

*Nominal Syntax in the Medieval and Early Modern Celtic Languages*

Room: SPW 0.108 (Jacob-Grimm-Haus)

Friday 27.10.2023

9:00-9:45

Mícheál Hoyne (Remote)

Accusative for nominative in Middle and Early Modern Irish

9:45-10:30

Elisa Roma

Differential case marking in Old Irish: Nominal and pronominal arguments and valency reduction and expansion constructions

10:30 - 11:00

Coffee Break

11:00-11:45

Joseph Simpson

Agreement and personal pronouns in the diachrony of Irish

11:45-12:30

Fangzhe Qiu

The syntactic positions of Old Irish preverbs (part 2)

12:30-14:00      Lunch Break

14:00-14:45

To Be Confirmed

The order of multiple adjectives in Old Irish

14:45-15:30

Elliott Lash

Adnominal pronoun constructions in Old Irish

15:30-16:15

Ranko Matasovic

Possessive Agreement in Insular Celtic

16:15 - 16:45

Coffee Break

16:45-17:30

Raphael Sackmann

Out of scope? - Indefinite nominal subjects and objects preceding the negative marker in Middle Welsh

17:30-18:15

David Willis, Marieke Meelen, and Mark Darling (Remote)

The diachrony of Celtic subject pronouns

Saturday 28.10.2023

Note that coffee/tea and refreshments will be available throughout this part of the workshop.

9:00-10:00

Short introduction on the use of phrase structure parsed corpora for Celtic Languages (Hosted by David Willis & Marieke Meelen with Introduction by Elliott Lash)

10:00-10:45

Carlos García-Castillero

Isolated light-headed NPs in the Old Irish Glosses

10:45-11:30

David Stifter (Remote)

Observations on the use of attention markers in *Comrac Líadaine 7 Chuirithir*

11:30-12:15

Aaron Griffith

On the etymology of Old Irish *ocus* 'and'

Accusative for nominative in Middle and Early Modern Irish

Mícheál Hoyne

Department of Irish and Celtic Languages, Trinity College Dublin

One of the major concerns of the vernacular grammarians of the Early Modern Irish period (1200–1650) was to stem the tide of case syncretism in high-register texts. Among other things, they worked – with great success – to maintain distinctive accusative marking of direct objects in the work of professional poets, both in the morphology of the noun itself and in the accompanying initial mutations, this despite the loss of such case distinctions in the ordinary language: the unauthorised use of the nominative in place of the accusative as direct object was classified as *ainréim*, the fault of ‘non-inflection’, illustrated by ‘faulty’ *do-uarais bean* ‘you found a woman’ (with nominative *bean*) in place of ‘correct’ *do-uarais mnaí* (with accusative *mnaí*) (Bergin 1955, §16).

Curiously, in our earliest grammatical tract (no later than the mid-fourteenth century), we also find the opposite condemned: *réim i n-ionadh anma* ‘an inflected form in place of nominative’ (Bergin 1955, §19). The example given is *Táinig mnaí* ‘A woman came’ for expected *Táinig bean*. *Réim i n-ionadh anma* was not a figment of the Bardic grammarian’s imagination: examples are found occasionally in Middle and Early Modern Irish texts. Sticking with *ben* ‘woman’, for instance, we find *ní tháinig i talmhain mnaí bud ferr delb ná tuaruscbáil inás í* (Nic Dhonnchadha 1964, §16), ‘never on earth has there come a woman better in shape and appearance’ (Stokes 1902, 407) and *ba terc for bith mnaí a samail*, ‘scarcely was there to be found her equal in the world’ (Atkinson 1887, l. 830). In both of these examples (with the verb *tic* ‘comes’ and the copula) we would expect nominative *ben* in subject position. For the same phenomenon only visible in the initial mutation, note *rob áilgen trá in mbolad-sin* ‘That perfume was delicious’ (Atkinson 1887, l. 1590), for expected nominative *in bolad-sin*.

One could chalk up the occasional unexpected use of the accusative to crude hypercorrection (in an attempt to preserve accusative inflection of the noun, it may occasionally have been overextended). In the examples I have collected so far, however, unexpected accusative forms as nominatives tend to occur in specific syntactical environments (e.g. with the verb *tic* ‘comes’ and the copula, as above). I suspect a more subtle explanation of *réim i n-ionadh anma* is required, connected with developments elsewhere in the grammar of the language (in particular, the pronominal system), as I hope to show at this workshop.

