting point of developments in question and the best analysis of the end point of developments of interest to us; only then can we really know what changes have occurred ...

(Joseph 2004: 63)

In line with this general methodological requirement, this section lists the morphological strategies identified in the Old Irish verbal complex for the expression of clause typing. With respect to the list given in Section 8.3.2, this list is different in that it constitutes an almost complete catalogue of the possible morphological strategies expressing clause type and includes a type of morpheme, namely, the one numbered as (9), which is not usually considered in current treatments on morphology: (1) segmental morphemes (prefixed, infix and suffixed); (2) morphophonological markers; (3) phoneme replacement; (4) phoneme elision; (5) stress variation; (6) stem suppletion; (7) zero morpheme; (8) subtraction; (9) ‘position morpheme’. Some formal markers can be interpreted in more than one sense. The approach is more in line with the synchronic description of the pronominal affixes in Section 2.6 and it will be perhaps of value for scholars interested in morphology.

(1) The segmental markers are the pretonic conjunct particles, whether portmanteau elements (the negative particles *ni-* for declarative, *nad-* and *nach-* for relative, and *na-* for imperative clause types) or not (the oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N-*), some infix pronouns (i.e. most elements of Classes A/B and C for the distinction between declarative and relative clause types), and the inflectional endings (specifically, the absolute declarative and relative, as well as the specific imperative clause type endings). The suffixed pronouns are dealt with later.

(2) The mutations known as lenition and nasalization constitute a group on their own and mostly express relative clause type. They represent a well-known instance of morphophonological marker for which Old Irish evidences a certain autonomous productiveness beyond the limits of their assumable original locus, as stated in Sections 4.7.4 and 5.7.3.

(3) The replacement of segmental elements noted in Section 2.6 for some infix pronouns deserves a proper entry in this list of morphological procedures. The Class A 3SG n. infix in the form *darigni* ‘he did it’ quoted above, if compared to *dorigni* ‘he did’ is a case in point. The substitution of the final consonant of some lexical preverbs when combined with Class B pronouns (e.g. *as-beir* ‘(s)he says’ vs *at-beir* ‘(s)he says it’, both declarative forms) is perhaps a clearer case of phoneme substitution as a morphological marker.

(4) As also observed in Section 2.6, the addition of a suffixed pronominal marker often involves the elision of the vowel before the 3SG absolute declarative ending.

(5) The variation between deuterotonic and prototonic form of the same lexical compound may be in itself a clause type marker and, as stated in Section 2.4, the basic reason for this opposition is the different position of the main stress of

the verbal complex. To be sure, variation in the position of the stress counts as a morphological marker, in this case, of a suprasegmental nature, but the formal variation this difference has given rise to in Old Irish can sometimes be dubbed as a case of partial suppletion.

(6) Genuine or full suppletion triggered by clause type distinctions has been observed in the present indicative of the substantive verb (see Section 9.3.2), and of the copula, in particular for the expression of clause types other than the positive declarative in the present indicative; see Sections 9.4.6 and 9.4.7. Suppletive imperative forms for some other verbs were mentioned in Section 7.3.

(7) The 2SG ending of the imperative paradigm, as noted in Section 7.3, is an example of zero morpheme. The same applies to the 3SG of the negative declarative form of the present indicative of the copula, as suggested in Section 9.4.7.

(8) The lack of pretonic elements in the positive forms of the responsive clause type, at least if this form is compared to the corresponding polar interrogative forms, see Section 7.4.4, could be interpreted as a case of subtractive morphology.

(9) By the term ‘position morpheme’, I refer to the fact considered in Section 4.4.1 that the expression of a suffixed pronominal object reference (i.e. in slot 6) is in itself a marker of declarative clause type. This is a morpheme, much in the same way as the zero morpheme, which represents a choice in a paradigmatic environment. As for the ‘position morpheme’, the choice is made among the possibilities provided by a syntagmatic environment, in this case the two possible positions for the affixal object pronouns in the verbal complex.

11.4 Pervasiveness and cohesiveness of clause type marking in Old Irish

With the noticeable exception of slot 1, which can include elements of both a lexical and grammatical nature, a fairly clear distribution of these two types of morphological elements in the verbal complex can be stated: the left (slots 1 and 2) and right (slots 5 and 6) edges of the verbal complex are mainly devoted to include grammatical elements, whereas the central part (slots 3 and 4) is the site of the lexical components.

Nevertheless, clause typing potentially affects every slot of the verbal complex. No other grammatical category expressed in this morphological structure is so pervasive.

Slot 1 is very often the only place in which clause typing is expressed. Recall the opposition between negative declarative *niretid* ‘you don’t believe’ and neg-

ative relative *nadcreitid* ‘that you don’t believe’ in the examples in (45), in Section 4.7.1. The oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N* is used in *hoaricc* ‘whereby [God] has saved’ in example (65a) in Section 5.4.2, which contrasts with the declarative form *ro-icc* ‘(s)he has saved’. An example of the rare cases in which the *wh*-question is marked with a conjunct particle is *cia tiasam* ‘wherever we go’ in (90) in Section 6.3.2, the declarative version of which would be *tiasmi* ‘we go’. Finally, a case of polar interrogative clause type is *inbértar* ‘shall [epistles] be brought?’, in (104a) in Section 7.2, contrasting with e.g. declarative *bértir* ‘they will be brought’.

Slot 2 is the place in which Classes A/B and C appear in order to minimally distinguish declarative (e.g. *darigni* ‘he did it’) from relative clause type (e.g. *dudrigni* ‘who did it’); this pair of forms is quoted in (49) in Section 4.8.1.

Slot 3 is concerned in the expression of clause types in so far as the lexical preverb appears in this slot, i.e. the lexical compound has the prototonic form to express e.g. imperative clause type (e.g. *tomil* ‘consume!’), in contrast to the deuterotonic form, which expresses e.g. relative clause type (e.g. *dommeil* ‘which [your nation] consumes’); these two forms appear in example (108) in Section 7.3. But this slot 3 is also the place in which relative mutation applies, as in the case of the lexical compound *in-coisig* ‘indicates’, with the lexical preverbs *in-* (slot 1) and *com-* (slot 3). As shown in the examples in (42) in Section 4.7.1, the form with relative mutation *inchosaig* ‘which indicates’ has the lenition on the first consonant of the second lexical preverb, in contrast to the declarative form *incoissig* ‘it indicates’. As a combination of both formal procedures affecting slot 3, the prototonic form can sometimes be used to express relative clause type, as in *thórnther* ‘which is denoted’, a form of *do-foirmdea* given in example (60a) in Section 5.3.1.

Slot 4 is also the place of relative mutation, as in *asmberar* ‘which is said’, which includes relative nasalization with respect to declarative *asberar* ‘it is said’, both in example (48) in Section 4.7.1. The use of suppletive stems included in this slot is also used, in the case of the substantive verb, to distinguish clause types: cf. declarative *ata* ‘it is (in...)’ and relative *feil* ‘which is (between...)’, both in (121a,b) in Section 9.3.2.

Slot 5 includes the absolute declarative and relative endings, in addition to the imperative ones. Recall the minimal difference between declarative *berit* ‘they bring’ and relative *bertae* ‘that they carry’ in (37) in Section 4.3.2. A specifically imperative ending is the 3SG *-ed* of *táirced* ‘let him procure’, quoted in example (109) in Section 7.3, which also shows the use of the prototonic form of *do-áirci*.

Slot 6, the place in which suffixed object pronouns are located, involves declarative clause type character, as stated in Section 4.4.1 and in point (9) in the previous section.

To a great extent, the two main possibilities of the verbal complex, i.e. with and without pretonic part, are to be interpreted as the outcome of the various possibilities of expressing clause types, which can appear in either the left or the right edges of the verbal complex, but not on both sides at the same time. See Section 8.3.3.

Clause typing can therefore be expressed in every slot of the Old Irish verbal complex, though it certainly appears more often in either the left or the right edges. This is why it is characterized as a pervasive category in Section 8.3.2. At the same time, and given that it is obligatory in every Old Irish finite verb, clause typing turns out to be a cohesive category in the sense that it is the category that either alone or in combination with other categories appears in either the prefixed or the suffixed elements of the verbal complex.

The Old Irish verbal complex described in Chapter 2 is fairly different to the verbal expression of other ancient Indo-European languages, which only consists of a verbal stem and inflectional ending. In view of the pervasive and cohesive character of clause typing in the Old Irish verbal complex, one may conclude that the systematic expression of clause typing and, more in particular, the existence of a paradigm of six clause types which must include also polarity and an additional, second pronominal reference (i.e. the Old Irish paradigm of clause types proposed in Section 8.4), is the reason for that difference between the Old Irish verbal complex and the finite expression of other ancient Indo-European languages.

11.5 The Old Irish paradigm of clause types

The consequence of the systematic consideration of clause typing as a grammatical category is the proposal of a paradigm of clause types that includes the six clause types that are formally distinguished in the Old Irish verbal complex. These six clause types must be considered in both their positive and negative versions and, as an additional feature superposed onto the possibilities arising from the combination of clause type and polarity, the expression of an affixal pronoun. The descriptive adequacy of the resulting paradigm, which is the central part of Chapter 8, can be measured according to two main observations.

On the one hand, the paradigm of clause types proposed in Chapter 8 includes all the conjunct particles described in Section 2.3.1, with the exception of perfectivizing *ro-* and reciprocal *imm(a)-*, which represent the secondary, i.e.

grammaticalized used of lexical preverbs. Leaving aside *ro-* and *imm(a)-*, a good deal of the conjunct particles referred to are negatives of various types and this points to the relevance of clause typing for the expression of polarity, as argued at length in Section 8.6. In addition, clause typing turns out to be also relevant for the expression of pronominal references, in the sense that the opposition between declarative and relative clause type determines the form of the infixed pronoun. This was observed in Chapter 4, while Chapter 10 considered more cases in which the pronominal forms (both stressed and unstressed) are involved in some manner in clause type distinctions.

On the other hand, the specific arrangement of the Old Irish six clause types in the paradigm proposed in Chapter 8 reflects the coherence of the relationships between these clause types, and also the cohesion of the paradigm itself. This paradigmatic arrangement also points to the idea that, on the basis of the typologically most basic illocutions, which are the declarative, the imperative, and the interrogative, the relative and the responsive clause types occupy a functionally intermediate position between the declarative and *wh*-interrogative, on the one hand, and the imperative and the polar interrogative clause types, on the other.

The proposed paradigm is to be understood as a semantic map and represents a descriptively appropriate tool with a considerable potential for the diachronic investigation. For instance, the Old Irish paradigm of clause types constitute the conceptual space through which the extension of lexical elements has taken place, as assumed in Section 9.5.2 for the stem $(\cdot)fil(-)$ of the paradigm of the substantive verb. In view of its etymology, this stem could have been introduced in this paradigm in clause types such as the polar interrogative or the negative declarative, and from these places it was easily extended to other clause types on the basis of the specific needs of the paradigm.

