STUDIA CELTICA, XXXIII (1999), 155–234

Structural Sketches of Middle Welsh Syntax (II)

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Noun Predication and Presentative Patterns

Section 0: Preliminary
0.1 Working definitions and terms of analysis. Analytic notions.
Research history and method
0.2 The Nominal Sentence: basic distinctions and *Grundproblematik*
0.3 Interlocutive vs. delocutive 'referential sphere' systems of grammar. Dialogic vs. narrative textemic systems. The Nominal Sentence in paradigm
0.4 Converters and junctors
0.5 Noun determination in the NS rheme

Section 1: Inherent (circumstance-absolute) noun predication
1.1 The rheme-initial pattern set: basic (unmarked) predication
1.1.1 The interlocutive pronominal theme
1.1.2(a-c) The delocutive pronominal *yw*-theme pattern set
1.1.2(d) Excursus: typology of topics in the Four Branches
1.1.3(a-f) Binominal/bimembral patterns
1.2 The theme-initial pattern set: text-grammatically marked nom. predication
1.2.1 The copular Nominal Sentence
1.2.2 The *sef*- narrative pattern of forward attention-directing

Section 2: Incidental-contingent (circumstanced) noun predication: the *yn*-marked rheme

Section 3: Lenition-infix nexus patterns

Appendix I: the Literary Modern Welsh Nominal Sentence pattern repertory
Appendix II: the presentative deictic-existential introduction of nominals
Appendix III: the [Pronoun/Substantive + Adverbial] nexus pattern

Terminological defining glossary

Bibliography

0. *Preliminary*

0.1 Working definitions and terms of analysis

The Nominal Sentence is a convenient code-name for a specific predicative pattern set primarily predicating nouns (that is substantives or adjectives) and pronominals, characterized, not by 'the absence of a verb',[1] but as a distinct nexus type[2] that is sometimes paradigmatically opposed (or, in given environments, opposition-neutralized) to both verbal and statal adverb-rheme nexus, and in any case one for which verbal nexus has no constitutive relevance. In the following pages I aim at a structural account – the *système des valeurs* (opposition and neutralization), definition, typology and documentation – of noun predication patterns on the basis of the Four Branches (Mabinogi) and *Owein*.[3] For each pattern here isolated and defined primarily by syntagmatics and paradigmatic constituency, I will present the 'pattern profile' – the evidence for negation and conversion (arguments *inter alia* in proof of the special nexus status of the NS),[4] text-grammatical role and integration, prosody, juncture and specificity contour properties, and so on.

The aim of this study is to establish patterns, that is entities formally more complex than (and yet if inclusive of) sequences ('word orders') alone, which are either component phenomena or epiphenomena. Moreover, the part-of-speech *a priori* 'identity', as distinct from true structural identity, is of less importance here, especially for the identifying and definition of the rheme constituent in the NS. For the former is synthetic, poly-paradigmatic (consisting at its best and most analytic of 'conglomerates of categories'), praetor-analytic, 'logically' oriented and thus essentially Eurocentric; the latter truly analytic and mono-paradigmatic, at the ever shifting intersection of the paradigmatic/syntagmatic coordinates. I believe the significance of these methodological and meta-theoretical contentions requires re-evaluation of the whole syntactic issue.

The ModW NS, while essentially similar and certainly relatable to the MW pattern sets, differs from it and needs a separate study. In Appendix I below I present and briefly illustrate the pattern repertory for Literary Modern Welsh, observable especially in Kate Roberts's works.[5]

Research history and method

While Celtic non-generative syntactic description generally falls between the two eminent stools of Indo-European interest and dialectology, and Irish syntax has had a fair

[1] See further below. This, the generative view, is often countered also in theory-indifferent causal reference to the phenomenon (so for instance Tristram [1983]: 14, '"Nominal Sentence", that is sentence without an inflected verb').

[2] Cf. Shisha-Halevy (1995): §1.0.1.

[3] (*PKM*) for I. Williams (ed.), *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (Cardiff 1951, 2nd edn., 1978; (*P*) for R. L. Thomson (ed.), *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet* (Dublin, 1957); (*B*) for D. S. Thomson (ed.), *Branwen Uerch Lyr* (Dublin, 1976); (*O*) for R. L. Thomson (ed.), *Owein* (Dublin, 1968). I have included Owein as a contrasting control system, in NS patterns as in other phenomena - the use of the periphrastic present, narrative tenses ('INF a oruc', *sef*- constructions, the 'Abnormal Sentence' not to mention orthography and morphophonemics).

[4] Shisha-Halevy (1995), and see below.

[5] In the opening sections of the study of the NS in Literary Modern Welsh (Shisha-Halevy 1998: 108ff.) I have dwelt on the main theoretical and methodological problems involved in the issue. Although I shall to an extent repeat those observations here, I wish nonetheless to refer the reader to the Modern Welsh study.

amount of attention, synchronic not to mention *Spezialgrammatik*, accounts of Welsh syntax are few and far between. However, the relative neglect of noun predication in current linguistic study and the fact that, when considered, it is as a more or less 'mutilated' (deleted) or in some way deviant type of verbal predication, are no doubt due mainly to the aim of modern attention, given Celtic syntactic intricacies, more often than not to gain insights into Indo-European verbal syntax (which partly accounts also for the primacy given Goidelic, with its higher 'heritage burden', over Brythonic); the nominal sentence pattern set, as a phenomenon of syntax, is (at present at least) less attractive from the Indo-European comparative-reconstructive angle.[6] On the other hand, the reductionist negative definition of the NS as 'verbless' is, I believe, unacceptable both for its verb-oriented basis (again, deriving from an ingrained Indo-European-oriented view, compounded by a specific theoretical tradition – once Latin – now English-tailored; as may be expected, it is extended as a 'methodological' tool outside Indo-European)[7] and its negative epistemological nature. The 'absence' of some element or other[8] can hardly be used to define a linguistic element. In our case, a 'significant absence' (i.e. zero) of a verbal copula, as for instance in Greek, Latin or Slavonic, does not apply (cf. Hjelmslev 1948), and in numerous discussions of the Indo-European NS, e.g. Schiefer (1974).[9] What may be seen as an Indo-European squint 'fixation' with the verb manifests itself as a pervasive assumption that, in nexus and to 'operate' a nexus, a verb must be present on some level in any clause – or, if absent, that it still leaves a structural mark – an assumption axiomatically inherent in generative-model theories of grammar).

Observations

1. The NS (or rather Noun Phrase predication) features frequently in the current general 'typological' view of syntax, in its various orientations. Without attempting to cover this ground here, and certainly without endorsing universalistic claims often made, or assuming an *a priori* descriptive validity for the Welsh phenomena, let me briefly comment here (if only for the methodology involved) on two conspicuous instances, very different from one another. Hengeveld (1992) addresses two main theoretical issues. First, and more basic, the part-of-speech query: 'part-of-speech systems' (47ff.). Evidently, these involve again Eurocentrically posed questions and assumption of the fundamental and generally applicable validity of the models developed with the European situation in mind (e.g. 'is a given element adjectival or verbal?'). Then, ensuing classification of languages as 'specialized', as 'rigid' or 'flexible' (e.g. 63ff.), and the part-of-speech hierarchy (verb>noun>adjective>adverb, 68ff.: 'a category of

[6] See however Moreschini Quattordio 1965, 1966. Incidentally, Welsh/Celtic syntactic affinities with oriental Indo-European (Hittite, Tocharian, Indic) are certainly becoming clearer and more pronounced with new syntactical insights, and not necessarily in the orthodox Indo-European genealogical perspective (cf. now Migron 1994/5, Vedic, N *vâ etâ, yad-*, to be compared with the formal theme/rheme constructions (*é*, appositively expanded by subst.) in Modern Irish.

[7] Recently, Niccacci 1993: 216 defines the 'simple nominal clause' negatively, as 'the clause that does not contain any finite verb form - not even the verb *hyh*'.

[8] Note even the curious, if tenderly associative, 'small clauses' (so e.g. Hengeveld): some NS patterns and many NS clauses are anything but small, while verb clauses may be pretty minimal.

[9] The pervasive assumption that, to effect nexus, a verb must be present in any clause-form – of that, if absent, it still leaves a structural mark – is of course central and inherent in generative-model theories of the NS.

predicates is more likely to occur as a separate part of speech the more to the left it is in this hierarchy'). Parts of speech are defined mainly by syntactic 'functioning', yet in fact in a no less ethnocentric conception (the verb, 'predicative only'; the noun, potentially nuclear; adjective/adverb, potential noun-expanding and verb/adjective-expanding roles respectively). Second, the Nominal Sentence, described as 'Non-Verbal Predication' (25ff.), depends on the establishment of the 'verbal sentence' and still approximates the reductionist 'verbless sentence'. Hengeveld's definition is logico-semantic rather than formally grammatical (26–7): 'the application of a non-verbal predicate to an appropriate number of arguments', and, as said, shows ingrained ethnocentrism. Declerck (1988) is not a universalist study, but a generally conceived descriptive one of the English phenomenology. It applies and elaborates the by now established semantic classification into 'predicational' ('predicating a property of the subject NP' – class-inclusion, indication of class membership, role, function: 'John is a teacher', 'John is the cleverest student of them all') and 'specificational' ('specifying a value for a variable": 'The bank robber is John Thomas', 'The only people that can help you is the Prime Minister'); adding 'descriptionally identifying' (actually, I believe this is a macrosyntactic value rather than a pattern: 'Mike? Who's Mike' – 'Mike is my brother'), the rather specialized 'identity statements' ('Dr Jekyll is Mr Hyde') and 'definitional' ('a pyramid is . . . '). These semantic groups, and other semantic statements, are correlated with formal features and parameters ('formal' in the broadest sense).

The Welsh NS

The basic methodological guideline and, at the same time, a major faulting factor here, alongside the reductionist verb-oriented conception mentioned above, has always been the deeply rooted distinction and terminology of 'pure' and 'impure' NS. This infelicitous dichotomy, the ghost of which apparently cannot be laid to rest, has a long history in Indo-European linguistics since Antoine Meillet's influential essay of 1906.[10] (Arabic in origin is the subsuming of adverbial-predicate clauses under 'Nominal Sentence', which, in Arabic, refers to any noun-initial clause). In nineteenth-century European, especially German, scientific terminology, *echt* or *eigentlich* ('genuine' or 'proper') in their privative form, were the frequent 'fuzzy' terms of binary classification. Even discerning typologists speak of the '*echt* nominal' NS of Hebrew, Egyptian-Coptic, Chinese (Steinthal and Misteli 1893: 269ff.).

It was Benveniste's typological-comparative article of 1950 that put the interpretation of the NS phenomenon on a sound structural basis. Unfortunately, Benveniste ignored the Welsh NS, taking Kerry Irish as representative of Celtic (quoting from Sjoestedt's study of the dialect). Following Hjelmslev's strictly structural essay of 1948 (which, however, treated Indo-Euorpean zero-copula constructions rather than the NS proper), Benveniste's focus is on the paradigmatics, rather than syntagmatics, of the NS, that is, on its opposition to the verb clause rather than its inner structure.

[10] Meillet associates here, by implication, the Nominal Sentence with 'be' syntax (consider 1906: 1, the verb 'be' being 'accessoire et éminemment susceptible à manquer'); in 1921: 180, this view was to be radically modified: 'La phrase nominale et la phrase verbale diffèrent de nature, et il est . . . vain de vouloir ramener l'une à l'autre.'

Following the distinction of 'nominal NS' from other (e.g. 'adverbial') types of NS – a conception of NS, based on native Arab linguistic terminology, of a noun-initial (theme-initial) clause as 'nominal'[11] – the classification-by-predicate (rheme) was widely accepted in Semitics by the turn of the century and in Egyptian linguistics in the early years of the twentieth. I find this typology, essentially un-Indo-European, very useful and well adapted to Celtic and Welsh in particular. (I substitute 'nexus-type' for 'sentence'.)[12]

Observations

1. Some influential basic discussions of the Welsh Nominal Sentence, briefly commented upon: Melville Richards's (1938) seminal overview of Welsh syntax (by a wide intuition, beginning the whole presentation with the NS) is probably (following the pioneering Morris-Jones) the immediate source of most later traditional accounts (see on pp. 6ff., the 'Brawddeg Enwol Bur', negatively defined). In the same general approach, the usually sensitive and penetrating Morgan (1952), which I believe is still the best overall syntactic account of Welsh to date, treats separately the 'Brawddeg Enwol Bur' (283–9) and the 'Amhur' (284ff., 343–4), while separating, in the latter case 3rd-person (our 'delocutive'; 284ff.) from 1st/2nd person (our 'interlocutive', 291ff.). Like others, Morgan considers the 'Brawddeg Bur' an archaic form (267–8), in which he follows in Morris-Jones's glottogonic tradition (1931: 196: 'most primitive form'). Earlier, Morgan (1948/50) had brought forwards a cogent and valid objection to treating the NS as 'verbless'. T. Arwyn Watkins (1956) is one of the most important contributions to the issue, a critical account of the various subdivisions faulty in inadequacy of noun/verb definitions, synchrony/diachrony blurring,[13] but seemingly on the verge of the nexus-type solution. D. Simon Evans 1968, predicate-subject resolution, is sometimes contestible: 'tydi yw ein tad ni' cannot have the same information structure as 'a phen hon yw Crist i hunan' or 'yr achos fwyaf o hynn yw diphig llyfrau' (exx. under 'definite predicate', 325ff.: see also below). D. Simon Evans (1970/2) is an account of the Early ModW NS, setting out from the same basic distinction of 'pure' NS (two juxtaposed nominals; 'verbless', by implication; included here are presentative constructions) and 'impure NS' (with a 'be copula'; here are included adverbial predicates.) The earlier study (Evans 1968) presents an earlier version of the same classification (the exx., p. 325–6) for 'Predicate + copula' – 'Definite Predicate' are in reality mixed, with rheme-initial and theme-initial cases confused.

2. It is always a problem, especially in a dead language, to know exactly how much weight to give to caprices of documentation. A distinction that can be made, when the overall functional tableau is uncovered, is between 'accidental' and systemic non-attestation: cf. Shisha-Halevy (1986: §0.2.3.)

[11] The Arabic NS, noun-initial (even verb clause!) = 'topic' (cf. Arabic *mubtada*): cf. Lewin 1985.