Atkinson, R., 1887: *The passions and homilies from the Leabhar Breac*. Dublin.

Bergin, O., 1955: 'Irish Grammatical Tracts V (Metrical Faults)', supplement to *Ériu* 17.

Nic Dhonnchadha, L., 1964: *Aided Muirchertaig Meic Erca*. Dublin.

Stokes, W., 1902: 'The death of Muirchertach mac Erca', *RC* 23, 395–437.

Differential case marking in Old Irish:  
 Nominal and pronominal arguments  
 and valency reduction and expansion constructions  
 Elisa Roma  
 University of Pavia

It is well known that Old Irish treats nominal and pronominal arguments in divergent ways. In particular, nominative and accusative are not inflectional categories for lexical pronouns. This also holds for the dative, which is not generally an argumental case on its own, i.e. without a pronominal flag, and the genitive case, which marks only arguments of non-finite verbal forms (Roma 2021). Moreover, argument marking with the passive voice is split, as deictic persons (Speech Act Participants) pattern with active second arguments (object pronominal indexes), while third persons (non-Speech Act Participants) pattern with first arguments (subject pronominal indexes). Cross-linguistically, this classifies the Old Irish person category as mostly inflectional rather than lexical, according to the typology set out in Nichols (2017).

However, there are also less frequent or evident constructions where the divergent behaviour of nominal and pronominal arguments surfaces. As shown in Roma (2021), verbs which do not usually govern an accusative argument, i.e. intransitive verbs, can occur with referential pronominal direct objects (infix pronouns) and, in a parallel way, their verbal nouns can have genitive pronominal arguments that correspond to the second argument (e.g. the goal with motion verbs) rather than the first (e.g. the goer with motion verbs), see examples (1) and (2) respectively. Conversely, if verbal nouns of transitive verbs govern a genitive argument that corresponds to the subject in the active form, that is likely to be a pronominal argument, i.e. a possessive, as in (3).

- |   |                 |               |                |               |
|---|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1   | <i>amal</i>     | <i>núntet</i> | <i>cách</i>    |               |
| `as each one goes to it'                  |                 |               |                | MI 77a14      |
|   |                 |               |                |               |
| 2   | <i>ma adced</i> | <i>torbe</i>  | <i>inna</i>    | <i>thecht</i> |
| `if you should see profit in going to it' |                 |               |                | Wb 11b22      |
|   |                 |               |                |               |
| 3   | <i>a</i>        | <i>epert</i>  | <i>cluinte</i> |               |
| `his saying: hear!'                       |                 |               |                | MI 136a10     |

Object infixes can also be used with intransitive verbs in verb anaphora constructions, as shown in Roma (2018).

In this paper I will tackle this issue from the point of view of verb valency, first assessing Old Irish basic valency orientation, along the lines of Nichols et al. (2004), and Luraghi (2012) for Hittite, Inglese (2021) for Latin, and then looking at other argument patterns and alternations that are different for nouns and pronouns, linking them on the one hand to argument reduction and argument expansion strategies, and on the other hand to specific constructions such as relative clauses. It will be shown that the inflectional rather than lexical nature of person and relativisation markers in Old Irish also affects some transitivity patterning.

- Inglese, Guglielmo. 2021. Anticausativization and basic valency orientation in Latin. In *Anticausativization and basic valency orientation in Latin*, 133–168. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110755657-005>.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2012. Basic valency orientation and the middle voice in Hittite. *Studies in Language* 36(1). 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.36.1.01lur>.
- Nichols, Johanna. 2017. Person as an inflectional category. *Linguistic Typology* 21(3). 387–456. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2017-0010>.
- Nichols, Johanna, David A. Peterson & Jonathan Barnes. 2004. Transitivity and detransitivizing languages. *Linguistic Typology* 8(2). 149–211. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2004.005>.
- Roma, Elisa. 2018. Old Irish pronominal objects and their use in verbal pro-forms. In Raimund Karl & Katharina Möller (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second European Symposium in Celtic Studies, held at Prifysgol Bangor University from July 31st to August 3rd 2017*, 7–19. Hagen/Westf: Curach Bhán Publications.
- Roma, Elisa. 2021. Valency patterns of Old Irish verbs: finite and non-finite syntax. In *Valency Patterns of Old Irish verbs: finite and non-finite syntax*, 89–132. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110755657-004>.