The Old Irish paradigm of clause types involves a number of well-known phenomena associated to morphological paradigms such as defectiveness (e.g. there is no verbal complex expressing negative *wh*-question, as noted in Section 8.5.2), syncretism (e.g. in the expression of some forms of the responsive and imperative paradigms, as noted in Section 7.4.4), and suppletion (e.g. in the present indicative of the copula and substantive verb, as observed in Chapter 9). The mixed paradigms considered for simple verbs, i.e. the configuration of the passive verbs seen in Section 4.5.1, as well as those active ones considered in Section 4.9.1, can also added to this list.⁹¹

91 The discussion on the extent to which these mixed paradigms can be a case of heteroclisis lies beyond the scope of this study.

This paradigm including negative polarity serves to realize that sentential negation is not a category that is dissociated from clause typing. Put differently, sentential negation is always associated to a specific clause type.

11.6 Clause typing and subordination in Old Irish

The declarative and relative clause types are formally distinguished by a number of minimal features and constitute a pair of clause types that can be viewed apart from the remaining clause types. For instance, the opposition absolute vs. conjunct endings is a distinction which makes sense in these two clause types, since there are absolute endings (i.e. endings specifically used for the situation in which the verbal complex has no element in slots 1 to 3) only for declarative and relative clause types. Further markers considered in Chapter 4 that minimally distinguish these two clause types are the relative mutations in the deuterotonic form of most lexical compounds and the bare opposition between Classes A/B and C of infixed pronouns.

An additional fact that speaks for a close structural link between declarative and relative clause types is the fact that the relative mutations express different degrees of subordinate character. While relative lenition is used to express the more dependent clause that has subject or object antecedent, relative nasalization is regularly associated with subordinate clauses that have an oblique antecedent and, as a further domain in which it is also used in a more or less consistent manner, in some specific types of adverbial and complement clauses. See Section 5.7.

Relative nasalization is very remarkable due to the fact that it alternates with other clause type markings. On the one hand, it alternates with relative lenition when the relative clause has a m./f. sg. antecedent with object NP_{rel} function and, as observed in Section 4.7.3, relative nasalization is clearly more frequent when the antecedent constitutes a tautophrasal NP with the relative verb (i.e. when it is not the focused element of a cleft-sentence). On the other, and referring to the form of the copula, relative nasalization alternates with declarative morphology after the adverbial subordinating conjunctions (*h*)óire ‘because’ and *amal* ‘as’. The use of the nasalizing relative clause type is due to different reasons in each case: as stated in Section 5.6.2, relative nasalization after (*h*)óire is due to the use of the copula as marker of attributive non-verbal predicate, and not as the introducer of a cleft-sentence, while after *amal* relative nasalization correlates with the use of indicative mood. As noted in Section 10.4.3, the so-called ‘conditional’ -*d^l*- is also a case in which relative clause type marking correlates with the use of indicative mood.

The previous observations on relative nasalization and its intermediate position as regards syntactic dependency are possible if the whole set of subordinating strategies used in Old Irish is considered, as in Chapter 5. These strategies include the use of declarative forms after some subordinating conjunctions, and an important result of this chapter is precisely the observation that leniting relative morphology is regularly used in the less assertive subordinate clauses and declarative morphology in those subordinates that are more assertive.

For scholars interested in the general phenomenon of subordination, the so-called relative nasalization of the Old Irish language represents a type of subordination strategy that marks less subordinate clauses than the restrictive relative clause usually marked by relative lenition and, in more general terms, it provides a nice illustration of the gradational nature of subordination. This is why it could be better termed as ‘subordinate nasalization’. For scholars interested in Old Irish, this general consideration of relative (or subordinate) nasalization takes into account its proper functional position in a cross-linguistically valid classification of subordinate types and serves to give a proper description of the phenomenon of subordination in Old Irish.

11.7 Clause typing and pragmatically marked constituent order

As stated in the previous section, the involvement of the cleft-sentence is a significant factor in the alternation between relative nasalization and relative lenition after *m./f.* sg. antecedents with O NP_{rel} function, on the one hand, and relative nasalization and declarative morphology after *(h)óire* ‘because’ on the other. In the former case, relative nasalization appears in relative forms not included in cleft-sentences, i.e. it is the lack of this structure that makes the extension of this relative marker possible, whereas in the latter case, the copula introducing a cleft-sentence most often takes declarative morphology, in line with the assertive character of this syntactic structure that serves to focus on one specific constituent of a normal clause.

But the cleft-sentence is involved more directly in the configuration of other clause types. This is the case of the usual shape of the *wh*-interrogatives in Old Irish, which is basically the same as that of a cleft-sentence, as concluded in Chapter 6. Moreover, there are three further aspects in which the cleft-sentence has played a role on the basis of its allosentential relationship to the unmarked structure. This notion of ‘allosentential pair’ was introduced in Chapter 3 (in particular, in Section 3.3.3).

First, the structural similarity between the distribution of the 3SG and 3PL forms in the passive paradigm is exactly the same as that in the copula used to introduce the cleft-sentence, as observed in Section 4.5.1. In Section 4.9.1, I suggested that the same allosentential relationship between the declarative paradigm with 3SG n. affix and the corresponding relative paradigm without such an affix in active simple verbs would be the reason for their similar mixed pattern, so that this would be the reason for innovative 1PL forms with suffixed pronoun such as *guidmit*.

Second, Section 9.5.3 assumed that the use as copula form of the stem *-tá-* of the substantive verb starts with the use of the latter in the relative form of the cleft-sentence in which the bare non-verbal predicate is focused. The conversion of that relative form into the corresponding unmarked allosentential clause would be the way in which those more perceptible forms have been introduced in the paradigm of the present indicative of the copula.

Third, as stated in Section 10.2.6, the set of focusing structures that includes the cleft-sentence and the copular *wh*-question has played a decisive role in the configuration of the Old Irish referential non-verbal predicate that, by virtue of its main clause character associated with its inherent character of focusing structure, turns out to be marked by a specific element of that set of focusing structures, namely, the tonic pronoun. In other words, whereas in other cases considered up to now the cleft-sentence imposes the morphology of the two main verbs involved in its expression, in the present case it imposes another characteristic element such as the tonic pronoun, which has a fairly restricted distribution in Old Irish.

As stated in the same diachronic explanation for the referential non-verbal predicates, the left-dislocating structure is a feasible factor that can also be assumed for other innovative structures such as the cataphoric object pronouns considered in Section 10.3. Again, the allosentential relationship between pragmatically marked and non-marked structures turns out to be a useful notion.

The cleft-sentence and the left-dislocated structures described in Section 3.2 and 3.3 respectively are profusely used in Old Irish and have exerted a certain influence on various types of clause types of this language. In particular, the clause types that are more involved with these pragmatically marked structures are the declarative, the relative and the *wh*-interrogative clause types.

11.8 Clause typing and non-verbal predicate types

It is surely not a matter of chance that the use of suppletive stems or elements in the expression of clause types is found in the stems used for the expression of

non-verbal predicates. Reference is made to the suppletion of the stems *(·)ta(-)* and *(·)fil(-)* (slot 4) in the present indicative of the substantive verb, and to the suppletion of forms such as *is-*, *-ta/-da-* and *con(d)id-* (slot 1 or slots 1 and 2, see Section 9.4.1), in the paradigm of the present indicative of the copula.

That clause type distinctions are directly related to the various types of non-verbal predicates can be observed directly in two clear facts, which have most probably general value. The first is the neutralization of the difference between existential and locative non-verbal predicates in relative clauses, as observed in Section 9.3.2. A consequence of this fact is that the stem *(·)fil(-)* can also be used as a declarative form to express existential meaning. The second is the inherently non-relative character of the referential non-verbal predicates, as stated in Section 10.2.5, one of the features shared by this type of predicates with the cleft-sentence, as stated in the previous section.

A further situation in which clause typing interacts with the expression of non-verbal predication is of a more specific nature, since it is determined by the unstressed, i.e. pretonic character of the copula in Old Irish. As noted in the previous section, when the bare non-verbal predicate is focused in the cleft-sentence, the form of the copula must be substituted by the nasalizing relative form of the substantive verb in order to get a stressed verbal form. Apart from its diachronic implications, this implies that the formal differentiation between bare and locative non-verbal predicates is neutralized in Old Irish when the former is focused.

The quantity and quality of the arguments of the clause represent important, if not decisive, criteria in the classification of both the verbal and non-verbal predicates. This is especially remarkable for the latter, for which the referential character of the predicate decides a type of (non-verbal) predicate different from the bare, i.e. non-referential non-verbal predicate; those two types of predicate contrast with the locative predicate, and those three types of predicate have in common the definite character of the subject, in contrast to the usually indefinite character of the existential predicates. For intransitive and transitive predicates, to quote only the two basic types considered for verbal predicates, the decisive criterion is the number of main arguments, i.e. one or two respectively.

11.9 Clause typing and pronominal references

The maximal quantity of pronominal references in the Old Irish verbal complex is two, most usually in the pragmatically unmarked function of subject and object, the so-called inflectional ending in slot 5, though it can also appear at the end of slot 4, and the pronominal affix in either slot 2 or 6. It is important to recall

that such pragmatically unmarked pronominal references (see Section 10.3.1 for this notion) can only be expressed within the structure of the verbal complex. In active verbs, whether transitive or not, the syntactic subject is expressed by means of the inflectional ending, while the syntactic 1st and 2nd person subjects of the passive verbs are expressed by means of the pronominal affixes in slot 2, as stated in Section 4.5.1.

The distinction between declarative and relative clause types is formally linked to the expression of pronominal arguments in the verbal complex, as stated above, and, in Section 4.9.3, I suggested a preferred pronominal argument structure for declarative and relative clause types, in the sense that, for active transitive verbs, the expression of two arguments is linked to non-relative and, more in particular, declarative clause type.