[12] Cf. Polotsky 1987: 12ff. for discussion and literature on the *Nominalsatz* concept and term.

[13] My main contention with past research on the Welsh NS is that the issue is dealt with cursorily and sketchily. The constituency (hence, pattern) aspects fall out entirely; no awareness is evident of individual complexity of patterns. Such questions as are asked are as a rule evolutive, an aspect which, given the continuity fallacy of 'later literary *états de langue* evolved from earlier ones', is of very limited validity and at any rate secondary.

A second flawed factor in the description of the Welsh NS consists in viewing the relative-order parameter as primary and definitive rather than as merely distinctive or epiphenomenal (and indeed a tertiary feature of the pattern); this has the effect of 'short-circuiting' the fundamental, appositive tension between two very different nexus-types, as well as between the two rheme-types (namely, *yw*-marked rhemes and *ynlen*-marked ones), obliterating most of their distinctive features. Following the definition of 'pattern' given above, it is clear that paradigm sequencing (i.e. constituent ordering) is a full and definitive constitutive feature of a pattern. The possible argument (implicit in certain accounts of the NS)[14] that what we see is a single pattern with varying constituent ordering, and word-order the decisive factor, is unacceptable both as a contradiction in terms and in view of the numerous other parameters which, combined, constitute a pattern. This notwithstanding, we find, as already pointed out, the sequence feature entering as the crucial factor in traditional and current grammatical opinion concerning the differentiation between noun predication in two entirely distinct nexus types, viz. the existential-statal (*y*) *mae ef yn-N* (as if it were a 'copula-first' construction) and the Nominal Sentence.[15] The error is thus compounded: the patterns are hardly comparable, except in paradigmatic opposition. The constituent paradigmatics are entirely different, as is the systemic *valeur* of the patterns (and most other formal specifics). In many descriptions of the Welsh NS the location of 'predicates' and 'subjects' (ideally corresponding to our 'rheme' and 'theme', respectively) is not considered of primary significance, and indeed the assignation to either category is sometimes contestable.

Observation

Thus, throughout the chronological continuum, conflating *mae-* and *yw*-nexal patterns: Morris-Jones (1913: §189; 1931: 196ff.); Richards 1938: §16 (even the gerundial or converbal *yn-* INF. is subsumed by Richards and later followers as a case of 'impure' NS, e.g. 1938: §24ff.); Morgan 1948: 143 ('when the Predicate follows the copula, the predicative particle *yn* may be placed before it, but this is often omitted'), inverting here the hierarchy of order and predicate marking – incidentally, also nullifying the formal opposition by the prescriptive-like formulation of 'may be placed' and by 'is often omitted', postulating free variation); Jones and Thomas 1977: 424ff., 49–50, relating, in terms of their own generative-transformational approach, the two sentence patterns as 'basic → inverted' ('identificatory sentences compulsorily invert the noun phrase in the verb phrase . . . *mae* → *yw, ydi*'); Awbery 1984: 262–3. (Awbery integrates this with the additional parameter of rheme specificity, thus approaching closer to a true pattern definition); Tischhäuser 1971.

Even within the NS construction proper there seems to be misconception as to the tagmemic significance of sequencing: 'word-order' is as a rule not considered a pattern-distinctive but an 'overmapped' feature.

[14] Cf. for instance D. Simon Evans (1955:77):

[15] So from the early accounts even up to Tischäuser (1971).

Observation

So, for instance, in T. Arwyn Watkins and P. Mac Cana's seminal article of 1958, two basic sequences are postulated (4ff.) for Old-to-Middle Welsh: (A) 'copula + Predicate + Subject', a mixed bag, pattern-wise, including also the Cleft Sentence, 'conjunctional' status ('A gysylltiol'), conversions (*neut*-, negations), *ys* and zeroed copula), and (B) 'Predicate + copula + Subject', no less heterogeneous and mixed: our expanded and unexpended delocutive-theme, and in fact the entire rheme-initial pattern set, including both our interlocutive and delocutive patterns, and even the theme-initial Theme + copula + Rheme 'copular sentence'. Earliest of all, Strachan (1909) had noted the sequence alternation between the basic 'affirmative' clauses ('Pred. + copula', §159): on the one hand, the interrogative/negative/subordinated/'impersonal'/adverb-following clauses, on the other ('copula + Pred.', §105, our converted alternant). Tischhäuser 1971, discussing 'predicative complements', suggests the inverse taxonomy: he subordinates NS rhemes to *yn*-rhemes, accounting for the former as special cases of *yn*-omission, e.g. motivated by specificity factors (see below).

0.2 The Nominal Sentence: basic distinctions and Grundproblematik

(a) Terminology

We are obviously in need of elucidation of the concepts we use, which are partly a formal source of the prevailing descriptive confusion. I operate within the quadruple system of *theme:rheme, topic:focus*, approximately that suggested by M. A. K. Halliday.[16]

Observations

1. From the extensive literature on the subject, I will quote only Georg's (essentially dialogue-orientated, hence communicative) definitions of 'psychological subject' (approx. = our 'theme') – 'das woran, worueber ich den Angeredeten denken lassen will', and 'sychological predicate' (approx. = our 'rheme') – 'das, was er darüber denken soll' (Gabelenz 1869). See the penetrating as well as broad-scoped 'Elffers-van Ketel 1991, a historiographic study of the grammatical, logico-semantic, 'psychological', language-philosophical context of the vicissitudes of the clausal information-structure terminology.

2. 'Complement' is used in several recent English-language Welsh grammars for the rhematic constituent (so Thorne 1993, e.g. p. 368 'subject and complement', [349] 'predicative *yn* preceding the complement';[17] King 1993, e.g. *yn* as complement marker, §§15, 473; also Williams 1980, e.g. p. 80 'complement [or together with verb, predicate]') for or with 'predicate' or 'rheme'. The application of this relatively recent term[18] is not without relevance to the Welsh NS, for it too is a biased one: 'comple-

[16] See Shisha-Halevy 1986: 69ff.

[17] Thorne does not define his basic terms; *yw* is 'copula' and 'predicator' (not clear), and 'predicate' is also in use (e.g. §279).

[18] The *OED* gives only 'predicative complement', attested from 1875; Halliday 1970: 485 dates 'complement' as 'not before 1880'; the term seems to have been imported from the Continent, either from German or French usage.

ment' presupposes a verb or a predicate core, and its use must imply verb-centred syntax.

3. The constituent order 'theme to rheme' is still implicity or explicitly considered 'natural' or 'basic' in general writing on syntax. In fact, this sequence is but a 'default' order in many Indo-European verbal clauses (not in the verbal complex as such), and does not really come to terms with the syntagmatics of the 'Nominal Sentence' special nexus pattern. Indeed, the theme-to-rheme sequencing is in Welsh (and generally in Celtic) text-grammatically marked (cf. Watkins and Mac Cana 1958: 4ff., MacCoisdealbha 1976: 28ff., 44ff., *pace* Thorne 1993: §279).[19]

(b) 'Copula' as a definitional constituent

Here is once more slippery ground. 'Copula' is a fluid and problematic notion, especially because of the ethnocentrism snares. My definition of the copula as 'the element signalling the predicative nexus' or 'the signifier of which the signified is the predicative nexus' detaches it entirely from the domain of the verb. For I conceive of the 'copula' as a constituent element – tagmemic, but not necessarily segmental – of any nexus – an element that denotes (and marks) the special nexal interdependence: the *significant* of which the *signifié* is 'predicative nexus'. A copula may thus be a prosodic grammeme (the prosodic 'weakness' of the theme, for instance), a syntactic juncture feature (paradoxically, even a delimitation, such as the absence of gender-number concord, 'concord freezing' or absence of aspiration for an adjective following a feminine theme in Irish, in Germanic and, outside Indo-European, in Egyptian; for infixed lenition as copula, cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.4.2), or an order feature, beside segmentals ranging from pronouns (e.g. Modl, Modern Hebrew and other Semitic languages, Egyptian,[20] Coptic) to so-called particles (e.g. Vedic *vai*, etc.,[21] arguably Irish *is*-[23] and Euw *ys*[23]).

Observations

1. The *ideé fixe* of the verbal copula, or of the verbality somehow intrinsic to copular role, is a classic example of the combined vitiating effect of 'superstition de la morphologie' with the 'tyrannie du latin' (Latin, in this case, a terminological-imprint supplying source; currently replaced in this role by English); De Boer 1928. We have here precisely a 'mirage morphologique en fait de syntaxe', where the very notion of morphological identity obscures and often, diachronically biasing, distorts the synchronically systemic view of entirely distinct syntactic functioning. In the case in point,

[19] Needless to say, such statements are not universally valid within a given language (= the whole corpus array), but are always textgrammatically and textemically oriented. In the grammar of proverbs, for instance, the signifier-to-signified sequence, expressing 'the deep or transcendent or universal significance', is typically matched by a theme-to-rheme one ('Spare the rod and spoil the child'; even a case like 'It's an ill wind that blows nobody any good' is not a simple focusing construction: it realizes cataphorically the predication that 'the wind that . . . is an ill wind').

[20] Steinthal-Misteli 1893: 296-7.

[21] Cf. Migron 1994/5.

[22] See Ahlqvist 1972, esp. 270-1, with n.13, for the earlier and native Irish tradition, which sees the copula as an article-like particle (*airmbearla*). I find Irish *is*, rather than Welsh *ys*, of relevance to our Welsh *y w* (although both morphs are essentially different). Consider Greene *apud* MacCoisdealbha 1976: 28 '[*is* is] something much more like a demonstrative particle than a verb (but M. still considers it a 3rd person present indicative verb).

[23] Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.2; 1998: 198–232.

the consequences of the 'historical-genetic-morphologistic' view are especially grave, for it veils the essential insight that the 'second' (i.e. non-rhematic) element in the pattern is a thematic constituent rather than a copula: see further below.

2. In Hengeveld 1972: 30ff. (copula ('is', 'ser'), 'semi-copula' ('become', 'remain' 'estar'[24]]; 'pseudo-copula'; also pronouns and particles), the copula is defined as 'a kind of auxiliary . . . semantically empty supportive device', with 'supportive function', (making) no independent contribution to the meaning of the sentence'.

(c) YwB *pronominal theme, not verbal copula*

We should get our terminology and conceptual pictures clear at this point, synchronically and functionally; for this is obviously the key question. The formal pronominal theme (playing an important role in the Nominal Sentence patterns in Brythonic and Goidelic, and in the Cleft Sentence in the latter) is a delocutive grammemic element which, in a NS, is referable to an opposed (extra- or pre-posed/topicalized, or post-posed; thus, the theme respectively anaphoric or cataphoric) lexemic (pro)nominal (its role is typically to fill a thematic slot in a core pattern, leaving lexemes to its periphery). The non-formal pronominal theme is referential to cotextual or pragmatic-contextual nominals outside the clause. Now while both formal theme and copula are grammemes 'mediating' between theme and rheme, there is one decisive difference between them: the former is a phoric index, a delimitation (a boundary signal for a core pattern), while the latter, as stated above, is no less than the *significant* to the *nexus signifié*, and thus a link. In view of all this, the nature of *yw* – an especially acute question of definition – cannot, I believe, be established *a priori* and praeteranalytically.

I would here (to anticipate the findings presented below) challenge the tacit asumption that our constructions are verb clauses.[25] The burden and centrepiece of my argument is, that in MW (and, to a different extent, in ModW) yw_1 functions synchronically as a delocutive (3rd-person) pronoun. As such it is phoric, in a functional spectrum of phoricity: it may be anaphoric, referring to preceding cotextual segments, in the foregoing cotext or even within the clause, in the nominal topic: cataphoric – heralding subsequent appositive expanding nominals; or, much less frequently, exophoric, referring to pragmatic-situational elements outside the text. This may claim not merely to stand an *idée reçue* on its head, but to be a restatement of the problem and approach more closely a truer understanding of the syntax concerned, Yw_2 on the other hand – of a very limited distribution, in MW, but of a great importance in ModW – is a true copula, mediating between initial theme and final rheme.

Observations

1. The verbal morphology of *yw* is conventionally taken for granted, e.g. in D. Simon Evans 1964; 136ff.; the *GPC*; Lewis 1967: 215 ('Originally a 2nd-person form, *esi, as basis [*eo, yu*] for pronominal agglutination': this would mean a zero pronoun for

[24] See below on the analogic role affinity of *ser/estar* and Welsh NS-rheme/*yn*-rheme.
[25] Most recently in Rouveret 1996.

the sgl. delocutive; but do we then really have a verb, when personal forms have been shuffled like this?); Morgan 1959; 268ff. ('berf y cyplad'); Williams 1980: §141f.; Thorne 1993: §s77ff., although his blending or morphology and 'syntax' is very sound, elsewhere, e.g. §349IV a, *yw* is referred to as 'predicator'; this would seem to approach closest to the 'formal-theme' conception of *yw* proposed here. No convincing synchronic evidence is produced for the verbality if *yw*. The verbality of *yw* would have no synchronic structural descriptive meaning if the element is shown to have thematic value and nothing of the formal/functional characteristic of a verb.

2. As for the part-of-speech aspect of the question, I can but repeat F. de Saussure's words (see Engler, *Lexique terminologique*, 39), to the effect that this consideration is but a 'principe purement logique, extralinguistique, appliqué du dehors sur la grammaire'.[26] My impression is that the preservation and imposition of the old part-of-speech categorization is motivated as much by inertia as by the feeling of 'terminological security' deriving from this foremost of the 'good old descriptive certainties'. This seems also the motive for the constant attempts to update and refine this pseudo-system, and introduce into it the sophistications of categorial analysis (cf. for instance *Les Parties du Discours*, Aix-en-Provence 1983 (Travaux du Circle Linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence, 1)). A genuinely analytic approach would seek to understand and define 'value elements' which, more often than not, fall into the cracks between the *a priori* part-of-speech categories.

3. 'N yw ef' is considered 'a kind of Abnormal Sentence' by Richards (1938: §148), probably by token of its commutation with 'N fydd *ef*'; the latter, however, is not a case of conversion *relatival lenition* but of *nexus-infix* linition (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.4.2).