Agreement and personal pronouns in the diachrony of Irish  
Joe Simpson  
University College Dublin

This paper is based on ongoing research that I am conducting as part of my doctoral studies into Early Irish clause structure. The diachrony of Irish exhibits a restructuring of the pronominal system resulting in a pattern of rich and invariant agreement known as *complementarity*.

Old Irish is a null-subject language in which the use of so-called *independent pronouns* was restricted to copular predicates and the subject of non-third-person passives. The Middle Irish period saw the extension of these independent pronouns to subject and object position, along with a concomitant restructuring of the pronoun set to reflect case distinctions.

This paper will discuss pronouns in Old, Middle and Modern Irish. I will seek to provide a parameter-driven generative account of the development of the pronominal system in Irish diachrony given the changes outlined above. In so doing I will develop the argument advanced in my talk at the ICCS in Utrecht in July 2023; namely, that the emergence of invariant agreement (the so-called 'analytic forms' of the verb) is intimately related to the extension of the independent pronouns to subject pronouns.

The syntactic positions of Old Irish preverbs (Part 2)

Fangzhe Qiu

University College Dublin

Earlier this year in Utrecht, I presented a paper with the same title. However, due to the limit of time several points have not been sufficiently elucidated, and they will constitute the main contents of this talk.

I will start with a review of the observation in Carnie, Harley and Pyatt (2000), that the simple verb or the first preverb in the complex raises to C in the absence of an overt complementiser (cf. Adger 2006). I believe this 'Move to C' is not part of the syntactic process, but results from the insertion of a prosodic stress which is purely a PF operation, determined by the individual prosodic features of the morphemes. I will attempt to reconcile this stance with Newton's (2008) argument for a post-syntactic account of the Old Irish double inflectional system.

Secondly, I will develop further on the core views I presented in Utrecht, namely, 1) De-adjectival preverbs are probably phrases merged at Spec,VP; and 2) Lexical preverbs are probably P heads in the complement of V.

Lastly, I will examine the syntactic positions of the augments, taking into consideration the diachronic changes such as those proposed in García-Castillero (2013).

Adger, David. "Post-Syntactic Movement and the Old Irish Verb." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 24, no. 3 (July 5, 2006): 605–654.

Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley, and Elizabeth Pyatt. "VSO Order as Raising out of IP? Some Evidence from Old Irish." In *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*, edited by Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle, 39–59. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

García-Castillero, Carlos. "Morphological Externalisation and the Old Irish Verbal Particle Ro1." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 111, no. 1 (2013): 108–40.

Newton, Glenda. "Exploring the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: A Post-Syntactic Account of the Old Irish Verbal System." *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 4, no. 1 (2008): 1–20.

The order of multiple adjective in Old Irish  
To Be Confirmed  
University of \_

In this study I will examine the order of adjectives in Old Irish to determine the preferred relative order of multiple adjectives in Old Irish noun phrases on the basis of corpus texts.

While we know about the syntax of adjectival modifiers of noun phrases in modern and some earlier varieties of other languages, to date too little research has determined this question in Old Irish: while grammars of the language (Thurneysen 1980) determine the outline of adjective use, so far little is known about the structure of these elements in corpus data.

As the source for the study I will use the tagged POMIC corpus (Lash 2014) and will use the search interface to determine complex noun phrases involving more than one adjectives.

As a result of the study we will receive further insights into the relative order of adjectives in Old Irish and factors conditioning their ordering.

Lash, Elliott. 2014. The Parsed Old and Middle Irish Corpus (POMIC). Version 0.1. [https://www.dias.ie/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=6586&Itemid=224&lang=en](https://www.dias.ie/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6586&Itemid=224&lang=en)  
Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1980. A Grammar of Old Irish. Dublin: DIAS.

Adnominal pronoun constructions in Old Irish  
 Elliott Lash  
 University of Göttingen

This paper examines the construction in (1), in which either a fully stressed independent pronoun or *pro* is associated with a coreferential noun in the dative case.