In addition to these effects of the semantically plene pronominal markers on clause typing, some more or less desemantized uses of the personal pronouns play a relevant role in the expression of certain predicate types and clause types. To a great extent, these uses are rooted in the semantically full uses and represent the upsurge of the concomitant clause type features. The processes of grammaticalization proposed in Chapter 10 are a good token of the diachronic possibilities of the pronominal markers if they are considered in the perspective of the interaction with discourse factors.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- AC = *Aided Chonchobuir* (see Corthals 1989).
ACC = *Amra Choluibm Chille* (see Stokes 1899).
AM = *Audacht Morainn* (see Kelly 1976).
BB = *Bethu Brigte* (see Ó hAodha 1978).
Blathm. = The poems of Blathmac (see Carney 1964).
CIH = *Corpus iuris Hibernici* (see Binchy 1978).
Corm. = *Cormac's Glossary* (see Stokes 1862).
EC = *Echtrae Chonnlai* (see McCone 2000).
Ir.Gosp.Thom. = *The Irish Gospel of Thomas* (see Carney 1964).
LL = *Book of Leinster* (see Best *et alii* 1954–83).
LU = *Lebor na hUidre* (see Best and Bergin 1929).
ML = Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i.7–483).
MU² = *Mesca Ulad* (see Watson 1941).
Rawl. = *Rawlinson B 502* (see Meyer 1909).
Sc.M² = *Scéla mucce Meic Dáthó* (see Thurneysen 1935).
Sg = Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: ii.49–224).
Stories fr. Táin = *Stories from the Táin* (see Strachan 1944).
TBC-1² = *Táin Bó Cúailnge. Recension I* (see O'Rahilly 1976).
TBDerga = *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* (see Knott 1936).
TBF = *Táin Bó Froích* (see Meid 2019).
Thes. = Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903).
Tur = Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i.484–493).
Wb = Stokes and Strachan (1901–1903: i.499–712).

References

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 1990. La funzione sintattica delle marche morfologiche di lenizione e nasalizzazione in antico irlandese. *Annali de la Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, s. III, v. XX(2–3). 695–728.
- Ahlqvist, Anders. 1971/72. Some aspects of the copula in Irish. *Éigse* 14. 269–274.
- Ahlqvist, Anders (ed.). 1983. *The Early Irish Linguist, an edition of the canonical part of the Auraicept na n-Eces*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Ahlqvist, Anders. 1990. Periphrasis and Univerbation. In Alfred Bammesberger & Alfred Wollmann (eds.), *Britain 400–600: Language and History*, 283–290. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Ahlqvist, Anders. 2003. Old Irish *masu* ‘if is’ and similar forms. In Brigitte L. M. Bauer & Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, 13–17. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Altmann, Hans. 1993: Satzmodus. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer*

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680324-012>

- Forschung / An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 1. Halbband / Volume 1, 1006–1029. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. Zwischen Parataxe und Hypotaxe: 'abhängige' Hauptsätze im Gesprochenen und Geschriebenen Deutsch. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 26. 284–307.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown, and Greville G. Corbett. 2005. *The Syntax-Morphology Interface (A Study on Syncretism)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Bernhard. 2015. The online database of the Old Irish Priscian glosses. Available at <http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/priscian>.
- Baudiš, Josef. 1913a. Nominalsätze und Nominalprädikate im Irischen. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 9. 309–335.
- Baudiš, Josef. 1913b. Zum Gebrauch der Verbalnomina im Irischen. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 9. 380–417.
- Bergin, Osborn. 1938. On the syntax of the verb in Old Irish. *Ériu* 12. 197–214.
- Best, Richard Irvine and Osborn Bergin (eds.). 1929. *Lebor na hUidre. The Book of the Dun Cow*. Dublin: Hodges & Figgis; Williams & Norgate.
- Best, Richard Irvine, Osborn Bergin, M. A. O'Brien, and Anne O'Sullivan (eds.). 1954–1983. *The Book of Leinster, formerly Leabar na Núachongbála*, 6 vols, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Bhat, D. N. Shankara 2004. *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bickel, Balthasar, and Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 169–240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Binchy, Daniel Anthony (ed.). 1978. *Corpus iuris Hibernici: ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum*, 7 vols., Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Bisagni, Jacopo. 2012. The Origins of the Preterite of the Old Irish Copula and Substantive Verb: An Overview and New Ideas. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 14. 1–29.
- Bisang, Walter. 2007. Categories that make finiteness: discreteness from a functional perspective and some of its repercussions. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness (Theoretical and Empirical Foundations)*, 115–137. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blom, Alderik H. 2017. *Glossing the Psalms. (The Emergence of the Written Vernaculars in Western Europe from the Seventh to the Twelfth Centuries)*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.
- Breatnach, Liam. 1977. The Suffixed Pronouns in Early Irish. *Celtica* 12. 75–107.
- Breatnach, Liam. 2017. Varia III. *Ériu* 67. 277–237.
- Bruil, Martine. 2014. *Clause-typing and evidentiality in Ecuadorian Siona*. Utrecht: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1985: *Morphology (A Study of the Relation Between Meaning and Form)*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Carney, James (ed.). 1964. *The poems of Blathmac, son of Cú Brettan, together with the Irish Gospel of Thomas and a poem on the Virgin Mary*. London: Irish Text Society.
- Collins, Peter C. 1991. *Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Peter C. 2006. Clause Types. In Bas Aarts & April McMahon (eds.), *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, 180–197. London: Blackwell.
- Corbett, G.G. 2007. Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words. *Language* 83. 8–42.
- Corthals, Johan. 1989. The *retoiric* in *Aided Chonchobuir*. *Ériu* 40. 41–59.

- Corthals, Johan. 1999. Zur Entstehung der archaischen irischen Metrik und Syntax. In Heiner Eichner, Hans Christian Luschützky (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, 19–45. Praha: Enigma Corporation.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1975. The Origins of the Insular Celtic Conjunct and Absolute Verbal Endings. In Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg 9.–14. Sept. 1973*, 40–69. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1987. The Distribution of Infixes and Suffixes in Old Irish. *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 13. 1–7.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William. 1994. Speech classification, language typology and cognition. In Savas L. Tsohatzidis (ed.), *Foundations of Speech Act Theory: Philosophical and Linguistic Perspectives*, 460–477. London: Taylor & Francis Routledge.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar (Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William & D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crysmann, Berthold & Olivier Bonami. 2016. Variable morphotactics in Information-based Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 52. 311–374.
- Cysouw, Michael. 2007. Content interrogatives in Pichis Ashéninka: corpus study and typological comparison. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 73(2). 133–163.
- Dahl, Östen. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17. 79–106.
- Devine, A.M. & Laurence D. Stephens. 2006. *Latin Word Order (Structured Meaning and Information)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2001. The ordering distribution of main and adverbial clauses: a typological study. *Language* 77. 345–365.
- Diessel, Holger. 2003. The relationship between demonstratives and interrogatives. *Studies in Language* 27(3). 635–655.
- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part II. Complex and Derived Constructions*, 2nd edn. by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DIL: *Dictionary of the Irish language. Based mainly on Old and Middle Irish materials (and Contributions to a dictionary of the Irish language)*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1913–1975 (compact edition 1983). The edition quoted is the electronic version of 2013 ('eDIL') available at <http://edil.qub.ac.uk/dictionary/search.php>.
- Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2002. Word: a typological framework. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Word (A cross-linguistic typology)*, 1–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Draak, Maartje. 1952. Emotional reflexes. *Ériu* 16. 74–78.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Clause types. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. I: Clause Structure*, 224–275. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, John W. 1985. Competing motivations. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax (Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24–26, 1983)*, 343–365. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 64. 805–855.

- Enrique-Arias, Andrés. 2002. Accounting for the position of verbal agreement morphology with psycholinguistic and diachronic explanatory factors. *Studies in Language* 26(1). 1–31.
- Eriksen, Pål Kristian. 2011. 'To not be' or not 'to not be'. The typology of negation of non-verbal predicates. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 275–310.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1992. Focus structure and predication: the case of negative *wh*-questions. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 7(1). 35–51.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The dynamics of focus structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1991. First person emphatic and imperative in Early Irish. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 38. 87–92.
- Eska, Joseph F. 2007. Bergin's Rule (Syntactic diachrony and discourse strategy). *Diachronica* 24. 253–278.
- Eska, Joseph F. 2008. Grammars in Conflict. Phonological Aspects of the Bergin's Rule Construction. *Keltische Forschungen* 3. 45–62.
- Feuth, Els. 1983. Gemination: an Old Irish mutation rule? *Ériu* 34. 143–156.
- Foley, William A. 2007. A typology of information packaging in the clause. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 1: Clause Structure*, 2nd edn., 362–446. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2001/02. La sintaxis del pasivo en irlandés antiguo. *Veleia* 18–19. 255–274.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2012. The paradigm of clause types in Old Irish (The morphological encoding of illocutionary force). In H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb. (Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles, 13–15 September 2010)*, 61–72. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2013a. Morphological externalisation and the Old Irish verbal particle *ro*. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 111(1), 108–140.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2013b. Old Irish tonic pronouns as extraclass constituents. *Ériu* 63. 1–39.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2014. De-adjectival preverbs in the Old Irish verbal complex: a synchronic and diachronic study. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 61. 57–100.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2015a. The type *tánicc* in the Old Irish Glosses: affix ordering, frequency and phonotactics. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113. 76–104.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2015b. On the history and prehistory of the Old Irish passive ending *-ar*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120. 115–151.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2017a. Descriptive and diachronic aspects of the Old Irish quotative marker *ol*. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 18(1). 58–81.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2017b. Grammaticalization as morphosyntax and representation: Mood from tense markers in the Old Irish and Romance conditional. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog & Hella Olbertz (eds.), *The Grammaticalization of Tense, Aspect, Modality and Evidentiality. A Functional Perspective*, 191–214. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2017c. The diachrony of the Old Irish 'ex-deponent' *-(a)igidir* verbs: deponency, sound change, paradigm split, canonicity and the edges of the verbal complex. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 64. 81–140.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2017d. The split *for*, a gecko morpheme in the Old Irish verbal complex. In Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan & Katharina Zipser (eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, 195–206. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2017e. The meaning of the Proto-Indo-European verb 'to be'. In Juan Antonio Álvarez-Pedrosa, Alberto Bernabé, Eugenio Luján & Fernando Presa (eds.), *Ratna. Homenaje a la Profesora Julia Mendoza*, 61–69. Madrid: Guillermo Escolar.
- García-Castillero, Carlos. 2018. On morphological internalization: The origin of the Old Irish oblique relative conjunct particle *-(s)a^N*. *Diachronica* 35(1). 35–70.
- García-Castillero, Carlos, forthcoming. Paradigmatic split and merger: the descriptive and diachronic problem of Old Irish Class B infixed pronouns. In Elliott Lash, Fangzhe Qiu, and David Stifter (eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to morphosyntactic variation and change in medieval Celtic languages*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Geist, Ljudmila. 2006. *Die Kopula und ihre Komplemente. Zur Kompositionalität in Kopulasätzen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Genee, Inge. 1998. *Sentential complementation in a functional grammar of Irish*. The Hague: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.
- Green, Georgia. 1976. Main sentence phenomena in subordinate clauses. *Language* 52. 382–397.
- Greene, David. 1962. The Conjunct Forms of the Copula in Old Irish. *Ériu* 19. 73–74.
- Greene, David. 1969. Varia II. *Ériu* 21. 89–98.
- Greene, David. 1972. The Responsive in Irish and Welsh. In Herbert Pilch & Joachim Thurow (eds.), *Indo-Celtica. Gedächtnisschrift für Alf Sommerfelt*, 59–72. München: Hueber.
- Griffith, Aaron. 2008. The animacy hierarchy and the distribution of the *notae augentes* in Old Irish. *Ériu* 58. 55–75.
- Griffith, Aaron. 2011. Old Irish Pronouns: Agreement Affixes vs. Clitic Arguments. In Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics*, 65–94. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Griffith, Aaron, 2012. *Dictionary of the Old Irish Glosses in the Milan MS Ambr. C301 inf.*, available at http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/milan_glosses.
- Griffith, Aaron & David Stifter. 2014. New and corrected ms. readings in the Milan Glosses. *Études Celtiques* 40. 53–84.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Periphrasis. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim & Stavros Skopeteas (eds.), *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, 1. Halbband / Volume 1, 654–664. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2003. The Geometry of Grammatical Meaning: Semantic Maps and Cross-Linguistic Comparison. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language (Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure)*, Volume 2, 211–242. Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Explaining the Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint: a usage-based account. *Constructions* 2. 49 pages, available at <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/elanguage/constructions/article/view/3073.html>.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Creating Economical Morphosyntactic Patterns in Language Change. In Jeff Good (ed.), *Linguistic Universals and Language Change*, 185–214. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax. *Folia Linguistica* 45(1). 31–80.