4. Typological-comparative. The following are the four essential and prominent features involved in the formal phenomenon of the NS in Welsh, with significant typological characterization and comparison implications:[27]

(a) the systemic formal distinction of noun-rheme and adverbial-rheme nexus patterns (Egyptian-Coptic, Semitic, Berber);

(b) the rheme-to-theme syntagmatic order as an unmarked ('default') pattern sequence arrangement (Egyptian-Coptic, Syriac, Biblical, Hebrew, etc.);[28]

(c) the formal pattern-associated existence of the opposition of inherent (circumstance-absolute, 'permanent') vs. incidental, circumstance-sensitive noun predication, the latter role expressed by an adverbial rheme in an adverbial-rheme nexus pattern (Egyptian-Coptic, probably Berber);

[26] See also Tullio de Mauro's n. 219 in his editions (Italian, French) of Bally and Sechehaye's compilation of passages from Saussure's three courses (known as Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale*).

[27] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: section 7. The typological significance of the noun-predication syntactic feature was first (?) pointed out in Morris-Jones 1900: 628-9 (feature no. 5).

[28] The typological application of syntagmatic order features is not straightforward, because of the complexity of this tagmemic feature, which may be conditioned or motivated and often internally contradictory. I do not distinguish between 'syntactic' and 'pragmatic' order (as does Lopreino 1988, for Egyptian; see the cogent criticism in Satzinger 1991). In Welsh, the rheme-initial sequence is also observable in the non-periphrastic verb clause.

(d) the pronominal theme (*yw*) a constituent part of a special noun-predicating nexal pattern (Egyptian-Coptic,[29] Semitic, Berber).

0.3 Interlocutive vs. delocutive 'referential sphere' textemic systems of grammar. Dialogue vs. narrative textemic systems. The Nominal Sentence in paradigm

The pattern sets I wish to define and establish in a *système des valeurs* must be resolved analytically in the distinct frameworks of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. This in turn presupposed a precision of its distribution and functioning in the respective interpersonal diasystemic units – delocutive (3rd-person) and interlocutive (locutive, 1st-person, and allocutive, 2nd person) – as well as the syntagmatic/textematic environmental ones. Of these I shall mention here only the narrative and dialogic ones. The former consists in fact of subtextemic clusters that make up a highly complex textural web, with numerous subsystems and functional roles. Note, for instance, that of the narrative mainstream ('foreground), and its setting complex, the Comment Mode both 'background' and non-'background':[30] 'Narrator's Channel' intervention, parenthetic perspective, 'omniscient narrator's information' – all constituents of non-foreground narrative; narrative pacing ('tempo'); narrative 'gear-shift'; in-depth or slow-motion account; narrative *relief* – narrative staging and manipulation grounds; narrative peak vs. 'valley'; narrative focusing ('highlighting') – all formally signalled narrative functions. Narrative event, scene, episode, inter-episode seam, boundary; narrative blocking or 'chunking' – elements of narrative texture and juncture. The dialogue, on the other hand, is differently complex: it comprises two major substructures – the allocutive and reactive ones – that may be combined or may be mutually superimposed.

Paradigmatically, the functional essence, the *valeur* of the Nominal Sentence emerges in opposition to other clause forms. Generally speaking, the NS is extratemporal (not attemporal, in the sense of 'aoristic' or generic-time-referent, like the Welsh aorist verbal tense (the 'present[-future]').[31], or the zero-form of Indo-European 'be' predication;[32] it is thus opposed to verbal-nexus forms (e.g. to the aorist and periphrastic present) as specifically standing outside any time-relevance. But probably most striking is the oppo-

[29] Wagner 1977: 210 (+n. 23) considered the Middle Egyptian prefixed element 'yw' (*jw* in Egyptological notation) to be 'kopulaartig' (he had compared Egyptian often also in Wagner 1959, a work severely criticized yet full of analytical insights: one does not have to agree with all its claims to find it stimulating). *Jw* is in point of fact a peculiarly existential-pronominal formal theme, occupying the structural first position of and thus characterizing the adverbial-rheme nexus pattern or matrix, in the second position of which adverbial as well as most verbal rhemes ('adverbialized', as finite gerunds, preposition-governed infinitives, etc.) are constructed to occur (see Polotsky 1965); it is not copular, and does not realize the nexus but does mark the rheme and define the nexus type; it is still eminently comparable to Welsh *mae*, which is zeroable in included or exclamative status: its presence signals the 'indicative autonomy' of the nexus.

[30] Sometimes presented as an irreconcilably double conception of grounding: Weinrich's (and Romanistic) tense-based grounding *vs.* Labov's (and generally Anglo-American) generally discourse-pragmatic grounding. Frankly, I cannot see why they cannot be combined, as two full diagrammatical systems (esp. as Weinrich expressly stresses the importance of other concomitant signals beside the tenses for his dichotomy); note S. Fleischmann's (1990) multidimensional grounding model, mainly but not exclusively tense-oriented.

[31] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.3.0.1.

[32] See Hjelmslev 1948 and Lanérès 1994: 237 for the semantic specifics of this opposition. Note that even in such cases as 'be' zeroing as in Greek, there exist formal distinctions such as word-order and constituence, establishing a separate pattern (Lanérès 1994: 244ff.).

sition of the Nominal Sentence to the 'circumstances' or 'incidental' *yn*-rheme predication in the statal-rheme nexus pattern featuring also the existential *mae*, that is, when such opposition obtains at all: see in some detail below.

Observations

1. In many languages featuring the Nominal Sentence as a special nexus pattern one notes alternant and opposite patterns that are verbal (esp. the verb 'be' or comparables: Hebrew HYH, Egyptian WNN, Syriac HW? etc.), supplying temporal (and modal) paradigmatic correspondents to the extratemporal, a modal-Nominal Sentence. Similarly, Welsh *bot: bu, oed* and so on. Still, these – all pertinent (i.e. unconditioned) – are of a different nexus pattern, viz. verbal nexus. On the other hand, conversion of the NS often involves inversion from rheme-initial to theme-initial sequence, as two tagmemic alternants.[33] The converters and some junctors 'activate', in a metaphorical manner of speaking, a suppletion system in which forms of the verb 'be' replace the NS patterns proper (e.g. *pan-fu/yny-fu/tra-fu* + Nom. Rheme). These cases of suppletive converted *bot-* clauses are conditioned.

2. Once again, the notion of complementarity (i.e. absence of opposition) between *yn*-rhemes and NS-rhemes, conceived of as motivated by the sequence parameter alone, lives on in Thorne's recent and generally excellent grammar (Thorne 1993: §349 IVb): 'The copula also occurs initially and the clause takes the structure PC(A)S; the complement is preceded by the predicative *yn*. P selects the 3 sing.*mae*.

0.4 Converters and junctors

Converters (Shisha-Halevy 1995) are exponents of clause- and text-syntactic status: non-binary actualizers, essential components of their clause (i.e. their absence constitutes a zero morph). The converter system may be briefly and schematically presented as follows:

Category I: Clause-constituent functions – substantivators

a^{len}-/Ø[[*oed, ry-*]: actant-nucleus substantivator (verbal nexus) *y(d)-/pan-yw-*; [verbal/non-verbal nexus, respectively] circumstant-nucleus substantivator; 'that' substantivator
na-t-, na(t): negativer of above (specific) [non-verbal/verbal nexus, respectively]
ny-t-, ny(t)- non-specific actant/circumstant-nucleus substantivator (non-verbal/verbal nexus, respectively]

Category II: Discourse functions

(a) texture and information-structuring functions:
ny-t, nt(t-: negative delimitation
neu-t-, neu-; nexus-focusing (in dialogue), superordination (in narrative) [non-verbal/verbal nexus, respectively]
linition (medial or infixed): noun-rheme nexus
lenition: parenthetic syntactic status

[33] Cf. Niccacci 1993, for biblical Hebrew: 'P-S' (1 Kgs. 20: 32 *'hy hw'*) vs. 'S-P' circumstantial-responsive-presentative (Gen. 24: 65 *hw' 'dny*, 28: 13 *'ny yhwh 'lhy'brhm 'byk*).

(b) dialogic structuring and act-of-speech functions

ae/y-, *a*^{len}- [non-verbal/verbal nexus, respectively]: nexus interrogative; constituent disjunctor

Ø- + verbal nexus (aorist tense), + non-verbal rheme: [all persons] – reactive; [first persons] performative

na (c)^{len}- + verbal nexus: (all persons) reactive; constituent disjunctor

Converters are distinct from junctors (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §1.1–3), which are exponents (prefixed to verbal nexus only), not of text-grammatical status but of binary (in-pair) temporal/conditional interclausal relation. They are not actualizers, and are non-essential: their absence does not constitute a zero. Some important junctors are:

pan^{len} – (with affirmative nexus only) 'when', 'that' . . .
tra ^{len} – 'while, as long as'
yny ^{len} – 'until' (ng. *hyt na-*)

0.5 Noun determination in the NS rheme

The noun determination syndrome is not a category, but a categorial cluster, and indeed the *condition nominale*: constant formal syntagmatic, cotextua/contextual monitoring of the nominal's actual location on a complicated multidimensional scale of specificity (to use a convenient term: on the following pages, I shall refer to 'specific', 'non-specific' and 'zero', as basic points or location on this scale). In fact, the nexal status of a (pro)noun, as theme or rheme, is probably the one in which the nominal's specificity marking is more grammatically relevant than anywhere else, and one of the two major grammatical 'applications' of the determination syndrome (the other being textual cohesion).[34]

Now when we speak of a 'specific rheme', it is in the sense of a convenient code-name for the higher-to-highest specificity sector or scalar range incorporating, in rough descending specificity order, Proper Names, demonstrative pronouns and adjectives, personal pronouns, determinators nuclear in lexeme-containing noun syntagms (the so-called definite article and the possessive articles), high-specificity zero determination or 'notion name'.[35] Otherwise, zero determination – i.e. no determinator in the commutation environment of non-zero determination[36] – covers both abstract or extensional generic, non-specific indefinite and specific-indefinite references.

[34] On the correlation of syntactic status with determination, see the excellent Jones 1975/6: 327ff. In the highly complicated system of the Modl NS, theme determination is also a crucial factor.

[35] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989: 140 (see under 'Generic (notion) names').

[36] A few selected slots where it is *nil* rather than *zero* that is in evidence, with no non-*zero* determination signal in commutation, that is, not 'indefinite' but 'bare determination-indifferent lexeme'; (a) the infinitive (alias 'verb[al] noun'), in constructions such as 'INF a wnaeth', 'Sef a wnaeth . . . INF', 'da yw genhym ni INF' (*PKM* 69) (of course, the infinitive has a different determination structure from non-verbal lexemes); (b) the so-called 'vocative': 'A geimeit' (*PKM* 70); (c) the (lenited) apposition to a proper name: 'Gwydyon uab Don'; (d) the resuming-anaphoric substantive following cataphoric *sef* ('Sef arch a archaf lloneit y got' (*P* 375), see below - not 'indefinite'!); (e) the nucleus in noun phrases of the construction type 'drws y ty', although this is apparently a case of fuzzy rather than 'indifferent' determination.

1 Inherent (Circumstance-Absolute) Noun Predication

1.1 The rheme-initial pattern set: basic (unmarked) predication

This is the most important and largest pattern set. The predication by the rheme-initial pattern set is not emphatic or focal or prominent, but the basic or unmarked NS pattern with respect to information structuring, Communicative Dynamism and Functional Sentence Perspective. It is not pertinently opposed to an inverse or otherwise different sequencing, which means, in a structural analysis, that this placement of the rheme does not carry any focusing or 'prominencing' functional load.[37] As to its textemic environment, the rheme-initial pattern set is typically dialogic or expository, not narrative.

Observation

The unmarked rheme-initial sequencing is an important typological trait in Celtic, similarly to Egyptian-Coptic (Shisha-Halevy 1987), Biblical Hebrew (Niccacci 1993), Class. Syriac (Goldenberg 1983) and 'classical' or older phases of other Semitic languages, unlike their modern descendants which, arguably under the influence of the North-West-European linguistic type, have come to associate clause-initial placement with emphasis or focusing. Inversion in the normal copular noun-rheme pattern in the European languages is as a rule marked as regards prominence or expressivity.

1.1.1 The interlocutive pronominal theme: 'eirchat-wyf'

Profile – Paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties

(a) Constituency

Rhemes:
PRONOUN (interrogative, in allocution);
PROPER NAME (in response/reaction);
SUBSTANTIVE (zero-determinated).

[Unattested (systematically?); specific substantive; *un-*; adjective]:

Themes, suffixed to rheme: *wyf*, *-wyf-i*, 1st sgl. (responsive); *-wyt*, *-wyt-ti*, prominent-topical *wyt-titheu*, 2nd sgl.

[Unattested (provisionally?): plural themes]

[37] *Pace* e.g. Preusler 1953: 119, D. Simon Evans 1968: 317-18, Thorne 1993: §282 IV. The implication correlation of initiality and thematicity (cf. Welke 1992: 32ff., following a long tradition, beginning with the German 19th-cent. syntactic typologists, cf. von der Gabelenz 1869: 379-80, and H. Weil's *De l'ordre des mots* (1879) is certainly not of universal validity, except in the case of a very basic stair-like 'thematic progression' chain (cf. Elffers-van Ketel 1991: 230).

(b) Text-grammatical features

Specificity and reference contours: Unlike the delocutive theme pronoun, the interlocutive theme is non-phoric, and, much like Proper Names, is denotative.[38] Consequently, the pattern has low cohesive value and is delimitative. Unlike the delocutive patterns, it is monolexemic, with no expansion, no topicalizing extraposition (of the type 'Titheu pwy wyt')[39] is attested.

Textemic environment: both allocutive/responsive (reactive) subsystems of dialogue (semi- or fully responsive. Responsive to a foregoing question, reactive to a foregoing cotext or pragmatic situation – a distinction absent in the delocutive pattern, below).

Juncture properties/prosodics: theme and rheme join in close juncture, theme enclitic.

Conversions: uncommon in this pattern, which is usually autonomous or unmarked for text-grammatical status, enver abnominalo, and not superordinated/nexus-focused by *neu-t-*;[40]

negative *nyt-* (→ theme-initial pattern, with lenited rheme);[41] suppletive *na-bo-ro* (rheme-initial);

interrogative *a-* (→ theme-initial pattern, with lenited rheme);

junction: conditional *ot-* (← theme-initial pattern).