1. a. *is ni=ni firi6n-aib*  
 is us=EMPH just-DAT.PL  
 "It is we righteous ones." (Wb.33a7)
- b. *na nn6 ad-ro-chobur-s-am pro firi6n-ib*  
 any thing PV-PRF-desire-PRET-1PL pro[1PL] just-DAT.PL  
 "anything we righteous ones had wished" (MI.36c2)

This construction can be seen as one of the OIr. representatives of a class of nominal person constructions in which collocations of pronoun and noun both have the same reference, e.g. English "we firemen" (Comrie & Smith 1977). Up until recently there has been little detailed theoretically informed work on this topic, although the English construction just exemplified has been known and sporadically discussed along with a few other languages almost since the beginning of modern generative syntactic theory (Postal 1969, Sommerstein 1972).

H6hn (2017, 2022) represent the first steps taken toward developing a cross-linguistic typology of what he calls adnominal pronoun constructions (APCs). This paper will situate the Old Irish data within this typology and show that Old Irish is an interesting outlier with regard to a number of features, listed in (2), that H6hn identifies as of central importance in the typology of APCs.

2. a. morphological expression of person: regular / affixal~clitic pronouns  
 b. case effects: pronoun case = noun case / pronoun case ≠ noun case  
 c. relative position of pronoun: postnominal / prenominal  
 d. co-occurrence with the definite article or not  
 e. co-occurrence with a modifying demonstrative or not f. person/number restrictions  
 g. (un)agreement patterns.

Comrie, B. & N. Smith. 1977. *Lingua* descriptive studies: questionnaire. *Lingua* 42.1:1–72.

- Höhn, G. F. K. 2017. *Non-possessive person in the nominal domain*. U. of Cambridge: PhD. Thesis. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003618>
- Höhn, G. F. K. 2022. Eliciting data on (ad)nominal person, ms.
- Postal, P. 1969. On so-called "pronouns" in English. In: D. A. Reibel & S. A. Schane (eds.), *Modern studies in English: readings in transformational grammar*. 201–226.
- Sommerstein, A. 1972. On the so-called definite article in English.

Possessive Agreement in Insular Celtic  
Ranko Matasović  
University of Zagreb

Possessive agreement is a pattern of NP-internal agreement in which certain features of the possessor (usually person, number and/or gender) are marked twice within the NP: firstly, on the possessive marker itself (e.g. a possessive pronoun) and secondly, on another morpheme, which obligatorily agrees in those features with the possessive marker (Corbett 2006: 47). This type of agreement is not common in Indo-European languages, but it is in Uralic, Turkic, and several other language families in Eurasia (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003). However, two possessive constructions (limited to pronominal possessors) in Goidelic and Brittonic fall under the definition of possessive agreement. In these constructions, illustrated in examples (1) and (2) for Old Irish, and (3) and (4) for Middle Welsh, the pronominal possessor can be marked by two pronominal elements which have to agree in person, number and (in the third person singular) gender. In both languages, the first pronominal element is the proclitic possessive pronoun, which distinguishes three persons, singular and plural, and (only in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular) gender. In Old Irish, the second pronominal element referring to the possessor is traditionally called the “emphasizing particle, or *nota augens*” (Thurneysen 1946: 252-3, Griffith 2008), and it distinguishes the same categories as the possessive pronouns. The second pronominal element in the possessive NPs with agreement in Middle Welsh is identical to the stressed simple personal pronouns, and it also distinguishes the same categories as the possessive pronouns.

This paper will take a close look at the phenomenon of possessive agreement in Insular Celtic. We will examine the frequencies of possessive constructions with agreement in selected Old Irish and Middle Welsh texts, and seek to establish the pragmatic functions of these constructions. We will also look at the earliest attestations and the origin of constructions with possessive agreement, and show that it is unlikely that they should be reconstructed in Proto-Insular Celtic (or even Proto-Celtic). Rather, it will be argued that possessive agreement in Insular Celtic developed as an areal phenomenon, similar to other features, shared by both Goidelic and Brittonic, which arose in situations of intensive language contacts that occurred in Britain and Ireland during the Early Middle Ages (Matasović 2008).