- Haspelmath, Martin & Andrea D. Sims. 2010. *Understanding Morphology*, 2nd edn. London: Hodder Education.
- Henderson, John. 2002. The word in Eastern/Central Arrernte. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Word (A cross-linguistic typology)*, 100–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication. Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1998. Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, in collaboration with Dónald P. Ó Baoill, 335–419. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2004. Illocution, mood, and modality. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim & Stavros Skopeteas (eds.), *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, 1. Halbband / Volume 1, 1190–1201. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees, Eli Nazaret Bechara, Roberto Gomes Camacho, Alessandra Regina Guerra, Taísa Peres de Oliveira, Eduardo Penhavel, Erotilde Goreti Pezatti, Liliane Santana, Rosa Francisco de Souza & Maria Luíza de Sousa Teixeira. 2007. Basic illocutions in the native languages of Brazil. *Alfa* 51. 73–90.
- Hengeveld, Kees & John L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar (A typologically-based theory of language structure)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henry, P. L. 1977. Bergin's Law and Syntactic Subordination in Irish. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 36. 29–53.
- Hentschel, Elke. 1998. *Negation und Interrogation (Studien zur Universalität ihrer Funktionen)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hertz, Rudolf. 1930. Beiträge zur Syntax der irischen Begründungssätze. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 18. 121–158.
- Hofman, Rijcklof. 1993. The linguistic preoccupations of the glossators of the St Gall Priscian. In Vivien Law (ed.), *History of Linguistic Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, 111–126. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hofman, Rijcklof. 1996. *The Sankt Gall Priscian. Commentary. Part 1. Vol. 1: Introduction; Book 1–5; Vol. 2. Translation and Commentary; Indices*. Münster: Nodus.
- Hofman, Rijcklof & Pádraig Moran (eds.). 2014. *St Gall Priscian glosses*, available at <http://www.stgallpriscian.ie/>.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elisabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. 1999. Sentence types and clause subordination. In Keith Brown & Jim Miller (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*, 329–343. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Hull, Vernam. 1956. Miscellanea Linguistica Hibernica. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 25. 246–263.
- Irslinger, Britta. 2014. Intensifiers and reflexives in SAE, Insular Celtic and English. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119/1, 159–206.
- Isaac, Graham R. 1996. *The Verb in the Book of Aneirin. Studies in Syntax, Morphology and Etymology*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Isaac, Graham R. 2001. The Function and Typology of Absolute and Conjunct Flexion in Early Celtic: some Hints from Ancient Egyptian. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99. 147–170.
- Isaac, Graham R. 2003. Prospect in Old Irish Syntax. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53. 181–197.
- Jackson, Kenneth H. 1953. *Language and History in Early Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jary, Mark and Mikhail Kissine. 2014. *Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Bob Morris. 1999. *The Welsh Answering System*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2004. Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization theory. In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds.), *Up and down the cline – The nature of grammaticalization*, 45–71. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Justus, Carol F. 2000. Word Order and the First Person Imperative. In Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*, 165–184. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Karlsson, Fred. 2000. Defectivity. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim & Stavros Skopeteas (eds.), *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, 1. Halbband / Volume 1, 647–654. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, Longon & New York: Springer.
- Kavanagh, Séamus. 2001. *A Lexicon of the Old Irish Glosses in the Würzburg Manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul*, ed. by Dagmar S. Wodtke. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kelly, Fergus (ed.). 1976. *Audacht Morainn*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Kelly, Fergus. 1986. Two Notes on Final-Verb Constructions. *Celtica* 18. 1–12.
- Kelly, Patricia. 1999. Remarks on the omission of the particle *no* in Early Irish verbs. In Peter Anreiter & Erzsébet Jerem (eds.), *Studia celtica et indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, 157–161. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.
- Kim, Ronald I. 2019. Suppletive stem distribution: a diachronic perspective. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 117(3). 455–470.
- Knott, Eleanor (ed.). 1936. *Togail Buidne Da Derga*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Koch, John T. 1987. Prosody and the Old Celtic verbal complex. *Ériu* 38. 143–174.
- König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2007. Speech act distinctions in grammar. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. I: Clause Structure*, 276–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kortlandt, Fredrik. 1998/2000. Three notes on the Old Irish verb. *Études Celtiques* 34. 143–146.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1992. La relative ‘nasalisante’ en vieil-irlandais. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 86. 226–264.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 2014. A further note on the Old Irish negative particle *nícon*. In Elisa Roma & David Stifter (eds.), *Linguistic and Philological Studies in Early Irish*, 105–130. Lewiston & Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form (Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lang, Ewald & Renate Pasch. 1988. Grammatische und kommunikative Aspekte des Satzmodus. In Ewald Lang (ed.), *Studien zum Satzmodus I*, 1–24. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR.
- Lash, Elliott. 2011. *A Synchronic and Diachronic Analysis of Old Irish Copular Clauses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University dissertation.
- Lash, Elliott. 2017. Evaluating directionality in the internal reconstruction of pre-Old Irish copular clauses. *Indo-European Linguistics* 5. 77–129.
- Laughren, Mary, Rob Pensalfini & Tom Mylne. 2005. Accounting for verb-initial order in an Australian language. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), *Verb First (On the syntax of verb initial languages)*, 367–401. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Lee, Felicia. 2005. Force first (Clause fronting and clause typing in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec). In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), *Verb First (On the syntax of verb initial languages)*, 91–106. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz (Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik)*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2008. Information structure and grammaticalization. In Elena Seoane & María José López Couso (eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*, 207–229. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Lewis, Wendy Joy. 1986. *The Loss of the strong conjugation in Middle Irish*. Cambridge MS: Harvard University dissertation.
- Lucht, Ina. 1994. Doppelte Markierung des Akkusativs beim Transitivum im Altirischen. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 46. 80–118.
- Lyons, John. 1999. Sentences, clauses, statements and propositions. In Peter Collins & David Lee (eds.), *The Clause in English. In honour of Rodney Huddleston*, 149–175. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Mac Cana, Proinsias. 1973. On Celtic word order and the Welsh ‘abnormal’ sentence. *Ériu* 24. 90–120.
- Mac Cana, Proinsias. 1985. A note on the prepositional relative. *Ériu* 36. 210–212.
- Mac Coisdealbha, Pdraig. [1976] 1998. *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish (Selected Studies from a Descriptive, Historical and Comparative Point of View)*. (Originally presented as a dissertation at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 1976). New edition with Additional Notes and an Extended Bibliography by Graham R. Isaac, 1998. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. 2004. Descriptive motifs and generalizations. In Alice Caffarel, J. R. Martin, Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (eds.), *Language Typology. A Functional Perspective*, 536–673. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- McCone, Kim. 1979. Pretonic Preverbs and the Absolute Verbal Endings in Old Irish. *Ériu* 30. 1–34.
- McCone, Kim. 1980. The Nasalizing Relative Clause with Object Antecedent in the Glosses. *Ériu* 31. 10–27.
- McCone, Kim. 1996a. *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, St. Patrick’s College.
- McCone, Kim. 1996b. Prehistoric, Old and Middle Irish. In Kim McCone & Katharine Simms (eds.), *Progress in Medieval Irish Studies*, 7–53. Maynooth: The Department of Old Irish, St. Patrick’s College.
- McCone, Kim. 1997a. *The Early Irish Verb*. Second Edition, revised with Index. Maynooth: An Sagart.

- McCone, Kim. 1997b. Delbrück's model of PIE word order and the Celtic evidence. In Emilio Crespo & José Luis García Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. (Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994)*, 363–396. Madrid & Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid & Reichert.
- McCone, Kim (ed.). 2000. *Echtrae Chonnlai (and the Beginnings of Vernacular Narrative Writing in Ireland: a Critical Edition with Introduction, Notes, Bibliography and Vocabulary)*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McCone, Kim. 2005. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader (including an Introduction to Middle Irish)*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McCone, Kim. 2006. *The Origins and Development of the Insular Celtic Verbal Complex*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1996. The functions of split-Wackernagel clitic systems: Pronominal clitics in the Ngumpin languages. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*, 299–332. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- McManus, Damian. 1991. *A Guide to Ogam*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McQuillan, Peter. 1997. Towards a Theory of Modality for the Irish Verb: Subjunctive, Imperative and Future in Early Irish. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 6. 1–62.
- McQuillan, Peter. 2002. *Modality and Grammar: A History of the Irish Subjunctive*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- Meid, Wolfgang. 1963. *Die indogermanischen Grundlagen der altirischen absoluten and konjunkten Verbalflexion*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Meid, Wolfgang (ed.). 2019. *The Romanze of Froech and Findabair or The Driving of Froech's Cattle: Táin Bó Froích*, English-language version based on the original German-language edition prepared with the assistance of Albert Bock, Benjamin Bruch and Aaron Griffith, 2nd revised version. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Meyer, Kuno (ed.). 1909. *Rawlinson B 502: a collection of pieces in prose and verse in the Irish language, compiled during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, now published in facsimile from the original manuscript in the Bodleian Library, with an introduction and indexes by Kuno Meyer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Meyer, Kuno. 1917. Orthanach ūa Cöilläma cecinit. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 11. 107–113.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard Negation (The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective)*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2007. Negation – An Overview of Typological Research. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(5). 552–570.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2010. On the relation between V2 and the second position cliticization. *Lingua* 120. 329–353.
- Morin, Yves-Charles. 1985. On the two French subjectless verbs *voici* and *voilà*. *Language* 61. 777–820.
- Myhill, John. 1985. Pragmatic and categorial correlates of VS word order. *Lingua* 66. 177–200.