Compatibilities and textual integration: adverbials, discourse markers are very rare. I note only initial *weithon* 'now'. Our pattern usually follows address forms or allocutions, typically in response (less often in allocution), often closing the communicative interchange complex; it is but exceptionally coordinated (*O* 543f-5). For its part, it is followed by a coordinated Abnormal Sentence (*P* 314, 418, *PKM* 79, 83, *O* 26–7) or infinitive (*P* 284–5).

Observations

This pattern is characterized by a morphologically pronominal theme. I suggest it is homonymic with a finite verbal (*bot*) element, one that is (like other verbal-nexus forms, but not Nominal-Sentence nexus) fully convertible, e.g. by *yd-*[42] in focusing Cleft Sentence constructions like: *Drwy y wlat honn yd wyf* (*PKM* 61–2). *Cam yd wyt arnaw* (*PKW* 57), *Llibin yd ym pob blwydyn* (*P* 514–15), *Nyt hir ettwa yd ym y gyt* (*P* 475–8), and even *Ay kyscu yd wyt* (*P* 535), which are not Nominal Sentences, and in syntactic principle not different from cases like: *Kam y'm byrywyt i* (*O* 504), *Drwc y gweda* . . . (*PKM* 64), with the element in question commuting with a bona-fida finite verb.[43] Cases like: *Yd wyf yn medylyaw* (*PKM* 87) and *Yd wyt yn y lle* . . . (*P* 403–4) present yet another '*wy*=' homonym – statal-existential theme – as well as a structurally distinct *yd* converter.[44]

[38] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989: 142, under 'Pronouns, interlocutive'.

[39] For examples, cf. D. Simon Evans 1968: 325ff.

[40] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.1.

[41] Contrast ModW *Nid hogyn bach ydw'i rŵan* (*Pigau'r Sêr* 119).

[42] Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.2.

[43] The ex-Coptologist Celtic scholar Ludwig Christian Stern (se Shisha-Halevy 1995: §7), discussing the Coptic Nominal Sentence in his still authoritative *Koptische Grammatik* (1880: 143ff.), writes of the 'subject copula' (the case of the delocutives *pe/te/ne*, masc. sgl/fem. sgl/masc.+fem. pl.); however, the 1st/2nd person (interlocutive) pronouns (Coptic [Sahidic] *ang-*, *ntk-*) 'may themselves express the copula'. A brilliant monograph on the Coptic interlocutive NS is Funk 1991; cf. also Shisha-Halevy 1987: 163-4.

[44] Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.

Documentation:

Riannon uerch Heueyd Hen wyf-i (*P* 284–5).
Nac af . . . eirchat wyf (*P* 314)
Negessawl wyf wrthyt (*P* 372)
Brenhin coronawc wyf-i (*P* 41)
Arawn urenhin Annwyn wyf-i (*P* 44)
Ie, arglwyd . . . briwdic wyf-i (*P* 418)
Weithon gwreic wyf-i (*PKM* 74)
A dywedy di y mi pwy wyt? (*P* 283)
Pwy wyt titheu? Lunet wyfi-i (*O* 684–5)
E rof a Duw . . . gwr drwc wyt-ti (*PKM* 83)
Dygaf y Duw yug-kyffes . . . Direit wreic wyt (*PKM* 79)
Dioer . . . hyn gwr wyt a gwell ymdidanwr no mi (*O* 27)
. . . a'm kefynderw wyt (*O* 535)

Conversions:

Nit-wyt-gystal ymdidanwr heno ac un nos (*B* 135)
A-wyt-uorwyn-di? (*PKM* 77)

Junction:

ot-wyt-uorwyn . . . (protasis, *PKM* 77)
tra-vwyf-vyw (*O* 810)

Some instances of the narrative verbal nexus (allo-) construction, suppletive to the interlocutive pattern: #RHEME – *owdwyn/uum* (*i*) #

Yspeilwr uun (*O* 808)
Direid-wreic uuost eiroet (*PKM* 83)
Namyn un mab a that oedwn-i (*O* 31–2)
(dywedut) pa-ryw wr-oedwn (*O* 142)
Ni-buum drwc i ettwa wrthyt-ti (*PKM* 81)

Note a special case of *na-*, suppletively (*-bo-*) with the rheme-initial pattern:

. . . na-bo miui yych-ti (*P* 57)
. . . na-bo-tidi wyf-i (*P* 67)

1.1.2 The delocutive pronominal yw-theme pattern set

This comprises three distinct patterns: (a) unexpended-theme pattern; (b) expanded-theme pattern; (c) topicalized-theme pattern. The three – all rheme initial – differ sharply in their macrosyntactic properties: (a) is an anaphoric (high thematic-referential extra-clausal textual linkage) construction; (b) is delimitative; (c) effects topical-lexical intra-clausal linkage.

1.1.2.1

The NS pattern with an unexpanded pronominal *yw* theme is in MW (unlike ModW) relatively rare, restricted and marked. This pattern is binary, dichotomically made up

of lexemic and grammemic constituents, and thus neatly isolating the lexical from the grammatical – a bipartition precisely matched on the information-structuring level: the lexical constituent is rhematic; the grammatical, thematic.

PROFILE – Paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties

(a) Constituency

Rhemes

PRONOUN (interrogative);
PROPER NAME;
SUBSTANTIVE (*zero* det., + expansion; non-specific/specific (untypical));
'ADJECTIVE' (rare: *zero* or *nil* determination. See Observation);

[Unattested: personal, demonstrative pronouns (unlike ModW); (*yr*) *un* (unlike ModW)]

Themes: 3rd person sgl.plur. *-yw* (masc.), *yw-Ø* (fem.); prominent-topical, *yw-ynteu* (masc.), *yw-hi* (fem.).

Observation

Note the specific substantives with superlative adjectives (*nil*, not *zero*-det. substantive; *yr*-det. superlative).

(b) Text grammatical features

Juncture properties/prosodics: close junction between rheme group and theme (theme enclitic). Rheme expansions normally precede the theme, with the theme thus a final boundary-signal. However, clause modifiers follow the theme, with a mainly rhythmic differentiation.

Specificity and reference contours: since a specific theme is extremely rare here (the Proper-Name rheme is a very special application; see observation 1 below), it may be suggested that specificity imbalance is distinctive in this pattern. As suggested above, this pattern is text-grammatically a link. The reference is as a rule to a foregoing nominal outside the clause (exophoric reference). Endophoric reference (see observations) is very rare in MW e.g. (probably) *moes yw genhym ni . . . y nos gyntaf y delher at wr mawr, dywedut o'r penkerd* (*PKM* 69); this seems to be the crucial difference between our pattern and its ModW correspondent.

Observations

In ModW, we find a double reference contour: first, clause-endophoric: *yw invariable*, referent to the rheme noun itself; the second clause-exophoric: *yw* variable, referent to the foregoing textual segment outside the clause: 'He/she . . . is, They are . . .' The clause-exophoric construction is expandable into the expanded-theme delocutive pattern (see below). The first contour is the one typical of this pattern, occurring with a well-defined lexemic inventory; consider for instance (exx. from Kate Roberts) *Iaith yr hen bobl . . . yw hi / Gardd rhyfedd yw hi / Ceffyl ysgafn fel ceffyl rhedeg ydi hi / Digon drwg ydi hi* (resp. to '*Sut mae Meri?*').

In ModI, on the other hand, the entire correspondent pattern is retro-dependent,

usually responsive: *Is fior duit / Is iontach* (resp. to '*Is iontach . . .*' / *Ni baol duit, a anam / Ni hea, agus ni hamhlaidh* (resp. to '*An amhlaidh . . .?*' Exx. from Myles na gCopaleen's *An Béal Bocht*).

Prosody: the theme *yw* is enclitic, in the approximative sense of the term.

Textemic-environment: the dialogue system (responsive/reactive, rarely allocutive); 1st-person narrative description.

Conversions:

negative *nyt-*, *ny-t*; suppletive *nyt -oes/oed/bu*, *na-bo-* (lenited rheme);
interrogative *a-* (→ theme-initial, lenited rheme);
nominalizing: *mae-* (rheme-initial; not in the Four Branches, only in Owain)

Junction: conditional *os*, *os-*; *tra-* (→ theme-initial, lenited rheme).

Adverbial compatibilities. Textual integration: clause modifiers are rare: *bellach* 'now', *heno* 'tonight' (post-posed to the pattern); rheme modifications (prepositional) usually follow in the Four Branches, except for possessive *i-*, which immediately follows the rheme. The pattern itself is text-grammatically a link.

Observations

1. A Proper Name occurs as rheme (*PKM* 80), not in a naming pattern, in the sense of basic, introduction-into-discourse, text-grammatically significant naming, but in a special 'magical naming' situation: effective 'post-performative naming', locutive, solemn and ceremonial name-conferring (real *Namengebung*, *impositio nominis*) on the epic hero.

2. Adjective as rheme: the nexal sequence, adjective-to-substantive (in its syntagmatic realization form, #ADJ. *yw* SUBST. #, i.e. expanded delocutive, see below: 1.1.2.2) is of course opposed to the non-compound phrasal sequence substantive-to-adjective. The structural differentiation between adjective and substantive as two syntactical form-classes (one of the less contested, but still questionable, since aprioristic and praetor-analytical, logical-part-of-speech categories) is somewhat less uneasy, analytically speaking, in Welsh than in other Indo-European languages. Like the definition of the notoriously problematic 'word', it is a 'patchwork' of uncoextensive and uncommensurable parameters. Beyond the restricted motion morphology (*byr:ber*, *y/w* – *e/o* vocalism and the like), the comparative/superlative suffixes extend in Welsh, as in Ino-European generally, to substantives (cf. Thorne 1993: §196); the post-posed adnominal paradigm is of course shared by substantives; the 'concording' monophophonemic, feminine initial lenition by itself is not sufficient as formally distinctive, witness the case of '*coes bren*' etc. We are thus left with rhematic status alone as possibly diagnostic (as it is for instance in Irish or in Egyptian), but here, in NS rhemes as in *yn*-rhemes, the zero-determinated substantive merges with the adjective.

3. Theme form: *yw* vs. *yw-ef*. In fact, we find this formal opposition attested only for the feminine (cf. *P* 237, *PKM* 64; *yw ynteu* occurs for masc. In *O* 111–12)) Middle Welsh does not have the 'copula + *augens*' feature as in Irish (cf. Mac Cana 1975/6: cf. 319ff.), but the formal opposition of *yw* and *yw-ef/hi* in Welsh does invite comparison.

4. Reactive *Ys gwir* (*O* 684) is an isolated instance of the relic of an old pattern (ModI *is fíor*, OI *is fír*): synchronically, *ys-* is a focusing rather than next signal. Note that *yw* is in MW mostly personal (cases like: *hi a vydei olaw gan y tan o'e harueu* (*O* 530), *hyny uu dyd dranoeth* (*O* 702) illustrate the non-autonomous alternants).

(c) Documentation

(y wybot) pyw yw [fem.] (*P* 209, sim. *O* 619–7); (e wybot) pwy yw-hi (*P* 237); (minheu a uenegeis yti) pwy yw hi (*PKM* 64); (mi a wybydat) beth yw (*PKM* 59) are all retro-dependent, differing in the extent of reference.

Wy-gwreic-i yw-hi (*PKM* 64)
Llew Llaw Gyffes yw bellach (*PKM* 80)
Llidyawc yw (*B* 279)
Mab y dynyon mwyn yw (*P* 541)
Negessawl yw wrthyt-ti (*B* 34)
Nos calanmei yw heno (*P* 517)

NB: this is arguably an expanded delocutive-theme pattern, with *heno* not a clause modifier but appositive lexical theme.

Moes yw gennym-ni (*PKM* 69)
Llawen yw genhyf inheu (*PKM* 50)

NB: this is reactive to: *minheu a vydaf wrth hynny yn llawen*, with *yw* either a situational – 'pragmatic' neutric referent or generally anaphoric to the foregoing context.

(Nyt gwr anhygar efo;) gwr hagyr yw ynteu (*O* 111ff.)

NB: ynteu is here probably the contrastive sentence particle, 'on the other hand, rather'.

. . . a chowydr ar y koet hwnnw yw (v.l. yw ef) (*O* 111ff.)

Conversion, junction:

Nyt llei ef no chaur (*O* 733)
Nyt gwr anhygar efo (*O* 111–12)
os da genhyt ti (*PKM* 73)
tra-uu-da ganthunt (*B* 197; sim. *O* 781, 810)
Duw a wyr . . . arnaf mae-mwyhaf gwreic a garaf i yw hi (*O* 366ff)
hyny uu dyd dranoeth (*O* 702)

Narrative suppletives – verbal nexus:

. . . a lleidyr uu hi arnaf i (*PKM* 63)
. . . a beichawc oed hi (*PKM* 63)
Teccaf morwyn yn y byt oed (*B* 46)
Dysymlaf gwreic a bonedigaf . . . oed (*P* 89)
. . . a gwr hefyt athruger mawr a drygweith anorles arnaw oed (*B* 159–60)

1.1.2.2

Expanded delocutive theme: lexical nominal theme appositive to the formal theme *yw*

PROFILE – Paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties

This is the most prevalent and least restricted nominal sentence pattern in our corpus, with the broadest rhematic range. It consists of two basic lexemic nexus constituents, mediated by a cataphoric formal-theme pronoun. By the same token, *yw* serves as rheme-marker for the first lexeme, as in pattern (1.1.2a) above, as well as a rheme-group delimiter. Observe that while the [pronoun + actualized substantive lexeme] unit itself, in rhematic or thematic role, is known to effect focusing, this is not the case here.

(a) Constituency

Rhemes:

ADJECTIVE;
PRONOUN (interrogative);
PROPER NAME (rare);
SUBSTANTIVE (specific/non-specific, always expanded);
'RHEMATIC WORD-CLASS' (adjective + *zero*-det. substantive merger (*nil* specificity signalling), coinciding with an infinitival/'that'-form/clause-content-referent pronoun theme: a distinct subpattern.

[Unattested: demonstrative or personal pronouns; adverbials – both classes attested in the ModW correspondent pattern, Shisha-Halevy, 1998: 154 ff.]