- (1) *do hires-so*  
2SG.POSS faith-2SG  
“your faith” (Wb 29d13)

- (2) *mo hires-sa*  
 1SG.POSS faith-1SG  
 "my faith" (Wb 31a6)
- (3) *a hynny yn dyuot yn erbyn y erchwys ef*  
 and this PART come.VN against 3SG.POSS pack 3SG  
 "and this came against his pack (of hounds)" (PPD 1.11)
- (4) *Ac y wybot dy ateb di am hynny y deuth-um*  
 and to know.VN 2SG.POSS answer 2SG about this part come-IPF.1SG  
*i*  
 1SG  
 "and it is to know your answer about this I have come." (PPD 9.30-31)

Corbett, Greville. (2006). *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griffith, Aaron. (2008). "The animacy hierarchy and the distribution of the notaeaugentes in Old Irish", *Ériu*, 58, 45–66.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2003). "Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe", in: Frans Plank (ed.) *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 621-722.

Matasović, Ranko (2008). "Insular Celtic as a Language Area", in: Hildegard L. C. Tristram (ed.) *The Celtic Languages in Contact*, Potsdam: Potsdam University Press, 93-112.

Thurneysen, Rudolf (1946). *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies.

Abbreviations of cited texts:

PPD = *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet* (MW, ed. L. Mühlhausen, Tübingen 1988)

Wb. = Würzburg Glosses (OIr., E-edition <https://wuerzburg.ie/index.html>)

Out of scope?  
Indefinite nominal subjects and objects  
preceding the negative marker in Middle Welsh  
Raphael Sackmann  
University of Marburg

While the diachronic development of negation in Welsh has been subject to extensive research (see Willis 2006, 2013, in particular), Middle Welsh negative (matrix) clauses are under-researched in a synchronic perspective (cf. Poppe forthcoming).

Although subject-verb and object-verb negative matrix clauses have largely been analysed as (reduced) clefts or left dislocation structures (Watkins 1993, Schumacher 2011), indefinite arguments with a non-referential interpretation cannot be left-dislocated (cf. Borsley et al. 2007, Willis 1998) and should be expected to be c-commanded by negation (cf. McCloskey 1996).

In (Modern) Irish, native speakers generally interpret comparable subject-verb and object-verb constructions in matrix and subordinate contexts with scope of negation over the indefinite (cf. McCloskey 1996). For the syntactic derivation of such clauses, McCloskey (1996) suggests movement of the phonological unit consisting of negative marker (+ past marker) + verb (+ pronominal subject) below the indefinite.

However, in Middle Welsh, instances of wide-scope indefinites can be found, such as the nominalized adjective *da* 'good (things)' in (1), while scope relations are potentially ambiguous in others, (2).

(1) *A allant wynteu pob peth o|r a|uynnont. **Da ny|s mynnant.** ac ny|s gallant. Ar drwc hagen y|maent graff.*

'(Pupil:) Can they [i.e. the devils] (do) everything they want? (Master:) **Good they do not want** and cannot (do). On evil, however, they are keen.' (Ystoria Lucidar, LIA: 9v22–24)

(2) *ar lleian a|gauas beichogi. en6 y|lleian oed nonn. a|mab a anet idi. A|dauid a|rodet yn en6 arna6. **A|g6r ny bu idi hi** na chynt na g6edy. di6eir oed hi o|vedd6l a g6eithret.*

'And the nun got pregnant. The name of the nun was Nonn. And a child was born to her And *David* was given as a name to him. **But she did not have a(ny) husband/And a husband she did not have,** neither before nor after. She was chaste of mind and deed.'

(*Buchedd Dewi*, LIA: 93v20–  
24)

Furthermore, indefinite objects preceding the negative marker as in (1) could give clues about the licensing conditions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person infixed object pronoun *-s*, which has been analysed as an optional agreement clitic (Borsley et al. 2007, Willis 1998) but may still have a resumptive function in some instances.

In my paper, I aim to draw attention to such presumably challenging Middle Welsh examples and would like to discuss their possible derivations in the workshop.

LIA: Oxford Jesus College MS. 119 (The Book of the Anchorite of Llanddewi Brefi).  
In Diana Luft, Peter Wynn Thomas & D. Mark Smith (eds.). 2013.  
*Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300–1425*.  
[http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?  
ms=Jesus119](http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?ms=Jesus119).