- Nordström, Jackie. 2010. *Modality and Subordination*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- O'Brien, Michael A. 1932. *Varia*. *Ériu* 11. 86–93.
- Ó hAodha, Donncha (ed.). 1978. *Bethu Brigitte*, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. 1986. The Old Irish nasalizing relative clause. *Ériu* 37. 33–87.
- Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. 1987. Notes on Old Irish syntax. *Ériu* 38. 177–183.
- Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. 1991. Early Irish *cía/ce* 'that'. *Ériu* 42. 45–53.
- Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. 1998. Complementation in Early Irish: the *uerba dicendi*. *Ériu* 49. 121–148.
- Ó Máille, Tomás, 1911. *Contributions to the History of the Verbs of Existence in Irish*. Freiburg i.B.: Freiburg University dissertation (= *Ériu* 6 (1912) 1–102).
- O'Rahilly, Cecile (ed.). 1976. *Táin Bó Cúailnge. Recension I*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen. II. Bedeutungslehre*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Poppe, Erich. 1991. *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung im Mittelkymrischen (Temporalbestimmungen und funktionale Satzperspektive)*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Poppe, Erich. 1993. Vorüberlegungen zu einer Interpretation von Voranstellungen im Alt-/Mittelirischen. In Martin Rockel & Stefan Zimmer (eds.), *Akten des ersten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologen (Gosen bei Berlin, 8.–10. April 1992)*, 229–240. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pusch, Claus D. 2000. The attitudinal meaning of preverbal markers in Gascon: Insights from the analysis of literary and spoken language data. In Gisle Andersen & Thorstein Fretheim (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, 189–206. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Pusch, Claus D. 2001. *Morphosyntax, Informationsstruktur und Pragmatik (Präverbale Marker im gaskognischen Okzitanisch und in anderen Sprachen)*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Quin, E. Gordon. 1966. Irish *cote*. *Ériu* 20. 140–150.
- Quin, E. Gordon. 1975. *Old-Irish Workbook*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Quin, E. Gordon. 1979–80. Nasalization of *g- b- d-* in Early Irish. *Studia Celtica* 14–15. 255–259.
- Rehbock, Helmut. 1992. Deklarativemodus, rhetische Modi und Illokutionen. In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Satz und Illokution, Band 1*, 91–171. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Roma, Elisa. 1999. Grammaticalizzazione di pronomi soggetto: una strada alternativa. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 84/1. 3–43.
- Roma, Elisa. 2000. How subject pronouns spread in Irish: A diachronic study and synchronic account of the third person + pronoun pattern. *Ériu* 51. 107–157.
- Roma, Elisa. 2003. Brevi note sull'etimologia di irlandese antico *atá*. *Studi Celtici* 2. 77–87.
- Roma, Elisa. 2018. Nasalization after Inflected Nominals in the Old Irish Glosses. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19. 1–30.
- Roulet, Eddy. 2006. The description of text relation markers in the Geneva model of discourse organization. In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 115–131. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Russell, Paul. 2005. 'What was best of every language': the early history of the Irish language. In Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (ed.), *A New History of Ireland, Volume I: Prehistoric and Early Ireland*, 405–450. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. I: Clause structure*, 155–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sadock, Jerrold M. 2004. Speech acts. In Laurence R. Horn & Gregory Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 53–73. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sanfelici, Emanuela. 2015. *Le subordinate non-finite in antico e medio irlandese: il tipo DP doNV*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1987. Thethetic / categorial distinction revisited. *Linguistics* 25, 511–580.
- Schiegg, Markus. 2016. How to do things with glosses (Illocutionary forces in the margins of medieval manuscripts). *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 17/1. 55–78.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1994. The Celtic Adverbs for ‘against’ and ‘with’ and the early apocope of *i. *Ériu* 45. 151–189.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1997. *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles*. Maynooth: The Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- Schumacher, Stefan. 1999. Randbemerkungen zu absolut und konjunkt: Mittelkymrisch *hanfot*. In Peter Anreiter & Erzsébet Jerem (eds.), *Studia celtica et indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, 453–464. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.
- Schumacher, Stefan. 2004. *Die keltischen Primärverben (Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon)*, unter Mitarbeit von Britta Schulze-Thulin und Caroline aan de Wiel. Innsbruck: Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Sims, Andrea D. 2015. *Inflectional Defectiveness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sims-Williams, Patrick. 1984. The double system of verbal inflexion in Old Irish. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 138–201.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1897. Das Pronomen personale infixum im Altirischen. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 1. 177–231 (= Diss. Freiburg i.Br. 1896).
- Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar. Vol. 1. Syntax and semantics*, 315–344. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Stassen, Leon. 1997. *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stifter, David. 2009. Early Irish. In Martin J. Ball & Nicole Müller (eds.), *The Celtic Languages*, 2nd edition, 55–116. London & New York: Routledge.
- Stifter, David. 2014. The history of the Old Irish preverb *to-*. In Elisa Roma and David Stifter (eds.), *Linguistic and Philological Studies in Early Irish*, 203–246. Lewiston NY & Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Stifter, David. 2015. The Language of the Poems of Blathmac. In Pádraig Ó Riain (ed.), *The Poems of Blathmac Son of Cú Brettan: Reassessments*, 47–103. London: Irish Texts Society.
- Stokes, Whitley (ed.). 1862. *Three Irish glossaries: Cormac's Glossary, O'Davoren's Glossary and a glossary to the Calendar of Oengus the Culdee*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Stokes, Whitley (ed.). 1899. The Bodelian Amra Choluimb chille. *Revue celtique* 20. 30–55, 132–183, 248–289, 400–437 (cf. *Revue Celtique* 21, 1900, 133–136).
- Stokes, Whitley. 1901. Irish Etymologies. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 3. 467–473.
- Stokes, Whitley & John Strachan (eds.). 1901–1903. *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus. A collection of Old Irish glosses, scholia, prose and verse*, (with suppl. by Whitley Stokes). Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Strachan, John. 1898/99. The substantive verb in the Old Irish Glosses. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 1–82.
- Strachan, John. 1900. Infixed *d* in conditional sentences in Old Irish. *Revue Celtique* 21. 412–421.

- Strachan, John. 1901. Irish *no-* in a relative function. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 3. 283–284.
- Strachan, John. 1903. On the language of the Milan glosses. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 4. 48–71.
- Strachan, John. 1904. Atakta. *Ériu* 1. 1–12.
- Strachan, John (ed.). 1944. *Stories from the Táin*. 3rd edn., revised by Osborn Bergin. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Strachan, John. 1949. *Old-Irish Paradigms and Selections from the Old-Irish Glosses*, with notes and vocabulary of John Strachan, 4th edn., revised by Osborn Bergin. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Stüber, Karin. 2009. *Der altirische do-Infinitiv: eine verkannte Kategorie*. Bremen: Hempfen.
- Stump, Gregory T. 2006. Heteroclisys and Paradigm Linkage. *Language* 82(2). 279–322.
- Ternes, Elmar. 1996. Warum erscheinen die keltischen Sprachen so fremdartig? Einige typologische Besonderheiten des Keltischen. In Anders Ahlqvist, Glyn Welden Banks, Riita Latvio, Harri Nyberg & Tom Sjöblom (eds.), *Celtica Helsingiensia. Proceedings from a Symposium on Celtic Studies*, 267–285. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1998. A discourse explanation for the cross-linguistic differences in the grammar of interrogation and negation. In Anna Siewierska & Jae Jung Song (eds.), *Case, Typology and Grammar (In Honor of Barry J. Blake)*, 309–341. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Robert E. Longacre & Shin J. J. Hwang. 2007. Adverbial clauses. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. II: Complex Constructions*, 2nd edn., 237–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1918. Irisches. *Kuhn's Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 48. 48–75.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1930. Aus dem irischesn Recht V. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 18. 353–408.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf (ed.). 1935. *Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf & Rudolf Hertz. 1936. Air. *indaas* 'als er ist'. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 20. 244–261.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1946. *A grammar of Old Irish*. Revised and enlarged edition. Translated from the German by Daniel A. Binchy & Osborn Bergin. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies (reprinted with supplement 1975).
- Traugott, Elisabeth Closs. 2007. Old English left-dislocations: Their structure and information status. *Folia Linguistica* 41(3/4). 405–441.
- van Liere, Frans. 2014. *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vendryes, Joseph. 1905. Mélanges italo-celtiques. *Memoires de la Société Linguistique* 13. 392–408.
- Vendryes, Joseph. 1910. Trois historiettes irlandaises du manuscrit de Paris. *Revue celtique* 31. 300–311.

- Veselinova, Ljuba N. 2006. *Suppletion in Verb Paradigms (Bits and pieces of the puzzle)*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Veselinović, Elvira M. 2003. *Suppletion im irischen Verb*. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.
- Wagner, Heinrich. 1967. Zur unregelmäßigen Wortstellung in der altirischen Alliterationsdichtung. In Wolfgang Meid (ed.), *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie. Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, 289–314. Innsbruck: Sprachwissenschaftliches Institut der Universität Innsbruck.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb. *Celtica* 6. 1–49.
- Watson, J. Carmichael (ed.), 1941. *Mesca Ulad*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 13, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Weigel, William F. 2013. Real data, contrived data and the Yokuts Canon. In Balthasar Bickel, Lenore A. Grenoble, David A. Peterson and Alan Timberlake (eds.), *Language Typology and Historical Contingency (In honor of Johanna Nichols)*, 477–494. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Zaefferer, Dietmar. 1987. Satztypen, Satzarten, Satzmodi – Was Konditionale (auch) mit Interrogativen zu tun haben. In Jörg Meibauer (ed.), *Satzmodus zwischen Grammatik und Pragmatik (Referate anlässlich der 8. Jahrestagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft, Heidelberg 1986)*, 259–285. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ziegler, Sabine. 1994. *Die Sprache der altirischen Ogam-Inschriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs Inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59. 502–513.