Observations

1. This pattern manifests a cancelling of ('indifference' to) the specificity feature.
2. The Proper Name occurs rhematically in this pattern as identification-of-named and not naming.
3. The *nil*-det. superlative adjective specifies a following substantive: *Pennaf neges uu y mi keissaw di welet* (*P* 282).

Themes:

Formal cataphoric theme, enclitic to rheme: 3rd person sgl/plur. *-yw* (ModW also *ydy(w), ydi*)
Appositive theme: high-specificity noun-syntagme; demonstratives: *hynny, hwn,* pl. *y rei hyn, hon-racko* etc.; personal pronoun; *yr*-possessive pronoun (pro-form); *a*^{len}- (relative); infinitives (*nil* or *zero* det.); 'that'-clause nexus nominalization (conjunctive, *ual-, na-, nyt-*).

Observations

1. The demonstrative series are opposed according to the referates, with *hynny* exophoric-pragmatic, *hwn* endo- or ana-phoric. Note here the importance of *hynny* as clause-content referent; see below.
2. *a* – actantial relative converter normalizing verbal nexus: see Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.1.

3. The infinitive in the thematic slot is either determination-indifferent, or else has a basically different determination system than the non-verbal noun lexeme. The infinitive-theme (and the *hynny* theme – 'clause/cotext-content referent'[45] – commuting with the infinitive: by this very fact demonstrably a distinct paradigm) construction must be considered an important subpattern, especially diachronically: in ModW it is binominal, with no mediating formal theme: *Anodd gin i gredu hynny / Bron na allai deimlo / Da bod rhywun yn hapus / Diamau iddo ei daro / Gresyn hynny / Well i chi symud* (all exx. from Kate Roberts). It is, in ModW and, inceptively, in MW, of theoretical importance: the point to seize the attention here is the special word-class-neutral rheme constituency. The rheme category consists of a unique and distinctive special word-class (or 'part of speech'), namely the word-class solely and exclusively characterizable as rhematic (or 'predicative') – a striking instance of syntax overruling (and reshuffling) a preanalytic part-of-speech conceptualization. (Specificity is in this pattern a category unmarked and non-pertinent). We find in MW the following rhemes (rather matching the ModW ones): *iawn, digawn, diheu, eres, truan, hawd, reit, da, goreu, go athrist, hawssaf, teckaf, moes, kynghor*. The theme paradigm features infinitives; 'that' clauses,[46] including *ual-*; *hynny*.[47]

4. The elements *gan-* and *i-* in our pattern pose the question of resolving rheme-circumstant, thematic actant, thematic pattern constituent and clause modifier. Their placement is as a rule following the formal theme (in *P* 409 it is a clause-final, and probably a clause-modifier).

5. The *agens* of the thematic infinitive is expressed either by the possessive article with post-posed pronouns (cf, *B* 92, *PKM* 58, 71, *O* 17, 227) or (as is usual in ModW) by the '*i-* cum infinitivo' included-nexus construction: *Drwc yw gennym ni, unben, dy druot titheu yma* (*O* 796–7).

6. *Ys* very clearly introduces a rheme-focusing construction (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.2), cleanly opposed to our #ADJ. – yw – INF# subpattern: *Ys guell in . . . kyrchu tref arall . . .* (*PKM* 53) 'What is *really* better for us . . . is to set out for another town', *Ys anhaws ynni ymlad a'r anifeil racko* (*O* 770) 'It's really difficult . . .' (In OW, #*is* (PRO)NOUN# is of course usual as a gloss-form: Lambert 1987: 303, 304, etc.; on *ys gwir* see above).

7. The themes, formal and non-formal, are zeroed in response to a nexal ('yes/no') question, repeating the interrogative rheme, constituting a separate *zero*-theme, see below (*PKM* 84, *B* 273–4, *O* 227–8): *Ae amser inni vynet . . .? Amser* (*O* 227–8); *Ae diogel hynny . . .? Diogel, dioer* (*PKM* 86); cf. *A-oed diheu . . ? Diheu* (*O* 697ff.).

8. The case of *Bychain-uynt wynteu* (*PKM* 68) with its 3rd plur. theme is doubtful. This unique instance evidently does not belong in the narrative system, nor indeed in the grammatical system of the corpus, and may well be a later interposed gloss (so

[45] On the cotext-content demonstrative 'neutric' referent see Koeppel 1993: esp. 94ff.; 118ff, for the thematic role of this referent. Koeppel distinguishes between anaphoric reference and 'textual deixis': our case in point is evidently the latter.

[46] The negation converter *nyt* occurs as thematic 'that'-form (nexus-substantival, following *gwir yw* (*PKM* 62); cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §§2.4.2, 3.0.1.

[47] For the clausal themes, cf. also some ModI patterns, partly matching in function: 'Ní foláir dúinn go léir a bheith go láidir / B'fhollas nárbh ionann na Rosa agus Corca Dhorcha / Is inchreidte gur daoine sinn / Ní miste sin go díreach' (Myles na gCopaleen, *An Béal Bocht*).

W. J. Gruffydd, who prints the clause and its sequel, *ac y maent yn symudau enweu, moch y gelwir weithon* in parentheses.

(b) Text-grammatical features

Specificity and reference contours: specific noun or Proper-Name-rhemes are as a rule paired with high-specificity demonstratives. Equispecificity is also the case of the 'rhematic word-class' subpattern. Of the uncommon cases of theme/rheme inequispecificity (*P* 376, *PKM* 69) the former echoes a cotextual theme/topic (*'arch'*), while the latter is special in that the theme replicates the rheme.

Juncture properties and prosodics: there is a clear open shot following the rheme, occupied by *hagen* (*P* 268; *O* 6, 615), by a parenthesis (*P* 635; *B* 271); antithetic *ynteu* follows *yw* in *O* 112. In the case of adjectival rhemes, and strikingly in the # 'Rheme'-yw-INFINITIVE/*hynny*# subpattern, close juncture seems to obtain between rheme and formal theme in the affirmative construction (in the negative one, open rheme/theme juncture once again),[48] with *gan-/i-* following *yw*. Elsewhere, although *yw* is not properly speaking enclitic to the rheme (which may be fairly extensive), witness *PKM* 84, the rare expansions join the theme. Unlike the theme *yw*, the suppletive verbal *oed* is clause-final, cf. *B* 46.

Textemic environment: the dialogue system, both allocutive and reactive (in ModW, the pattern also occurs in narrative-descriptive and expositive, generic-gnomic textemes).

Conversions:

negative *ny-t-/nat-* [+ binominal: rheme→theme]; suppletive *nyt-* (theme-initial, lenited rheme, verbal nexus): *nyt/oes/oed/bu* (theme-initial, lenited rheme); interrogative *a- e/y-* [+ binominal: rheme→theme; *a-* (theme-initial, lenited rheme, verbal nexus;
nominalizing *mae-*,
nexus-focusing *neu-t-*

Junction: conditional *ot, os-; tra-* (theme-initial, lenited rheme).

Adverbial compatibilities, textual integration; clause modifiers are rare: *bellach, weithon* 'now' (pattern-final).

Observations

1. In ModW, the negation by #*nis*-RHEME *mo*-THEME^{spec}# contours with *nid-* + #RHEME *yw/ydi*-THEME#: *Nid Arab mohono; Nid da gan yr hen gregethwr mo hyn,* vs. *Nid râs ceffylau yw hon, Nid lle i genod ydi afon*: see Shisha-Halevy 1998: 135ff..

2. The negative conversion *ny(t)* occurs in our pattern also adnominally (*zero* relative conversion, Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.4.2), as thematic 'that'-form (nexus-substantial, following *guir yw* (*PKM* 62).

3. For *neu-t- cf.* Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.1. Caerwyn Williams 1976 discusses in detail *neu-* with Nominal Sentences, offering a classification and ample documentation, yet does not provide any explicit statement of function. (I suggest our example *P* 122 means neither 'it is certain death for me', nor 'death is certain [has been decided] for me', but

[48] Cf. MacCoisdealbha 1976: 33ff. for particle placement as a pattern diagnostic.

'death is indeed certain for me'.) Incidentally, it is not *neut-* but *-t-* that is the copula in this syntagm: *neu* is the converter.

4. The opposition of the two *bot* auxiliaries, *bu* (on the whole less common in narrative) and *oed*, a complex paradigmatic set, is a key factor in the 'narrativation' of our pattern. Obviously, the semantic correlates of this opposition do not necessarily and simply match in this case the 'non-durative/punctual/unmarked vs. durative/non-specific/fuzzy-reality/marked', 'classic' PRETERITE vs. IMPERFECT category.[49] Note that the *bot* auxiliary placement opposition obtains only in unconverted clause status, the auxilliary following the rheme (#RHEME *oed/uu* (THEME)#) opposed to initial auxiliary (#*oed* RHEME#, only *oed*, expressing 'remoteness from reality' or a 'hypothetical reality'). In the case of conversion/junction, we have, as is normal with converted verbal nexus, either [CONV-*oed/uu*-RHEME-THEME] or [JUNCT-RHEME-*uu*-THEME], respectively.

(c) Documentation

Pronouns, Proper Names:

Pwy yw y llygoden? (*PKM* 64)
Pa-uedwl yw yr idunt (*B* 18–19), sim. *B* 35
Ny wnn pa-ryw attep yw hwnnw (*P* 329–30), sim. *PKM* 49
Py-dispedyn yw hwnn weithon? (*O* 336), sim. *O* 332, 436
Beth – dybygy dy – yw hynny (*B* 271), sim. *P* 472
Beth yw dy-arch di? (*P* 320) sim. *B* 273–4
Kicua uerch Wyn Gloyw yw vy gwreic inheu (*PKM* 49)

NB: a special case, as it were condensing the expanded-delocutive and copular patterns, with the meaning (according to the context) 'I have a wife and K. is her name'.

'Y gwyr a gychwynwys o Iwerdon' yw hwnnw (*B* 464–5)
Gronw Pebyr yw hwnn (*PKM* 84) NB: responsive to the question 'Who is he?'

Substantives:

Meirch Matholwch brenhin Iwerdon yw y rei hyn (*B* 67–8) sim. 70
Tauawt llawn da yw y teu di (*PKM* 69)
Arch didraha yw honno (*P* 375)
Vy-arglwydes-i yw honn-racko (*O* 365)

Adjectives:

Mwy yw gan Uendigeitvran no chenyt ti y tremic hwnnw a'r guare (B 102)
Drwc yw dy-annyan (*O* 409)
Digawn yw hynny o gosp (*P* 406–7)
Ryuawr yw y rei hynn (*PKM* 80)
Da digawn yw y enw (*PKM* 80)

[49] In any case, narrative and dialogic tense-grammars in MW are still largely obscure; *oed* is generally descriptive, and used also for narrator's insight (psychological, etc.); *bu* seems occasionally markedly specific. On the whole, however, I confess their difference escapes me (textemic distinctions do not seem to matter).

#'Rheme'-yw-INFINITIVE/*hynny*#:

Dir yw ymi gwneuthur hynny (*PKM* 92)
Eisswys anwymp yw gwelet gwr kyuurd . . . yn crogi . . . (*PKM* 61)
Medwl yw genhyf y diuetha (*PKM* 61)
Moes yw genhym-ni, Arglwyd, heb y Gwyydon, y nos gyntaf y delher at wr mawr, dywedut o'r penkerd (*PKM* 69)
Da yw gennyf . . . nat achaws itty hynny (*O* 399–400)
Kynghor yw hynny gennym-ni (*P* 409–10) [NB: contrast this with the substantive-rheme 'kynghor iawn yw hwnnw' (*P* 635)]
Goreu yw gennyf i bo kyntaf (*P* 291–2, *PKM* 90)
. . . a iawn yw idaw ynteu or byd gwr mwyn y dalu ytti (*P* 625ff., sim. [*iawnhaf*] *P* 621, *PKM* 85)
Truan yw hynny (*O* 733)
A del yn uaredawc, iawn yw y kymryt (*P* 127)
Riet yw in gerdet yn bryssur (*PKM* 71)
Digawn yw gennyf i . . . ual y llunyawd Riannon (*P* 416–17)
Hawd yw dy gynghori (*PKM* 77)
Go athrist yw genhyf i i welet (*PKM* 49)
Hawssaf yw in ymborth yno (*PKM* 58)
Teckaf yw itty wneuthur (*O* 17)
Da yw gennyf . . . nat achaws itty hynny (*O* 399–400)
Diheu yw ytti nat oes deuwr yn y byt ny . . . (*O* 110–11)
Eres yw genhyf na-uedrut (*PKM* 80)

Conversion:

Nyt da dy gynghor uynet y'r gaer (*PKM* 56)
Nyt-kyfle yni trigyaw yma (*PKM* 57–8)
Nit drwc uyn trawscwyd i (*PKM* 69)
Arglwyd . . . nyt hoff honno y glanet (*PKM* 58)
Nit hawd vy llad i (*PKM* 86)
Nit teilygdawt vy anryded (*P* 31–2)
Nyt hawd . . . y wr heb gyfoeth idaw ossymdeithaw (*PKM* 84)
Neu-t-teruynedic angheu y mi (*P* 122)
Arglwyd . . . ae guell y gwna neb uy neges i wrthyt ti no mi (*v.l.*miui) uu hun? Na well (*PKM* 69) [NB: note the responsive negation, *na-*, and the zero-theme responsive pattern, see below]
Ae amser inni vynet? – Amswer (*O* 227–8)
Ae diogel hynny? – Diogel (*PKM* 86)

Verbal-suppletive (theme-initial):

Nyt oed bell idaw ynteu (*O* 279)
. . . hyd nat-oed rym (*B* 77)
Ny bu gystal dy wybot . . . ny bu well dy dosparth eiroet (*P* 174ff.)
. . . hyt p/ban uuant weisson mawr (*B* 469)
. . . ow gwr mwyn uyd y mab (*P* 584)

Verbal-suppletive (rheme-initial):

oed:

. . . y mae Lleu oed yr eryr (*PKM* 89)
Beth oed y mynyd . . . (*B* 275)
Madws oed itt bot yn llawen (*O* 725–6)
. . . ac oed llesach y'r march pei assarchut yr meityn (*P* 272–3)
. . . ac oed iawn y wreic wneuthur da ytti (*O* 296)
. . . oed well itty geissaw (*O* 396)
. . . ac aryant oed y bwrd, a bliant oed lieneu y bwrt (*O* 80–1)
Diryued oed hynny (*P* 170)
Teg – med Pryderi – oed y'r gwr a wnaeth hynn . . . dodi . . . (*PKM* 73)
Da oed gennyf pei ys gwelwn (*P* 200)
. . . a gwiw oed y Arthur dahet y gwely (*O* 334)
Ac yn alt y ulwydyn hoff oed ganthunt y ureisket (*PKM* 78)
Gwynnach oed y gnawt . . . (*O* 621)
Mawr oed vy-ryvic (*O* 32)
. . . a hoffach o lawer oed gan O. e tecket ac eu hardet . . . (*O* 246), sim. 120–, 483
NB: contrast with *bu* in: (*O* 248f., 259) a hoffach uu gan O, meint y gwr no chan . . .
Reit oed im wrth gynghor (*PKM* 49)
NB: contrast the '*realis*' narrative 'y bu reit . . . (*PKM* 72)
Diheu oed ganthnt na welsynt . . . *B* 20–1), sim. O 171, 324–5, 351–2, 378, 528

NB: contrast the placement of *oed* with the converted (*O* 697ff.) . . . a oed didheu genhyt titheu . . . pei . . ?