- Borsley, Robert D., Maggie Tallerman, & David Willis. 2007. *The Syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCloskey, James. 1996. On the scope of verb movement in Irish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 14(1), 47–104.
- Poppe, Erich. forthcoming. Middle Welsh syntax (word order and information structure). In Joseph F. Eska, Silva Nurmio, Peadar Ó Muircheartaigh & Paul Russell (eds.), *Palgrave handbook of Celtic languages and linguistics*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schumacher, Stefan. 2011. Mittel- und Frühneukymrisch. In *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch. From Medieval British to Modern Breton*, ed. Elmar Ternes, 85–235. Bremen: Hempen.
- Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1993. Constituent order in main/simple verb clauses of *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet*. *Language Sciences* 15, 115–139.
- Willis, David. 1998. *Syntactic change in Welsh. A study of the loss of verb-second*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Willis, David. 2006. Negation in Middle Welsh. *Studia Celtica* 40, 63–88.
- Willis, David. 2013. The history of negation in the Brythonic Celtic languages. In David Willis, Anne Breitbarth & Christopher Lucas (eds.), *The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean, volume 1: Case studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 239–298.

The diachrony of Celtic subject pronouns

David Willis (University of Oxford), Marieke Meelen (University of Cambridge) and  
Mark Darling (University of Oxford)

This paper will present a contrasting view of the development of subject pronouns in Welsh and Irish. In the medieval period, both languages manifest extensive use of null subjects alongside rich verbal inflection distinguishing nearly all persons and numbers, while the modern languages have much more constrained use of subject pronouns either linked to the availability of rich (synthetic) agreement (Irish) or to formal literary style (Welsh). In Irish, where overt nominative pronouns are initially ungrammatical as the subject of finite verbs, we trace the extension of overt subject pronouns during the medieval corpus from a few syntactic environments (quotatives, copular clauses, absolute clauses) to finite contexts, particularly those with poorly marked morphological distinctions. Conversely, in Welsh, overt subject pronouns are always possible as the subjects of finite verbs, and we see little extension of overt subjects in the medieval period. Rather, there are person–number hierarchies in the use that point to the role of information structure in determining when overt pronouns are felicitous. We tentatively hypothesize that a loosening of the information-structure conditions for felicitous use of null subjects lies at the root of the loss of null subjects in Welsh.

Isolated light-headed NPs in the Old Irish Glosses  
as the effect of syntactic NP freedom  
Carlos García-Castillero  
University of the Basque Country

Any study on the syntax of the Old Irish glosses attested in contemporaneous manuscripts, which counts as the piece of linguistic evidence that most reliably represents the Old Irish language, must face the specific attestation of the linguistic material in the glosses. The glosses convey discontinuous utterances that depend on the Latin text to which they are attached. One of the most obvious consequences of this discontinuous and textually dependent character is that the glosses very often convey what we could consider incomplete utterances, i.e. linguistic units that have not the status of an independent clause or sentence.

When it comes to the study of NPs and their syntax, we often face the situation in which the gloss consists on a bare NP. This paper deals with these isolated NPs, in particular, with those that are introduced by the light heads *intí aní* and *a<sup>N</sup>*, and defends the idea that these isolated light-headed NPs constitute utterances that may (sometimes) be considered as complete, as against the initial impression, and therefore, that they may be considered for an inquiry on the Old Irish NP syntax. The main points that will articulate this presentation are the following:

1. Basic descriptive issues of the isolated light-headed NPs in the Old Irish glosses: in addition to the necessary quantitative description, I would like to introduce the notion of 'missing data' as proposed by Osborne (2013: 128–129) as relevant.
2. The notion of 'free NPs': Evans (1993) advances the idea of apparently incomplete but meaningful linguistic units, not only for the 'insubordinated' clauses, and a similar position for NPs is taken by Fox & Thompson (2010) and Auer (2014), who proposes the notion of 'analepsis'; Helasvuo (2019) proposes the notion of 'free NP'.
3. The linguistic value of the isolated NPs in the Old Irish glosses: animacy turns out to be a statistically significant factor explaining the difference between isolated and dislocated light-headed NPs, which are relatively more often animate, and intraclausal light-headed NPs, which are more often neuter.
4. At least some of the isolated NPs in the glosses may be seen as 'free NPs'.
5. Conclusion: a wider investigation on all NPs, both in Old Irish and beyond, would be necessary to check whether the outcome of this paper only applies to the NPs introduced by the light heads *intí aní* and *a<sup>N</sup>*, or may be formulated in

more general terms, i.e. that animate NPs have in general more chances to appear as free NPs.