Index

A

- absolute ending (see also *inflectional endings*)
– definition of ~ 100–102, 254–255
– distinctiveness of ~s 254–255
Acquaviva, P. 29, 181
Ahlqvist, A. 116, 297, 299, 351
Aikhenvald, A.Y. 29–31, 225
allosentential relation
– general notion of ~ 66–67
– ~ of cleft-sentence with unmarked order 59, 67–68, 118–119, 144–145, 308, 350
– ~ of left dislocation with unmarked order 81–82, 328–332, 338–339, 358–359, 369–370
Altmann, H. 22
ambiguity
– ~ avoidance 55, 113–114, 290, 309, 315–316, 355–356
– graphic ~ of the Old Irish spelling 18–19, 48–50
analogy 104, 133, 144–145, 208–209, 209–210, 282, 305, 310–311, 349–351
Anderson, S.R. 57–58
argument structure
– preferred ~ 145–146
– preferred pronominal ~ 145–147, 186, 242, 272
Armenian (Old)
– copula and inflectional endings in ~ 300–301
Arrernte (Eastern / Central)
– lexical compounds in ~ 56
assertiveness 174 (see also *cleft-sentence*)
Auer, P. 174
Austin, J.L. v, 21

B

- Baudiš, J. 187, 294, 297
Bauer, B. 8
Baerman, M. 227
Bergin, O. 83–94, 191
Bergin's Law 46–47, 83–94, 191, 233
Bhat, D.N.S. 251
Bickel, B. 29, 53
Bisagni, J. 303
Bisang, W. 258
Bonami, O. 109
Breatnach, L. 36, 52, 108–113, 217, 336, 340, 343–344, 355–357
Brown, D. 227
Bruil, M. 26
Bybee, J.L. 35, 241, 256

C

- Campbell, L. 251
causal (subordinate clause)
– ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
– ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 169–170, 176–177
– ~ conjunction with relative clause type form 166, 176–178, 182, 185–186
clause subordination (see also *subordinating conjunctions, conjunct particles, relative, final, complement, temporal, causal, manner*)
– definition of ~ 174
– formal marking of ~ 151–152, 173, 278, 346–351, 352–353, 354–355
– gradational character of ~ 173–175, 183–185
– ~ and clause typing 23–25, 172–177, 206–209, 251, 264, 368–369
– ~ and mood 177–180, 346–351
– ~ and left-dislocation 183–184
– ~ and non-finite forms 187–188

- clause typing (in Old Irish) (see also *illo-cutionary force, declarative, relative, wh-interrogative, polar interrogative, responsive, imperative*)
- definition of ~ 21–23
 - morphological strategies of ~ 238–240, 364–366
 - position of ~ markers 240–243, 362–364
 - paradigmatic design of ~ 143, 226, 243–250, 265–267, 283, 286, 296, 356, 364–367
 - ~ and predicate types 24, 145–147, 266–273, 325–326, 370–371
 - ~ and pragmatic structures 23–24, 325–326, 369–370
 - ~ and clause subordination 23–24, 172–177, 206–209, 251, 264, 368–369
 - ~ and mood 102, 162–165, 167–168, 171–172, 177–181, 346–351
 - ~ and negation 242–243, 256
 - ~ and person 141–147, 242, 371–372
- cleft-sentence (in Old Irish)
- function of the ~ 66
 - assertive value of the ~ 176–177
 - clause type marking in the ~ 129–132, 208–209, 251, 277, 292, 293–294, 350
 - allotential relation of the ~ with normal order 59, 67–68, 118–119, 144–145, 308, 350
 - ~ with focused verbal noun 69–70, 181
 - ~ with focused adverb 69–70, 75, 181, 208–209, 279–280, 308
 - ~ with focused subject and object 67–69, 73, 129–132, 144–145, 317
 - ~ with focused prepositional phrase 69, 73–75, 76, 288
 - ~ and *wh*-question 205–206, 253, 291, 330–332
 - ~ and referential non-verbal predicate 326–328, 330–332
 - ~ and the passive paradigm 118–119, 131, 144
 - combination of the ~ with left-dislocation 80–81
 - combination of two ~s 280
- cohesion
- paradigmatic ~ of clause typing 227, 250–252, 259, 260, 356, 367
- cohesiveness
- syntagmatic ~ of the verbal complex 30, 63, 94, 191, 364–366
- Collins, P.C. 180, 231
- comparative construction 161, 278–279
- complement (subordinate clause)
- ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175, 188
 - ~ in the present indicative of the substantive verb 267–273, 273–275, 284, 296, 352–353
 - formal marking of ~ 52, 128–129, 155, 156–157, 160–161, 164, 171, 185–186, 188
- concessive (subordinate clause)
- ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
 - ~ conjunction with copula 298–300, 346–351
 - ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 171–172, 180, 192
 - ~ conjunction with relative clause type form 167–168, 180, 346–351
 - ~ conjunction with substantive verb 273–274, 346–351
- conditional (subordinate clause)
- ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
 - ~ conjunction combined with conjunct particle(s) 163–164
 - ~ conjunction with copula 298–300, 346–351
 - ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 171–172, 180
 - ~ conjunction with relative clause type form 167–168, 180, 346–351
 - ~ conjunction with substantive verb 273–274, 346–351
 - conjunct particle used to mark ~ 160
 - imperative clause type as a ~ protasis 225–226
 - responsive clause type as the apodosis of a ~ 225–226

conjunct endings (see also *inflectional endings*)

- definition of ~ 100–102, 258
- distinctiveness of ~s 254–255

conjunct particle (in Old Irish)

- functional profile of ~s 35–37
- position of ~s in the verbal complex 14–15, 32, 40–41, 42, 45–47, 51, 55, 164, 238–239
- affixal character of ~s 55–60
- combinatorial possibilities of ~ 61–62, 157–158
- oblique relative ~ -(s)a^N 75–76, 127, 128, 131, 134, 157–160, 297–298
- negative declarative ~s 36, 138–139, 162–163, 295, 297, 301, 309–310
- negative polar interrogative ~s 36, 212–213, 253, 257, 292–294, 297
- negative relative ~s 36, 53, 126, 138–140, 157–158
- positive polar interrogative ~s 36, 212–213, 241, 292, 296, 297
- subordinating ~ 160–162, 272, 297–298, 311, 349–350
- *wh*-interrogative ~s 195–198, 199–202
- ~ *no*- 37, 102, 103, 105, 109, 113, 115, 141, 167, 217
- ~s and copula 297–298, 301, 309–310, 347–351
- position of ~s in tmesis 84–86

consecutive (subordinate clause) (see *final*)

continuum (see also *subordinate clause*)

- coordination-subordination ~ 174
- inflection-derivation ~ 35, 56, 236
- morphology-syntax ~ 56

copula (in Old Irish)

- the paradigm of the present indicative of the ~ 285–286
- suppletion in the present indicative of the ~ 289, 294–297, 297–298, 307–309
- special ~ form with some conjunctions 297–298, 298–300, 311, 346–351
- ~ and affixal pronouns 285–286, 289–290, 290–291

- ~ and conjunct particles 309–311, 348–351
- *wh*-interrogative clause type expression of the ~ 291, 329–330
- ~ introducing attributive non-verbal predicate 287–289, 318–319
- ~ introducing referential non-verbal predicate 318–319
- ~ and other verbs 295–297, 302–303, 307–309, 310–311, 348–351
- ~ use in the cleft-sentence 70–73, 176–177, 350

Corbett, G. G. 42, 227, 297, 305

correlative construction 74

Corthals, J. 86, 91

Cowgill, W. 110, 233

Cristofaro, S. 25, 173, 175

Croft, W. 173, 242, 250, 256, 291

Cruse, A. 250, 256

Crysmann, B. 109

Cysouw, M. 201

D

Dahl, Ö. 56–59

deadjectival preverb (in Old Irish)

- form and meaning of the ~s 39–40
- position of the ~ in the verbal complex 40–41
- ~ with infixed pronoun 52
- affixal character of the ~s 55–60
- combination of ~ with other preverbal element 40–41, 62

declarative clause type (Old Irish) (see also *clause typing*)

- functional definition of the ~ 25–26
- formal marking of the ~ 103–107, 109, 115–120, 121–122, 123–127, 134–138, 267–269, 274–275, 275–276, 299–300, 355–357
- paradigmatic relations of the ~ with other clause types 250–252
- ~ in subordinated clauses 168–172, 175
- ~ in post-focus verb of cleft-sentences 73–75, 76–77
- variation of the ~ with relative clause type 154–156, 175–180

defectiveness 103, 191, 223, 225, 252–254, 260, 267, 296, 367

dependent vs independent (see also *prototonic*, *deuterotonic*, *absolute*, *conjunct*)

- morphological character of the ~ opposition 45–47, 84, 93–94, 100–101, 148, 174, 191, 213, 218–219, 233–234, 252, 313
- use of dependent forms with relative meaning 152–154, 258–259

deponent verbs (in Old Irish) 119–120

deuterotonic (see also *prototonic*)

- formal description of the ~ structure 33, 40–44, 45–46
- ~ vs prototonic 14, 40–44, 56, 216–217, 238–240, 244–245, 249, 363, 365
- ~ boundary 44–45, 63, 354
- ~ and the notion of morphological (in)dependency 47, 219
- ~ form expressing declarative and relative clause types 45–46, 99, 101, 123, 141, 154–165, 241
- ~ form expressing imperative clause type 213, 217

Devine, A.M. 26

Diessel, H. 183, 194

Dik, S. 25, 66, 75, 205, 209

DIL 191, 192, 285

Dixon, R.M.W. 29–31

Draak, M. 222, 223, 225

Dryer, M.S. 23–24, 262–263

Du Bois, J.W. 114, 145–146

Dutch

- V2 order in ~ 25–26

E

economy 113–114

Ecuadorian Siona

- morphological marking of clause typing in ~ 26

Egyptian

- ~ emphatic verbal form 234–235

elision 43, 53–54, 158, 307, 363–364

English (Modern)

- omission of complementizer *that* in ~ 179
- negative imperative in in ~ 256
- referential non-verbal predicate in ~ 325–326

Enrique-Arias, A. 113–114

Eriksen, P.K. 292

Erteshik-Shir, N. 183, 253,

Eska, J.F. 90–91, 222, 223

ex-deponent verbs (in Old Irish) (see *deponent verbs*)

experiencer 290–291

externalization

- ~ of conjunct particle *ro* 14–15, 61, 164, 309

F

Feuth, E. 48

figura etymologica 69–70, 129

final (subordinate clause)

- conjunct particle used to express ~ 160–161
- ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 160
- ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
- ~ conjunction with copula 297–298, 311, 346–351
- ~ conjunction with substantive verb 272, 311, 346–351

finiteness (see also *non-finite forms*) 258

Finnish

- responsive form in ~ 294

Foley, W.A. 78, 119

French

- Canadian ~ use of *voilà!* 305

G

García-Castillero, C. 10, 14, 31, 39, 43, 52, 58, 62, 70, 118, 120, 152–153, 157, 164, 183, 209, 237, 303, 317, 354–355, 356