. . . a hyspys oed gan Owein na- . . . (*O* 375–8), sim. 125, 181
. . . a ryued oed genhyf nat- (*B* 97–8)

bu:

Y bu reit y wyr y Deheu enkil . . . (*PKM* 72)
. . . a hir uu genhyf i y nos honno (*O* 117)
Y bu digrif ganthaw ymwelet . . . (*P* 140–1)
Pennaf neges uu y mi keissaw di welet (*P* 282)
. . . hoffach uu gan Owein meint y gwr no chan . . . (0 259), sim. 248–9

1.1.2.3 Topicalized Theme

This is a rare pattern in our corpus, which is perhaps surprising in view of the importance of topicalization in MW syntax in general (see Excursus below). In this pattern, the formal theme is pattern-final, anaphoric to a pattern-initial topic, which anchors the clause in the textual and information block; the rheme, for its part, is 'erected on', marked as rheme and nexally associated with the formal theme alone.

Observations

1. I would point out that not all cases of initial noun resumes anaphorically constitute topics. Crucial factors and parameters are the text-formal and text-functional ones information structure, Functional Sentence Perspective and cotextual configura-

tion. (Needless to say, like foci, topics may be 'devalued', i.e. have their pertinence reduced or lost altogether by weakening or cancellation of paradigmatic opposition). See the brilliant discussion, decriptive and typological-comparative, clause-and-text-syntactical, in MacCoisdealbha 1976: 108ff., 131ff., 143ff., 1998: 83–142 cogently distinguishing topicalization from the *nominativas pendens* or prolepsis[50] and cataphora construction. The importance of these constructions in Irish, esp. in Old Irish, is paramount and well known: witness Havers's pioneering study of 1926 in IF 43, 207–57. MacCoisdealbha discusses MW too (1976: 179ff.), pointing out the theme-switching role of topicalization (as e.g. in *PKM* 23, 67, 68), which is valid in narrative verb clauses, not for the Nominal Sentence.

2. Certain languages topicalize adverbials as scene-presetting clause modifiers (so for instance Egyptian, esp. Late Egyptian).[51] See Poppe1991a: e.g. 52ff., 269ff.

3. I believe the Adnormal Sentence in MW is not a topicalization pattern, pace Fife 1988 and others (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.3.2).

4. *Imbriquement*-like constructions like *Mawr y dywawt y gwr y mi y vot ef* (*O* 123), *Plant a wnn i y uot idi hi* (*P* 497–8), are simultaneously (a) fheme-focusing, (b) topic-like cotext-anchored – two factors responsible for the placement of their initial constituent; but they are also markedly locutive (1st-person-centred).[52]

PROFILE – Paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties

(a) Constituency
Topic: high-specificity substantive
Rhemes
PRONOUN (interrogative);
PROPER NAME (titles – metanarrative);
SUBSTANTIVE (non-specific; expanded).

[Unattested: adjective, specific substantive (the evidence is too scant to draw conclusions)]

Theme: enclitic to rheme: delocutive sgl/plur. –*yw, yw-hwnnw* is a compound formal theme.

Observations

1. The pronominal-topic type *Titheu pwy wyt* is not attested in the corpus (cf. Mac Cana 1990: 423). In the ModW corpus studied in Shisha-Halevy 1998 I find the topicalized pattern absent altogether.

[50] On prolepsis as means of thematization/rhematization in Latin, descriptively and typologically, see Rosén 1992. For devalued topicalization in the Bohairic Coptic Nominal Sentence, cf. Polotsky 1987: 28ff.

[51] Cf. Satzinger 1976. Late Egyptian uses a prefixed 'segmenting' element *jr-* to mark all topics, including conditional protases, which are thus overtly marked as topics of their apodoses, in a high-lever complex nexus ('If I'm ill, it is because I couldn't keep from going out last night'). (In Middle Egyptian too, the 'Substantive + *sdm.f*', a much-studied construction, is structured in the same way - with a high-level nexus between the two primary immediate constituents, and a partial 'constituent nexus' in the *sdm.f* form, between the verb base *sdm* and its agent - *f*.). For *jr*-topicalization in Egyptian, cf. also Loprieno 1988: 41ff. For Coptic, cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986: 30ff.; 242, *s.v.* 'extraposition', 247, *s.v.* 'topicalization'. For Berber, cf. Galand 1964: 38ff.

[52] Cf. French 'L'amour, elle appelle ça' with 'L'amour tu ne connais pas' (Stempel 1981).

2. *A del yn wareduc, iawn yw y gymryt* (*P* 127) constitutes a special case, juncturally speaking, with the anaphoric representation of the topic not in the formal theme itself contained but in its appositive specificational. Cf. also *A'r ffon hayarn a dywedassei y gwr vot illwyth deuwr yndi, hyspys oed genhyr . . . vot yndi llwyth petwar milwr* (*O* 124).

Profile – paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties:

(a) Constituency: Topic: high-specificity substantives. *Rhemes:* PRONOUN (interrogative); PROPER NAME (titles: metanarrative); SUBSTANTIVE (non-specific; expanded).

[Not attested: adjective; specific substantive (the evidence is too scant to draw conclusions)]

Theme, enclitic to rheme: delocutive sgl/plur. *-yw, yw-hwnnw* is a compound formal theme.

(b) Text-grammatical features

Specificity and reference contours, juncture and prosody: examples are too scarce to formulate general properties. The theme complex is pattern-final; the pattern as a whole is highly cohesive with the preceding cotext.

Textemic environment: dialogue and narrative systems.

Adverbial compatibilities: 'but (that)', 'now'.

(c) Documentation

Y mab hwnn mab y ti yw (*PKM* 78)
A'r iarll pieu y gaer honno goreu gwr am vwyt yw (*O* 707–8).
Eu kyfranc wy 'Y gwyr a gychwynwys o Iwerdon' yw hwnnw (*B* 464–5).

1.1.2.3(a) Excursus: Typology and documentation of topics in the Four Branches

(1) Topic pronominal/pronoun [+ Proper Name]: NARRATIVE

Wynteu hagen ni wybuyssant . . . (*P* 142)
A honno teccaf morwyn oed . . . (*PKM* 67)
Ynteu Wydyon goreu kyuarwyd yn y byt oed (*PKM* 69, 82)
. . . a minheu pann gigleu . . . (*P* 610–11)
. . . ac ynteu yg Kaer Dathyl yn Aruon yd oed y wastatrwyd (*PKM* 67)

(2) Topic – highly specific substantive: DIALOGUE: prophetic, promissory, optative, injunctive

E gedymdeithas oreu a allwyf i, yti y byd, os mynny (*PKM* 50)
Y wreic honn . . . ym penn penthewnos a mis y byd beichogi idi, i'r mab a anet yna o'r torllwyth hwnnw, ar benn y pethewnos a'r mis y byd gwr ymlad llawn aruawc (*B* 163ff.)
Ie, heb wynteu, yr atteb goreu a gaffom ninheu, attat ti y down ac ef (*B* 309–10 W)
A'r arglwydiaeth a gaussam ninheu y ulwydyn honno, nys attygy y gennym . . . (*P* 180ff).

(3) Topic – generic noun, zero-determinated (rare): NARRATIVE

'Parabyl nis cauas' (*PKM 86): contrast the indefinite (Abnormal Sentence) 'a farabyl a dywot ef wrthi hi, a'r eil, a'r trydyt'* (P 152); Pa gynghor bynnac a gattei ef y gan Uanawydan, y

gaer a gyrchwys ef (*PKM* 56); Na gwr na gwreic o hynny nyt edewis Riannon heb rodi rod enwau idaw (*P* 445–6).

(4) Topic – substantivized verb (actant substantivation) – specific definite or indefinite: DIALOGUE: futuric, promissory, injunctive

. . . a del yn waredawc, iawn yw y gymryt (*P* 126–7)
. . . a wnaethost . . . Duw a'y talo itt (*P* 136–7)
. . . ac a del yma o Gymry, carchara wynt (*B* 223)
Yr hynn a allaf i o waret itti, mi a'e gwnaf (*O* 300, sim. *PKM* 74)
Yr hynn a deryw ymi ni frwytha ymi y adef y neb (*PKM* 68: this is a reactive to and resuming *a pha deryw it?*)
Kymeint ac a ercheist, o'r a uo y'm mediant, ti a'y keffi (*P* 345ff.)

Rarely narrative (not in the Four Branches): A delei o varchawc yno, Owein a'e byryei a'e gwerthei . . . (*O* 450ff).

Observation

A narrative case like: Yr a dywettei hi . . . hi chaffei namyn yr un atteb . . . (*P* 488–9), is not topicalized: *yr a-* here is adverbial ('the more . . . or sim.): see Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.1.1, also generally on substantivized relative conversion.

(5) Adverbially marked segmentation (am-): DIALOGUE – theme switching

Amdanaf innheu, heb hi, mi a wnaf oet ac ef (*P* 336); Eneit, heb hitheu Riannon, am y wled a'r darpar yssyd yma, hwnnw a rodeis i y wyr Dyuet ac y'r teulu . . . (*P* 355ff.).

Observations

1. On the conceptualization and definition of 'topic' and related notions (such as 'segmentation' (H. Frei); 'Nominativus pendens'), cf. MacCoisdealbha 1976, 1998; *passim*; 1977: 34ff. Sornicola 1985: 22ff. (quoting *PKM* 69 on p. 28, and associating the construction with the colloquial register; Sornicola 1988: 124–38 for OI).

2. Note in the documentation above especially the correlation between topic specificity and textemic distribution, in the case of verbal-nexus clauses. For the topicalized Nominal Sentence, however, this does not obtain, and the narrative Nominal Sentence suppletive occurrence is predominant: . . . *a'r ffrwyn ac a welit o'r kyfrwy eur oll oed* (*O* 567–8), . . . *a'r neill* . . . *gwas da oed* (*B* 9–10), *Yr hynn a oed ar y ben o wallt, kyuelynet oed a'r aur* (*P* 546–7), *Yr hardaf onadunt hardach oed no Gwenhwyvar* . . . (*O* 62), *A honno teccaf morwyn oed* . . . (*PKM* 67), *Ynteu Wydyon goreu kyuarwyd yn y byt oed* (*PKM* 69, 82).

3. Two important and very common special types of non-segmented resumptive topicalization call for special attention. First, the theme following the formal cataphoric rheme *sef-*: this theme is a topical resumptive-by-replication; in this case, there is no topic specificity marking whatever (see in detail below): *Sef gwreic a uynnawd Kicua uerch Wynn Gohoyw* (*P* 651). Second, *hynny* resuming immediately preceding textual segments as a resumptive topic for an adverbial specifying/precising rhematic comment (cf. also *hynny/hwnnw* following the formal cataphoric rheme + formal theme *Sef*

yw, below). I attribute a fundamental significance to the fact that the rhematic constituency here differs from that of the adverb-rheme nexus (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §1.0.1): *Y rwng y deu wrenhin y mae yr oet hwnn, a hynny y rwng y deu gorff wylldeu* (*P* 107–8), . . . *ac ny mynneis innheu un gwr, a hynny o'th garyat ti* (*P* 286); *Nyt oes gynghor it' heb ef 'onyt un, keissaw y ganthaw gwybot pa-furu y del y angheu, a hynny yn rith amgeled amdanaw* (*PKM* 85); *Coffa a dywedeis wrthyt, ac ymdidan yn lut ac ef, a hynny yn rith ysmalhawch caryat ac ef* (*PKM* 86); *Kyrch . . . a doeth am vym penn a hynny yn diargel . . . a chyscu a wynaethpwyt genhyf, a hynny i'th ystauell ac i'th wely* (*PKM* 74).

4. I do not see the Abnormal Sentence as synchronically signalling or involving topicalization (*pace* Fife 1988, and cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.3.2). There are instances favouring this analysis, like *Y mab hagen a gymeraf i* (*PKM* 75), where the particle *hagen* does accompany, prosodically delimit and probably co-signal segmented topics; or *Hwnn a gymeraf i* (*PKM* 76). Numerous other instances gainsay this. For instance, the AS itself may have a marked topic: *Minheu, ui a'r morynyon a wiscaf ymdanaf inheu* (*PKM* 82). Here it seems the 'topicalization effect' is signalled by the pronoun, particle or special cotextual constellations, as in . . . *a gwreic a geif ef ual kynt* (*PKM* 83), *'Ellynghwch was'* . . . *Y gwas a aeth* (*PKM* 84); or theme switching as in *Ynteu Gronw a gyuodes* . . . (*PKM* 89); *Enteu Math a gyrchwys* (*PKM* 89); sim. 74, 88, and often): here the construction induces phoricity in a Proper Name, non-phoric by itself. More often than not, however, a topicalization interpretation seems entirely ruled out, especially by the indefinite initial substantive: *Kennadeu a aeth* (*B* 270) . . . *a gwr du mawr a vely* (*O* 108), *Avon redegawc a oed ar hyt y glyn* (*O* 37).

1.1.3 Binominal/bimembral patterns

Here I include patterns that have no overt segmental copula; some have zero themes. One is surprised to find this set still described in the literature as a case of 'pure' Nominal Sentence (so for instance in Richards 1938; Morgan, 1952; Sommerfelt 1965; Simon Evans 1971; see below), which is unfortunate, descriptively and especially epistemologically, since the term would imply some special or marked standing of these constructions, whereas they are, I suggest, in fact the basic mould for such patterns as the Cleft Sentence.