- Auer, Peter. 2014. 'Syntactic structures and their symbiotic guests. Notes on analepsis from the perspective of on-line syntax'. *Pragmatics* 24:3, 533–560.
- Evans, Nicholas. 1993. 'Code, inference, placedness and ellipsis'. In William A. Foley (ed.), *The Role of Theory in Language Description*, 243–280. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fox, Barbara A. & Sandra A. Thompson. 2010. 'Responses to Wh-Questions in English Conversation'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43:2, 133–156.
- Helasvuoto, Marja-Liisa. 2019. 'Free NPs as units in Finnish'. *Studies in Language* 43:2, 301–328.
- Osborne, Jason W. 2013. *Best Practices in Data Cleaning (A complete guide to everything you need to do before and after collecting your data)*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Observations on the use of attention markers in *Comrac Líadaine 7 Chuirithir*  
David Stifter  
Maynooth University

In a series of articles, Griffith (2008; 2010; 2011; 2013) and Bauer (2018: 12–13) have shed light on the pragmatic function and the syntactic operation of the Old Irish *notae augentes* and the anaphoric pronoun *suide/-side*, which for practical reasons I group together as ‘attention markers’. The comparatively high incidence of these elements in the late Old Irish tale *Comrac Líadaine 7 Chuirithir* ‘The Encounter of Líadain and Cuirithir’ (Stifter forthc.), provides an opportunity to test these hypotheses and to add to and refine the description of their syntactic and pragmatic functions.

A close study of all occurrences of the words for ‘sun’ and ‘moon’ in the contemporary Old Irish, Old Welsh and Old Breton sources reveals a clear pattern for when they are used with or without the article.

- Bauer 2018 Bernhard Bauer, ‘The story of the monk and the devil’, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 65 (2018), 1–27.
- Griffith 2008 Aaron Griffith, ‘The animacy, hierarchy and the distribution of the *notae augentes* in Old Irish’, *Ériu* 58 (2008), 55–75.
- Griffith 2010 Aaron Griffith, ‘Die Etymologie der 1. und 2. Person Singular der altirischen *notae augentes*’, in: *Akten des 5. Deutschsprachigen Keltologensymposiums, Zürich, 7.–10. September 2009*. Herausgegeben von Karin Stüber, Thomas Zehnder und Dieter Bachmann [= Keltische Forschungen, Allgemeine Buchreihe A1], Wien: Praesens 2010, 109–121.
- Griffith 2011 Aaron Griffith, ‘Old Irish pronouns: agreement affixes vs. clitic arguments’, *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics*. Edited by Andrew Carnie, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2011, 65–93.
- Griffith 2013 Aaron Griffith, ‘Irish *suide / -side* ‘the aforementioned’’, in: *Celts and their Cultures at Home and Abroad. A Festschrift Malcolm Broun*. Edited by Anders Ahlqvist & Pamela O’Neill [= Sydney Series in Celtic Studies 15], University of Sydney 2013, 55–73.
- Stifter forthc. David Stifter, *Tri Chéill inna Filed, tri Dliged in Dáno* [= Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 6], Hagen: Westf.: curach bhán.

The etymology and syntax of Old Irish *ocus* 'and'  
Aaron Griffith  
Utrecht University

In 2009 at the Tionól in DIAS, I presented an as yet unpublished idea on the etymology of Old Irish *ocus*. I argued that the form could be derived from a phrase *A occo as B* 'A beside that which is B', with elements *occo* (3SG.M/N of *oc* 'at, by') and *as* (PRES.3SG.REL. of the copula). At some relatively late stage of Pre-Old Irish, this was grammaticalized as 'A and B' and the form contracted to *ocus*. This etymology can capture a number of features of *ocus*, including some verbal agreement patterns and the lenition that is sometimes found following the form.

The etymology does require a free relative, however, which is not common in Old Irish. Elisa Roma (forthcoming in *Études Celtiques*) has recently collected and analyzed free relatives in Old Irish and shown that, in her collection, the type required by my proposed etymology (i.e. as a prepositional complement) is not attested. In my paper I will re-examine my earlier proposed etymology, introduce (very) limited evidence for free relatives as prepositional complements in Old Irish, and argue that this etymology is still the best one available.