Gascon

- enunciative *que* in ~ 26

Geist, L. 319

- Genee, I. 155
- German
- omission of *dass* in ~ 179
 - V2 order in ~ 25–26, 174
- grammatical category
- ~s in the Old Irish verbal complex 236–241
- grammatical word (see *verbal complex*)
- grammaticalization
- ~ of lexical preverb as marker of perfectivity and potentiality 35–36, 46
 - ~ of lexical preverb as marker of reciprocity 35–36
 - ~ of a noun as a subordinating conjunction 50, 165–166, 185–186, 195–196
 - ~ of oblique relative clause type marker as a subordinating marker 58, 160–161
 - ~ of locative copula to express possession 114
 - ~ of locative copula to express the Standard NP comparison 276, 278–279
 - ~ of locative copula as attributive copula 309
 - partial ~ of tonic pronoun in referential non-verbal predicates 333
 - ~ of affixal pronoun as attributive copula 311
 - ~ of the verb ‘to see’ as the locative copula 305–306
 - ~ of nasalizing mutation as a relative marker 182–185
 - ~ of a demonstrative as a relative marker 157, 183
- Green, G. 175
- Greene, D. 84–87, 188, 215, 220, 222
- Greenlandic Eskimo
- morphological marking of clause typing in ~ 26
- Griffith, A. 8, 32, 57, 111, 315

H

- Harris, A.C. 251
- Haspelmath, M. 42, 59, 112, 146, 225, 250, 253

- headless (see *relative clause type*)
- Henderson, J. 56
- Hengeveld, K. 21, 25, 174, 250–251, 262–263, 283, 300, 301, 304
- Henry, P.L. 91, 205, 243
- Hentschel, E. 22
- Hertz, R. 168
- heteroclisis (see *mixed paradigm*)
- Hofman, R. 6–7, 8, 26
- Hopper, P.J. 251
- Huddleston, R.D. 25
- Hull, V. 267–268
- Hungarian
- ~ synthetic vs periphrastic 111
- Hwang, S.J.J. 174–175, 183

I

- iconicity 113–114, 154, 174
- illocutionary force 21–23, 25–26, 146, 223, 228, 236–237, 250–251, 255, 256, 258–259
- imperative clause type (Old Irish) (see also *clause typing*)
- function of the ~ 22, 25, 242
 - morphology of the ~ 37, 46, 55, 109–110, 216–219, 223, 238–239, 246, 261, 264–265, 286, 289
 - ~ plus infix pronoun 217–218
 - paradigmatic relations of the ~ with other clause types 226–227, 246–248, 250–252, 257–259, 305
 - relation of the ~ with person 146, 223–225
 - ~ as a conditional protasis 225–226
- imperative endings (see *inflectional endings*)
- Indo-European
- morphological configuration of the ~ verb 26, 28, 361, 366
 - ~ interrogative pronouns 210
 - functional profile of the ~ verb ‘to be’ 304
 - function of Proto-~ particle **de* 307, 352
 - Proto-~ form **swō* 299
 - Proto-~ root **bhuh₂-* 303
 - Proto-~ root **h₁es-* 303, 307, 310

- Proto-~ root **steh₂*- 304
- Proto-~ suffix **-tyo-* 187
- inflectional endings
- absolute declarative active ~ 10, 100–102, 103–105, 121–122, 141–143, 254–255
- absolute declarative deponent ~ 33, 119–120, 141–143
- absolute declarative passive ~ 115–116, 118, 141–143
- absolute relative active ~ 100–102, 103–105, 122–123 141–143, 254–255, 305
- absolute relative deponent ~ 119–120, 141–143
- absolute relative passive ~ 86, 115–116, 118, 141–143
- conjunct active ~ 60, 100–101, 103–105, 212, 216, 220, 141–143, 238, 254–255
- conjunct deponent ~ 119–120, 212, 216, 220, 141–143
- conjunct passive ~ 86, 115–116, 118, 141–143, 212, 216, 220
- imperative ~ 60, 216, 239, 254–255
- position of the ~ in the verbal complex 32, 60, 104, 238, 239
- Irslinger, B. 113
- Isaac, G.R. 66, 91, 223, 234–235, 322
- Italian
- omission of complementizer *che* in ~ 179

J

- Jary, M. 225
- Jones, B.M. 220, 223, 293, 294
- Joseph, B.D. 362
- Justus, C. 223

K

- Karlsson, F. 253
- Kaufmann, M. 25
- Kavanagh, S. 8, 191, 191, 199, 268, 290, 291, 352, 357
- Kelly, F. 84–87
- Kelly, P. 88–89

- Kim, R.I. 42
- Kissine, M. 225
- Koch, J.T. 29, 234
- König, E. 25–26
- Kortlandt, F. 307

L

- Lambert, P.-Y. 36, 129–132, 183
- Lambrecht, K. 66, 67, 77, 105, 205, 317, 324, 335–336
- Lang, E. 25
- LaPolla, R. 25, 66, 205, 236–237
- Lash, E. 58, 289, 301, 303, 353
- Laughren, M. 253
- Latin
- ~ influence in the language of the Glosses 26–27
- ~ model for the literary texts 90–91
- interaction of ~ with Old Irish 7, 195
- ~ deponent verbs 119
- ~ absolute constructions 187–188
- Lee, F. 205
- left-dislocation (Old Irish) (see also *Old English*)
- function of ~ 77
- ~ with dislocated subject and object 77–81, 338–340, 355
- relation of ~ with *wh*-question 207–209, 330–332
- relation of ~ with referential non-verbal predicate 323–325
- relation of ~ with clause subordination 183–184, 207–209
- allosentential relation of ~ with normal order 81–82, 323–325, 328–332
- combination of ~ with cleft-sentence 80–81
- Lehmann, Ch. 25, 69, 132, 251
- lexical preverb
- form and meaning of the ~s 37–39, 237, 308
- position of the ~ in the verbal complex 32, 40–44, 58, 61–62, 240
- affixal character of the ~ 56
- combination of ~s with affixal pronouns 52–55, 136

- ~ in tmesis 84
- grammaticalized use of ~s 14–15, 35–36, 46
- Lewis, W.J. 31
- light head 59, 82, 132, 133, 154, 162, 183, 188, 194–195, 202, 328
- Longacre, R.E. 174–175, 183
- Lucht, I. 336–340
- Lyons, J. 23

M

- Mac Cana, P. 75, 324
- Mac Coisdealbha, P. 7, 66, 70, 71, 75, 77–78, 91, 118, 205, 287, 297, 316, 319, 329, 353
- Mackenzie, J.L. 21
- manner (subordinate clause)
 - ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
 - ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 170, 177–180
 - ~ conjunction with relative clause type form 166, 176–178, 182, 185–186, 207–208, 273, 341–346, 352–353
- Matthiessen, Ch.M.I.M. 21
- McCone, K. vi, 9, 15, 29, 31, 45, 46, 47, 91, 104, 108, 109, 113, 122, 128–130, 133, 182, 216, 232, 234, 288, 290, 307, 310, 355, 357
- McConvell, P. 235
- McQuillan, P. 22, 155, 160, 171, 216
- Meid, W. 10, 100
- Miestamo, M. 46, 242, 257–259, 271
- Migdalski, K. 174
- mixed paradigm
 - instances of ~ 103, 110, 116, 142–145, 247–248, 260, 270, 295, 367
 - ~ as heteroclitisis 103, 367
 - ~ and suppletion 296
 - ~ and cleft-sentence 118, 142–145, 370
- mood 167, 169, 177–178, 180, 237–239, 274, 299, 346–351
- Moran, P. 8
- Morin, Y.-C. 305

- morpheme (see *elision, mutation, port-manteau morpheme, position morpheme, mutation, replacement, subtractive morpheme, zero morpheme*)
- morphosyntactic word (see *verbal complex*)
- mutations (see also *relative lenition, relative nasalization*)
 - phonological expression of ~ 18
 - morphological use of ~ 48–51, 53–55
- Myhill, J. 187
- Mylne, T. 253

N

- negative polarity
 - affixal character of the markers of ~ 56–60
 - asymmetry of ~ 257–259
 - combination of ~ with affixal pronouns 55, 138–140, 218
 - combination of ~ with other conjunct particles 61–62, 160–161, 163–165, 210
 - diachronic relevance of ~ 305, 309–310, 349–351
 - formal expression of ~ and the copula 292, 294–297, 309–310
 - illocutionary force and ~ 256–257
 - lack of verbal complex expressing wh-question and ~ 210, 253
 - marking of ~ in the verbal complex 35–36, 41, 42, 126, 148, 156–157, 214–215, 217–219, 221–222, 226, 238–239, 241–243, 264–267, 270–272, 283
 - ~ and aspect 46
 - ~ and non-verbal predicates 272, 279
 - paradigmatic inclusion of ~ 242
- Nichols, J. 29, 53
- non-finite forms (see *clause subordination*)
- non-verbal predicate
 - classification of ~s 262–263
 - attributive ~ 278–282, 287–289, 318–319

- locative and existential ~ 267–275, 276–277
- locative and existential ~ expressing possession 275–276
- referential ~ 318–333
- interaction of ~ with clause typing 266–273, 325–326, 370–371
- Nordström, J. 178–180, 225–226
- noun (subordinate clause) (see *complement*)
- O**
- Ó hUiginn, R. 74, 133, 139, 155, 160, 165, 166, 171, 174, 176–180, 281
- Ó Máille, T. 198, 282, 286
- O’Brien, M.A. 88
- Old English
 - left-dislocation in ~ 77
- Old Irish Glosses
 - editorial procedure for the ~ 6–8, 20–21, 154, 160, 170, 307–308
 - graphical variation in the ~ 17–21, 33–35, 48–50, 154, 307–308
 - historical and cultural context of the ~ 4–5
 - interaction of the ~ with the Latin text 7–8, 11–13, 26–27, 74, 80, 187–188, 195, 268, 280, 281, 290, 316, 318–325, 327–328, 346
 - linguistic variation in the ~ 13–15, 42–44, 104, 128–132, 133, 136–138, 139–140
 - spontaneous character of the ~ 15
 - textual evidence and philological work on the ~ 6–8, 20–21
 - use of the ~ 6, 11–13, 186–188
- Old Irish phonology 15–17
- P**
- paradigm split 211, 304, 312
- parataxis 173–174, 180
- Pasch, R. 25
- passive verbs
 - formal distinction of ~ from deponent verbs 119–120
 - impersonal use of ~ 264
 - inflectional endings of ~ 116–119, 141–143, 216
 - paradigmatic constituency of ~ 115–119, 143–145, 237–238, 248–250, 257–259, 269–270, 283, 290, 295, 306, 313
 - ~ and cleft-sentence 118–119, 131, 144
 - ~ and the notion of morphosyntactic or grammatical word in Old Irish 30–31
- Pedersen, H. 129, 153, 191, 216, 220, 268, 355
- Pensalfini, R. 253
- periphrasis (see *verbal complex*)
- person (see *inflectional ending, pronominal affix*)
- polar interrogative clause type (Old Irish) (see also *clause typing*)
 - morphology of the ~ 36, 213–215, 241
 - negative ~ plus infix pronoun 215, 247
 - paradigmatic relations of the ~ with other clause types 226–227, 250–252, 257–259, 306–309
 - syntagmatic relation of the ~ with the responsive clause type 220–222, 224, 226, 292–294
 - ~ of the present indicative of the copula 292–294
- Poppe, E. 66, 183
- portmanteau morpheme 57, 142, 241–242, 255, 259, 363
- Portner, P. 22
- position morpheme 109, 364
- pronominal affix (in Old Irish) (see also *pronominal suffix*)
 - obligatory character of the ~ 29–31, 334–336
 - morphology of the ~s 14, 52–55, 138–140
 - location of the ~ in the verbal complex 33, 141–143, 241
 - paradigm ascription of the ~ 143–145, 215, 242–245, 247, 252–253
 - syntactic function of the ~s 115–119, 272, 275, 283, 334–336
 - ~ and clause typing 145–147, 242, 371–372