The construction is of considerable importance in ModW (see Shisha-Halevy 1998: 154–83, with some references to general discussions) where the gnomic roles (pointed out by Hjelmslev (1948) as the functional correspondents of the zeroing of 'be' in Indo-European) predominate; yet in our MW corpus, we find neither 'universal' or 'general present', gnomic and/or 'balanced' equational (*Wechselsatz*)-type of bimembral NS (*Träume, Schäume*, 'Much cry, little wool).[53] The question whether in MW we have copula-zeroing or no copula at all (juxtaposition nexus) cannot be answered categorically, for all patterns. In at least one (1.1.3f) zeroing is plausible, at least by evolutionary considerations. In others the postulation of zeroing is descriptively a moot point. In any case, the 'negative' or 'privative definition' must here, as for the Nominal Sentence in general, be challenged as unsound.[54]

[53] See Thorne 1993: §349. Generally, Sandmann 1973.

[54] So for instance in Thorne 1993: §349 I-II ('non-predicator clauses', i.e. *yw* -less clauses).

We observe under the 'binominal' heading several distinct and in fact unconnected patterns: (a) interrogative identification/naming patterns, (b) included adjunct nexus, (c) the Cleft Sentence, (d) prepositional actantial theme + referential theme patterns, (e) exclamative-modal prepositional-theme patterns, (f) responsive: zero theme.

Observations

1. One's eye is drawn to D. Simon Evans 1971: 139: 'The Pure Nominal Sentence appears to represent a primitive mode of thought expression where the syntactical connection between the subject and the characteristic attributed to it, viz. the Predicate, is expressed by simple juxtaposition. This type of sentence is in general use in Semitic languages; numerous examples can be adduced from the Old Testament.[55] (Twenty years earlier, in Morgan 1952: 267–8, we find the same glottogonic claim regarding the 'primitiveness' of the binominal pattern). Whether these be ethnocentric slips worthy of past times, or rather (one suspects) its inverse romantic counterpart – the pure and untainted, 'heroic' epoch of direct, immediate, 'synthetic' way of expression, this statement oversteps the bounds of the evidence and fails to appreciate the fundamental structural significance of the construction.

2. The Cleft (or 'Mixed') Sentence is probably the most important case of bimembral pattern: the rheme (initial) is here promoted to focus status correlatively with the theme-topic being a (sub)nexus: see below.

3. For Modern Irish analogues, cf. for instance Sommerfelt 1965: 262 (exclamative-modal: once again, in the tradition of 'pure NS'), and see Shisha-Halevy 1998: App. II (§3.7). For Old Welsh, see briefly Wagner 1977: 244.

1.1.3.1 Interrogative identification/naming pattern

Pwy eu henw hwy? (*PKM* 68)[56]
Pwy enw dy uab di? (*PKM* 79)
(y wybot) pwy yr yniver racco (*PKM* 84)
Pieu yniver y llongeu hynn (*B* 30)

Observations

1. *Pieu* is presental and alternates with past *pioed* (*B* 68), which has verboid nature and points to a fusion derivation from interrogative + *yw/oed*. It has a distinct plural form, *p/biewynt* (*PKM* 68). Syntactically, all forms may be adnominal (*O* 241, 333, 337) as well as topical in a Cleft-Sentence-like focusing construction (*B* 32; *PKM* 68; *O* 581, 605), and yet I doubt this warrants characterizing it as 'relative': its autonomous rhematic role would preclude this. The pattern is unconverted.

[55] In fact, the binominal pattern sets coexist with the pronominal-theme and copular ones, and have their oppositions and neutralizations with them, in Egyptian-Coptic and Semitic. The literature on the subjects is extensive. For Hebrew and Syriac, cf. Cohen 1984; Niccacci 1993; and Goldenberg 1983, respectively; for Coptic and Egyptian, including Demotic, many discussions by Funk, Johnson, Junge, Layton, Polotsky, Satzinger, Sethe, Westendorf and the present writer.

[56] Cf. Gruffydd's note (1928: 42): 'We have here what looks like a double gloss, that is a gloss upon a gloss, and both incorporated in the text.'

2. This binominal construction appears by textual tradition to be older than its *yw*-version (pattern 1.1.2): cf. even *Pwy ef hwnnw?* in *Culhwch* 452. In ModI, cf. *Cé hé*; O/MI *Cía hé, Cíaso*, etc.

1.1.3.2 Included adjunct nexus

(a) Constituency
Rheme: adjective
Theme: specific possessed (inalienable) substantive

(b) Profile
Note the following clausal and text-grammatical features, which, taken together, are definitive and distinctive: (1) rheme-initial construction; (2) close rheme-group/theme juncture: composition effect; (3) semi-closed theme lexemic inventory: inalienably possessed substantives; (4) non-specific nucleus in the slot preceding the adnominal-status pattern; (5) cohesive immediately anaphoric function of the possessive article, theme-linking; lenition-signalled concord of clause rheme, linking the entire nexus via theme; (6) no conversions attested. No adverbial or modifier compatibilities.

The pattern occurs in adnominal status, expanding a non-specific nucleus: *Llongeu gyweirach eu ansawd* (*B* 21), *(aniueileit) guell eu kic no chic eidon* (*PKM* 68), *(pren) mawr a glassach y vric* (*O* 146–7: note here the variant reading with *yw*, which employs a different pattern, 1.1.2). Or, less usually in the corpus, in rhematic status: *(a uei) uawr y dwf a'e ueint* (*P* 550). Or as substantival focus of a Cleft Sentence: *Cadarn-a-ungwr y gydymdeithas a diffleis a geueis* . . . (*P* 161).

Observations

1. I suggest it is this pattern alone thta seems to uphold the distinctness of the 'adjective' as a word-class and justify its conception as a separate part-of-speech in Welsh – by token of a manifestly predicative slot in which the adjective does not commute with the substantive.

2. 'Inalienability', or rather inalienable or intimate possession and possessedness, is a property variously signalled (syntactically or morpho-syntactically), and as such is not absolute in a dichotomy of alienable vs. inalienable, but relative and gradient: the more special grammemes conjoined for the nominal concerned, the higher on the 'inalienability scale' it is signalled to be). Thus, the lexemic constituency of the theme is not *a priori* determined or restricted: a lexeme occurring in this slot is by virtue of this fact alone marked as inalienable at some grade of the scale. (By 'semi-closed' I refer to the class of sememes compatible with the semantic feature + inalienable possessedness).

3. The pattern is important in ModW (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1998: 167ff.), where it is again either adnominal to non-specific (indefinite) nuclei, or constitutes an *yn*- rheme in a larger complex, or is a 'morphological' *yn*-adverbial. The pattern is anaphorically cohesive to a preceding noun syntagm (cohesion exponent – the possessive-article nucleus of its theme).

4. The pattern was first described by Mac Cana in an important paper (1966), illuminating the history, documentation, as well as analysis of this very 'Semitic-Egyptian-

[Berber]' construction. Subset patterns are #Adj.-possessive article+infinite# (106ff.) and #Adj.-def. Noun# (111ff., cf. our 4.2). The construction shows obvious synchronic affinities with the two strict Bahuvrîhi-type compounds (*hirgoes* and *penboeth*: cf. Zimmer 1991), and is of inner-Celtic and Indo-European comparative interest.

1.1.3.3 The Cleft Sentence

This is a special rheme-initial pattern subset with a high functional complexity, which includes a nexus as its thematic constituent. I hope to offer a detailed discussion of this important construction, so important in Celtic, in a forthcoming study, also attempting (once again) to determine the formal boundary between the Cleft Sentence (CS) and the so-called 'Abnormal Sentence', the traditional embarrassment of MW grammar; this topic must await an in-depth study in the framework of a fuller one, of segmental *mise en relief* signalling. Here I shall refer the reader to a somewhat more extensive discussion of the ModW Nominal Sentence (Shisha-Halevy 1998: Chapter 3), repeating and noting only and repeating the following descriptive points.

(a) The Welsh CS deviates essentially from the North-West European (NWE) model. The part-NWE isogloss of a reactive-anaphoric 'It's me' (*C'est moi*) construction is not shared by Welsh; yet this is one of two interrelated NWE constructions not shared by Welsh, the other being the Cleft Sentence introduced by a cataphoric 'it': the Welsh CS has no formal theme, just as it has no nexus-exponence, i.e. 'is' copula (cf. Isaac 1996: 63f.). See the brilliant discussion of the NWE constructions in Beckman 1934: 22ff. (feature 9) and 29ff. (feature 10).

(b) The focus of the CS is either (pro)nominal or adverbial – *tertium non datur*: this has, of course, weighty theoretical implications which must be pursued. The adverbial rheme – adverbial focus in the Cleft Sentence, preceding a relative theme – is rare before a non-relative nominal theme, yet is attested beyond doubt (cases of 'circumstanced' *yn*-rheme nominal predication, like MW *yn didan gan Pryderi ymdidan ac ef* (*PKM* 69), must be included in the documentation). The interrogative [+animate] pronoun *pwy* too is constructed directly with a nominal theme (consider 1.1.3a above; *Culhwch* 791, *Breudwyt Ronabwy* 18.25, 20.6–7, etc., and cf. Simon Evans 1964: §80 N.1). On the other hand, the second relative verb-clause group, 'employing' the basic #RHEME + SUBSTANTIVE # matrix, is extensive and productive, and practically unrestricted. The theme-form alternates in correlative compatibility with the rheme word-class: a^{len}- and *sydd* with a (pro)nominal-actantial rheme, for verbal-nexus and periphrastic statal-nexus, respectively; *y*- with an adverbial and/or circumstant rheme (again neutralizing part-of-speech distinctions). We are dealing here with higher order or complex nexus:

RHEME – *a/y*- [theme + rheme]
{s u b n e x u s}
{n e x u s}

Our rheme is a focus, while the subnexus theme is a topic. The Cleft Sentence is in fact

definable as a specificational construction.[57] in which a verb-nexus is marked as thematic and a non-verbal element as rhematic. (The relative sequencing of these two immediate constituents varies in different languages, and is correlated with certain other primary factors.[58])

(c) An especially noteworthy detail is the commutation in the thematic slot: relative verb-clause commuting with a noun/pronoun – a substitution otherwise found only in certain cases of the satellital status. (In MW, this slot occurs also in the definite primary noun phrase, following the determinator *yr-*). However, in our instance we have a nexal, not phrasal constituent. As said the pattern is strictly binominal, and the theme in no way an expansion. The nominal focus is by no means the formal antecedent to the relative.

Observations

1. The literature concerning the CS is extensive. See MacCoidealbha 1976: 86ff., 189ff. and *passim*; Polotsky 1971: 720 (w.v.).[59]

2. On *ys-* adverbial-focus/component-focus market, often with the CS, cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.2

Some representative documentation follows for some special Cleft Sentence and related constructions, all featuring *bot* forms in the topic.

(i) Bot rheme focused: *yssyd-* topics: *Ni a uydwn drowtaw* 'We shall be his guarantors' (*P* 411); *Pwy yssyd pennaf arnunt wy?* (*B* 30); *ennein yssyd reit y mi* (*P* 419–20).

(ii) The Cleft Sentence narrative-descriptive, in a closed focusing system (*bot* either existential or copular): . . . *dwy yssyd o'e vlaen a dwy yn y ol* (*O* 643–4); . . . *un traed yssyd idaw/ffon yssyd idaw o hayarn* (*O* 109); . . . *a fob un ohonynt yssyd hawlwr ar y gilyd* (*P* 108); . . . *a dirawr lywenyd a uu yn y erbyn* (*PKM* 51).

(iii) The *bot* rheme, (pro)nominal or adverbial, focalized: *Pryderi* . . . *uyd y enw ef* (*P* 620–1: the topic here is lenition-marked); *Ar y kynnyd hwnnw y bu ef* . . . (*P* 650); *Yti y byd* (*P* 317; *PKM* 50); *Nyt ymywn ty yd oydynt* (*B* 56).

(iv) Cases of apocritic-explicative nexus focusing, with the pragmatic situation topical-thematic (i.e. neither cotext-bound topicalization nor contrastive emphasis, but cotext-bound topicalization). This is not a mere pedantic quibble: what we have here is a presentative construction, with a zeroed high-level situational-pragmatic theme and a

[57] Cf. DeClerck 1983; to my knowledge, the proverbial-gnomic 'predicational' construction, as in 'It's an ill wind that blows nobody any good', arguably not a Cleft Sentence, does not occur in Welsh (it is well attested in Demotic-Egyptian didactic literature).

[58] Differences between languages concern several parameters: the reflection of the focal verb-class in the topic form (in English this is partly neutralized, with *wh-* topics still excluded with adverbial foci, but 'that' nexus substantivation/general subordination, as well as *zero*, compatible with all types of focus: 'in the end it was Laraine . . . who cracked; it was an Inland Letter that he was pulling out from one of the pockets of Ali Mohammed's jacket; It was not until the late afternoon . . . that I saw Laraine returning alone' (V. S. Naipaul, *An Area of Darkness*); not so in French or Egyptian-Coptic, where the (pro)noun/adverbial focus dichotomy fully correlates with the topic form; the focus-topic sequence (in Egyptian and Ethiopian the topic precedes its focus; in Coptic, it either precedes or follows, according to a complicated alternation (Shisha-Halevy 1986: 92ff.); in Berber, it either precedes or follows, according to dialectal distribution (Galand 1964: 50); the presence of a cataphoric formal theme, in the case of an initial focus; the concord/discord of the copula with the pronominal (esp., interlocutive) focus.