- ~ as declarative clause type marker 107–109, 134–138, 336–340, 355–357
 - ~ as relative clause type marker 134–138, 167–168, 180, 341–355
 - ~ and the copula 286, 289–291, 295, 311, 349–351
 - pronominal suffix (see also *pronominal affix*)
 - combinatorial limitation of ~s 61, 107–112, 113–114, 143–145, 274
 - declarative clause type character of ~s 87–88, 107, 147, 217, 238, 252
 - prototonic (see also *deutero tonic*)
 - formal description of the ~ structure 40–44, 45–46
 - morphological opposition ~ vs deutero tonic 14, 40–44, 56, 216–217, 238–240, 244–245, 249, 363, 365
 - ~ and the notion of morphological (in)dependency 47, 219
 - ~ form expressing imperative and responsive clause type forms 46–47, 216, 219, 220
 - ~ form expressing relative clause type 46–47, 151–154
 - ~ form expressing declarative clause type 14, 43, 46
 - Pullum, G.K. 56–59
 - Pusch, C.D. 26, 66
- Q**
- Quin, E.G. 48, 78, 204
- R**
- Rehbock, H. 26
- relative clause type (see also *relative lenition*, *relative nasalization*, *clause typing*)
- functional definition of the ~ 25, 127–132
 - formal marking of the ~ 103–107, 115–120, 122–123, 123–133, 134–140, 152–154, 156–160, 267–269, 276–279, 294–299, 354–355
 - ~ in subordinated clauses 167–168, 341–353, 354–355
 - variation of the ~ with declarative clause type 154–156, 175–180
 - ~ in post-focus verb of cleft-sentences 73–76, 208–209
 - ~ with m./f. sg. antecedent in O NP_{rel} function 129–132, 181, 185–186
 - ~ with m./f. sg. antecedent in S NP_{rel} function 127–129
 - ~ with n. sg. antecedent in S/O NP_{rel} function 127–129
 - ~ with pl. antecedent 131
 - ~ with antecedent in oblique NP_{rel} function 127–128, 157–160, 181–182, 183–185, 194, 201–203, 206–207
 - ~ with antecedent in genitive NP_{rel} function 128
 - headless ~ 128, 161–162, 327
 - tautophrasal ~ 75–76, 130–131, 133, 148, 155, 158–159, 181–182, 183–186, 203, 206–209
 - paradigmatic relations of the ~ with other clause types 250–252
 - paradigmatic relations of the ~s 129, 206–209
- relative lenition (see also *relative clause type*)
- phonological expression of ~ 18
 - morphological use of ~ 47–51, 123–127, 133, 154–155, 238–243
 - syntactic use of ~ 73–76, 127–132
 - alternation of ~ with relative nasalization 129–132
- relative mutations (see *relative lenition*, *relative nasalization*)
- relative nasalization (see also *relative clause type*)
- phonological expression of ~ 48
 - morphological use of ~ 47–51, 123–134, 154–155, 165–166, 177–182, 208–209, 238–243
 - syntactic use of ~ 129–132, 181–183
 - alternation of ~ with declarative morphology 175–180

- alternation of ~ with relative lenition 129–132
 - diachronic origin of ~ 182–186
 - relevance
 - semantic ~ in morphology 241, 256
 - Q-N hypothesis and ~ 256
 - ~ of illocutionary force with respect to polarity 256
 - ~ of illocutionary force with respect to person 242–243
 - replacement 53–54
 - responsive clause type (Old Irish) (see also *clause typing*)
 - morphology of the ~ 220–223, 241
 - expression of the ~ in the present indicative of the copula 292–294
 - functions of the ~ 223–226
 - paradigmatic relations of the ~ with other clause types 226–227, 250–252, 257–259
 - ~ as a conditional apodosis 225–226
 - syntagmatic relation of the ~ with the polar interrogative clause type 220–222, 224, 226
 - Roma, E. 48, 304, 316, 329
 - Roulet, E. 223
 - Russell, P. 17, 27, 90, 235
- S**
- Sadock, J.M. 25, 231
 - Sanfelici, E. 187
 - Sasse, H.-J. 213
 - Schrijver, P. 232, 307, 310, 351
 - Schumacher, S. 232, 277, 289, 295, 304–306, 307, 310, 311, 312
 - Searle, J. 21
 - semantic map 232, 250, 260, 262, 367
 - Siemund, P. 25–26
 - Sims, A.D. 42, 225, 250, 253
 - Sims-Williams, P. 223, 233–234
 - Sommer, F. 52, 134, 340, 346, 352, 354
 - Spanish
 - prohibitive clauses in ~ 242
 - locative copula in ~ 304
 - Speas, P. 21
 - Stassen, L. 262, 328
 - Stephens, L.D. 26
 - Stifter, D. 8, 15, 308
 - Stokes, W. 8, 19, 50, 80, 89, 103, 138, 154, 160, 170, 192
 - Stump, G.G. 101
 - Strachan, J. 8, 19, 50, 74, 80, 89, 103, 138, 154, 160, 169, 170, 176, 192, 220, 253, 264, 268, 286, 288, 290, 295, 296, 297, 346, 352, 355
 - stressed pronouns (see *tonic pronouns*)
 - Stüber, K. 187
 - subordinating conjunct particles (see *conjunct particle*)
 - subordinating conjunction
 - clause type morphology variation after ~s 175–181, 181–186, 346–351
 - combination of ~s with conjunct particles 162–164, 269, 273, 280
 - relative clause type after ~s 128, 165–168
 - declarative clause type after ~s 168–172, 174
 - mutation effects of ~s 51, 133
 - present indicative of the copula and ~ 298–299, 300, 311, 349–351
 - variation of ~ and conjunct particle 160
 - *wh*-questions and ~s 208–209
 - substantive verb (in Old Irish)
 - paradigm of the present indicative of the ~ 265
 - suppletion in the present indicative of the ~ 267–273, 304–307
 - ~ expressing locative non-verbal predicate 267–270, 277
 - ~ expressing existential predicate 270–272, 274–275
 - ~ in conditional clauses 273
 - ~ expressing possession 275–276
 - ~ with the lexicalized meaning ‘to be vexed’ 277–278
 - ~ in the comparative construction 278–278
 - ~ as a surrogate form of the copula 279–282
 - relation of the ~ with the copula 295–297, 302–303, 307–309, 310–311
 - subtractive morpheme 226, 252

suppletion

- prototonic vs deuterotonic as partial ~ 42
- ~ between copula and substantive verb 279–280, 303, 307–309
- ~ in the expression of clause types 63, 216, 238, 267–273, 285–286, 292–300, 363, 304–306, 307–312, 370–371
- ~ in the paradigm of the present indicative of the copula 285–286, 292–300, 307–312
- ~ in the paradigm of the present indicative of the substantive verb 267–273, 304–306

Swedish

- omission of complementizer *att* in ~ 179
- syncretism 104, 225, 227, 228, 254–256, 260, 367

T

tautophrasal (see *relative clause type*)

temporal (subordinate clause)

- conjunct particle marking ~ 173
- ~ among other subordinate clauses 172–175
- ~ conjunction combined with conjunct particle(s) 162–163
- ~ conjunction with declarative clause type form 170–171
- ~ conjunction with relative clause type form 165–166, 182–185, 207–208, 341–346, 352–353

Tenny, C. 21

tense 61, 102, 237, 239, 241

Ternes, E. 243

thetic vs categorial 26, 213, 227–228, 251

Thompson, S.A. 174–175, 183, 256

Thurneysen, R. 6, 9, 21, 88, 101, 104, 107, 129, 133, 139, 153, 160, 161, 162, 168, 171, 176, 181, 183, 191, 192, 195, 199, 200, 216, 220, 252, 268–269, 277, 280, 281, 285, 286, 290, 295, 297, 299, 308, 316, 340, 341, 346

tonic pronouns (in Old Irish)

- forms of ~s 68–69

- pragmatic use of ~s 289, 317–318
 - ~s in cleft-sentence 68–69, 71, 130, 293–294
 - ~s in *wh*-questions 198–199, 201, 209–210
 - ~s in referential non-verbal predicates 318–333
- Traugott, E.C. 77, 251

V

van Liere, F. 4

Van Valin, R.D.Jr. 21, 23, 25, 66, 205, 236–237

Vendryes, J. 190, 203

verbal complex (in Old Irish)

- copular predicate as a ~ 285–287
 - competing strategies in the ~ 113–114, 151–152, 278–279
 - grammatical categories expressed in the ~ 236–238
 - periphrasis and ~ 192–195, 200–203, 215, 253
 - syntactic position of the ~ 65, 83–94
 - template of the ~ 31–33, 60–62, 141–143, 238–241
 - tmesis of the ~ 83–92
 - topology of the ~ 32, 240–241
 - ~ as a morphosyntactic or grammatical word 29–31, 55–60, 111–112
- Veselinova, L. 262, 308
- Veselinović, E. 198, 220, 261, 268, 297, 353

W

Wagner, H. 85, 91

Watkins, C. 103, 183, 220

Weigel, W.F. 21

Welsh

- Middle ~ temporal clause 183
 - ~ responsive clause type 25, 220, 223, 293
 - ~ *dawr* ‘it matters’ 277
 - ~ *gwelet* ‘to see’ 305
- wh*-interrogative clause type (in Old Irish)
- formal marking of the ~ 191–192, 205

- lack of negative ~ in the verbal complex
210, 253
- paradigmatic relations of the ~ with
other clause types 250–252
- relation of ~ with referential non-verbal
predicate 330–332
- ~ in the present indicative of the copula
291
- relation of ~ with cleft-sentence 205–
206

Z

Zaefferer, D. 22

zero morpheme 216, 271, 297, 364

Zwicky, A.M. 25, 56–59, 231