[59] It was in all probability H. J. Polotsky's lecture on the Egyptian-Coptic CS, at MIT in 1960, that introduced the term and concept into modern (later, esp. generative) linguistic discussion and revived the old Danish-origin Sandfeld-Jespersen terminology.

rhematic nexus: 'the [situation/matter] is, that . . .' What we have as overt constituent is a [SUBSTANTIVE – *yssyd* (+ rheme)] subnexus (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §2.3.2). We have here two subgroups, the first a true explicative response, the second narrative-expositive, including narrative-opening: *Py derw itti? – hiraeth yssyd arnaf* (*O* 459–60); *Py diaspedein yw hwnn wiethon? – Y gwrda bieu y gaer yssyd uarw yr awr honn* (*O* 336ff.); (What is the uproar?) *y iarll a dywedeis . . . yssyd yn dyfot* (*O* 624–5); *(Mi a wnn gynghor da – beth yw hynny?) – Gellast yssyd yma . . .* (*P* 472–3); *. . . a mein sugyn yssyd ygwaelawt yr auon, ny eill na llong na llestyr arnei* (*B* 286–7: this case is expositive, not strictly speaking dialogic). *Pa furyf y caf i dy gerennyd di? – Gwr yssyd gyferbyn a'm kyuoeth inheu yssyd yn ryuelu arnaf* (*P* 46).

Observations

1. In *Tidi, Owein, yssyd arglwyd . . .* (*O* 536–6), the focus is on 'ti'; the augental form is due not to the focality of the pronoun but to the confrontation of Owein and Gwalchmei – this reacts to Owein's foregoing allocution (On the contrary, it is you, Owein, who are . . .). This may well be a case of Abnormal Sentence, not CS, with the augental pronoun as exponent of textual cohesion, not prominence. So too in *Mi a uydaf pont* (I shall be bridge, *B* 294), with the variant reading (R) *miui a uydaf*. This *locus* is ambiguous as to its information structure; still, I believe it is not the augens that signals focality, but cohesion: ('He who is chief shall be bridge:) I, [who am chief], shall be bridge'.

2. In *Pryderi a uydei ac yrd porth uy llys am y vynwgyl, a Riannon a uydei a mynweireu yr essynn wedy bydyn yn kywein gueir am y mynwgyl hitheu* (*PKM* 65), the rheme is not nominal, but adverbial – a rhematic circumstantial [SUBST. + ADV] adnex (see below, Appendix III). Cases like: *Un troet yssyd idaw – ffon yssyd idaw o hayarn* (*O* 109) are possessive-existential, with the *possessum* focalized; *Dirwawr lywenyd a uu wrthunt* (*B* 204) is existential-located, with the existant the focal constituent.

3. I find in the corpus no clear instance of an adjectival *bot*-rheme focus, nor the important substantival-rheme focus, of the ModI types: *Is rómathbheathaite atá sé / Más marbh a bhí sé / Seanduine a bhí ann / Duine borb balcánta a bhí ann*, barring *imbriquement* cases like . . . *a ssegur y digaun pawb ohonawch uot* (*P* 169). I find the focal adjective an issue of particular interest.

4. In focal status, the adjective/adverb resolution[60] is formally carried by the conversion form, conjointly with the verb-lexeme valency. As a matter fact, however, such an opposition does not exist, since the focal adjective rheme (of the ModI type *Más marbh a bhí sé . . .*, see above, Observation 3) is virtually absent in Welsh. This is a pseudo-issue, for we are here concerned, not with a specific part of speech or a word-class, but with a (no less specific) syntactic function or value determined by its slot, commutation and conjunction of various signals. It is indeed a useful reminder of the need to break down and as it were 'reshuffle' the traditional part-of-speech divides and preanalytic pigeonholing system: *Llibin yd ym pob blwydyn yn gadu eppil yn cassec . . .* (*P* 514); *Drwc yd aeth arnunt hynny* (*O* 313); *Cam yd wyt arnaw* (*PKM* 57) vs. *Cam a wnaeth* (*P* 610); *Da yd enwaist . . .* (*P* 616), vs. *Da (a) welsynt* (*PKM* 53); *Kyntaf y gwnaeth ef ymdidan a'y wreic . . .* (*P* 147: but in *P* 397, *Ac yna gyntaf y guarywyt . . .* the lenition co-signals the adverbial role); *Nyt hir ettwa yd ym y gyt* (*P* 457–8).

[60] Cf. 'adverbiell gebrauchte Adjektive', Poppe 1991: 161ff.

5. *Yn-* is as a rule zeroed in focal status – in dialogue, with the gerundial or con-verbal [*yn* + INFINITIVE] in focus: *Caru Goewin yd wyt ti* (*PKM* 67–8); *Medylyaw yd wyf yr hyn ny medylyut ti amdanaf i* (*PKM* 86); . . . *mynet* . . . *drwy y wlat honn yd wyf inheu yr awr honn* (*PKM 61–2); Ay kyscu yd wyt ti?* (*P* 535); but apparently not in narrative: *Yn hela yr oedwn* (*B* 156); . . . *ac yn eisted yd oedynt ar garrec Hardlech* (*B* 3–4). Premodifier *yn-*,[61] predicative complement *yn-*, *yn-* in *imbriquement*-like cases are usually not zeroed (non-verbal adverbials are, in certain fixed cases): *Yn gyflym y lladawd* . . . (*O* 776–7); *Yn lledrata y keueis ef* (*PKM* 62); *Yn ymgeissaw a'r marchawc* . . . *y mynnwn vy mot* (*O* 251–2); *Mi a baraf iawn y ti yn gyntaf ac yn ol uy iawn y bydaf inheu* (*PKM* 74). But . . . *lle drwc yd ym* (*PKM* 82: 'It's a bad spot we're in'); . . . *a'r un dyd ym penn y ulwydyn y bu barawt* (*PKM* 87). Cf. also *PKM* 51, 67, 69, 74; *P* 449, 461–2; 509–10, *B* 394–5, etc.

6. Nexus focusing is effected by the Cleft Sentence, with conjoint contextually the-matic focus and topic: '. . . *a dos ragot*' . . . *ac racdaw yr aeth* (*P* 217); *'Meuyl ar uy maryf* . . . *onyt agoraf y drws* . . .' *Agori y drws a wnaeth* (*B* 450ff.).

7. The Irish CS differs in some basic respects from the Welsh one (it too still awaits special study).[62] In a scan of the ModI CS as occurring in Myles na gCopaleen's *An Béal Bocht*, Shisha-Halevy 1998: 215ff., it is notable that the Irish correspondent to groups (b) and (c) above is much more important, structurally than in MW. However, it is clear that the keynote in ModI is provided by the single topic-form for both (pro)nominal and adverbial foci: *a*^{len}-, which, however, is not a 'general subordinator' or 'that'-form elsewhere. This really breaks down the nominal *vs.* adverbial focus divide obtaining in Brythonic as in French or Egyptian-Coptic.

8. It is worth noting that the augental pronouns (*miui, tidi* . . .) and so-called 'con-junctive' series (*[m]inheu/inheu, titheu* . . .), albeit prominent and (respectively) con-frontative, have no straightforward or direct correlation with focality. On the contrary, they seem to occur in clear cases of topicality, as well as certain marked cohesive (text-junctural) configurations, while unmarked simple pronouns occur as Cleft Sentence foci (*P* 289–90, 411, etc.). Without entering upon a detailed study of their function-al profile (a full structural examination must take all pronominals, as well as zero ref-erence, into account; note also that these diasystems are corpus-sensitive in the extreme), the following schematic impression might be suggested, based on a pre-liminary scanning of the Four Branches. (Mac Cana 1990 is a precise functional pro-file on a broader basis; note the theme-switching and theme-identification roles, 413ff., 419–20; dialogue-section delimitation, 418; following imperatives, 421–2; 'emphasis-ing or reinforcing a verbal statement', 425–6; 'conveying a sense of reciprocity', 427ff.).

The augental pronouns are rare in the corpus (only interlocutives are attested). They seem to signal:

(i) Personal-address prominence (but rarely in the Cleft Sentence focus slot): *gwr kyuurd, kymoned, a thidi* (*PKM* 61, 62); *mynny ymgyuathrachu a thidy* (*B* 36); *a thidi*, . . .

[61] Cf. Poppe 1991a: 206ff.

[62] In MacCoisdealbha 1976 (1998) one finds, I believe, the best account to date of the Irish Cleft Sentence. See in particular his discussion of focusing in general (210ff.), Cleft Sentence in general (6ff., 95ff.), 'do' periphrasis (201-2), the issue of adjec-tive/adverb in focus (206ff.), rheme focusing (204-5, 239-46). I still find Mac Coisdealbha's reservation here (1976: 239), as 'predicate in itself it is unlikely to be further predicated', hard to accept: any rheme may well be put in focus, like any other clause con-stituent.

dwg gennyt . . . (*P* 231–2); *Miui a uydaf bont* 'I personally (or: I, as chief; or: It is I who) shall be bridge' (*B* 294R; v.I. W *Mi a uydaf* . . . See above, observation 1); . . . *a phei mynnewch chwi vyui drostaw ef, mivi a awn y chwi* (*O* 765–6) 'me/I personally).

(ii) Cases of personal-address/prominence coupled with interpersonal contrast prominence (cf. the conjunctive pronouns, below): . . . *ny oed amot ynni ymlad namyn a thydi dy hun, ac ys anhaws ynni ymlad a'r anifeil racko noc a thydi* (*O* 770–1).

On the other hand, the conjunctive pronouns are very common, occurring in the following:

(iii) Cases of interlocutive (+ delocutive) interpersonal (often reciprocal) prominence of contrast or confrontation, almost in any combination of persons; e.g. in reaction/response – especially typical (*PKM* 64, 70, 73, 81, 83, 85, 86, 91; *P* 46, 174–5, 219–20, 50, 341–2, 408, 542ff., *B* 40, etc) or allocution (*PKM* 70, 73, 82), or, less commonly, locutive narration (*PKM* 74). Often, a topical interpretation seems possible.

(iv) Interlocutive and/or delocutive: cohesive, non-prominent (*PKM* 51, 67, 91) even when focal in the Cleft Sentence (*PKM* 69). Note here the delocutive *ynteu* in narration (esp. *PKM* 54, 56, 58, 62, 63, 80, 81 – all *heb ynteu/hitheu* [± Proper Name],[63] where some cases suggest a theme-switching delimitation, junctural boundary signal (*PKM* 74, 76, 78, 83, 89, 90). Here we find clear theme-switching topical signalling, as a rule following the connective *a* (*PKM* 74: *a titheu – heb ef – mi a'th gymeraf yn wreic im*; 68, 76, 79, *P* 610–11; cf. *#amdanaf innheu* . . ., *P* 336), or narrator's channel backgrounding (*PKM* 82: *Ynteu Wydyon kyuarwyd da oed*). The delocutive *ynteu* appears often to act in the role of textual cohesion operator to the intrinsically non-cohesive Proper Name (*PKM* 89, 90, *P* 364).[64]

(v) Reactive dialogue-closing imperative: (*PKM* 61, *P* 422) *a gwna ditheu (hynny/yn llawen)*. When the two pronominal series are found combined in *Owein*, their functional difference seems very tenuous, at least to me (either topical or reciprocally contrastive): (*O* 306) *A minneu a vydaf ar yr esgynuaen racko y'th aros di a thydi a'm gwely i kyny welwyf i dydi. A dyret titheu a dot dy law ar penn vy ysgwyd i, ac yna y gwybydaf i dy dyfot titheu attaf fi* (*O* 401ff). *A mevyl idi ohonam y gyntaf a yrro att y gilyd, ae miui y adolwyn gwahawd itti, ae titheu y'm gwahawd inneu.*

1.1.3.4 Prepositional actantial theme + referential theme patterns

Adjectival or qualified substantive rhemes are in this rare pattern followed by prepositional pronominal 'actantial themes' within the valency of the rheme,[65] which combine with protatic or especially infinitival non-actantial, non-appositive, referential-specifying ones, in a special pattern that is essential dialogic. We find here *gan-* with many adjectives (excluding *llawn, iawn, teg (teckaf), llesach); i-* with *iawn, teg (teckaf, O* 17) *gwell (B* 59); *wrth-* with *llawen* and *garw*: *Eres genhyf* (+ protasis) (*B* 82, 154, R + yw); . . . *kanys*

[63] Cf. of course ModI augmented *ar seisean* (etc.).

[64] Note the *ynteu* homonym, viz. the interclausal, linking, colon-final 'sentence particle'; cf. the Coptic pair of 3rd-sgl. masc. cohesive pronoun and sentence particle (roles as above, for *ynteu*) - the typological connection was noted long ago by the Coptologist-turned-Celtic philologist Ludwig (Christian) Stern, see Shisha-Halevy 1995; §7.

[65] Cf. Schenkel 1971, on nominal valency.

gwell genhyt t . . . menegi ohonaf (*O* 101–2, R + yw); *goreu chwedyl gennyf, arglwydes, kafell ohonaf vy neges* (*O* 425–6).

Observations

1. This pattern runs in MW parallel with the concurring expanded delocutive (infinitival theme lenited!): *Da yw gennyf di welet ti* (*P* 277–8; *O* 399–400); *Reit yw in gerdet yn bryssur* (*PKM* 7); *Eres yw genhyf na uedrut* (*PKM* 80). Also *PKM* 58, 90, *O* 19–20, 110–11, etc. It is much more important in ModW, where *gan-* seems largely ousted by *i-* (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1998: 161): *Anodd gin i gredu hynny / Diamau gennyf ei bod . . . yn gymdogol / Well i chi symud / Lwc i'r Stiward Bach i rywun ddufod heibio* (exx. from Kate Roberts); note in the last example the compatibility, symptomizing different identity, of actantial-thematic and agentive *i-*.

2. Romance correspondents to this pattern use the 'have' auxiliary for a 'possessive theme' (Italian *ho freddo*), quite comparably with *gàn-* and *i-*, ModI *ag-*, *do-* and *le-*; outside Indo-European, cf. Modern Hebrew (inflecting) l^e- as in *kar l-i* 'I'm cold', *ra l-i* 'I feel bad'; similarly in other Semitic languages, such as Arabic and Ethiopian languages, as well as in Egyptian-Coptic.

1.1.3.5 Exclamative-modal prepositional-theme patterns

Here a zero-determinated rhematic substantive is followed by a thematic preposition; viz." *i-/wrth-* (benedictory/'advantageous'/approving/greeting) or *i-/ar-* (maledictory/'disadvantageous'/censorius/hostile; also as the apodotic component of an oath, preceding the protasis). This pattern differs drastically from the #SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBIAL# included-nexus one (see Appendix III below) both in its rhematic and thematic constituencies and the special modality.

Meuyl imi (*PKM* 61)
Meuyl ar uy maryf i (*B* 450–1, *O* 570)
Meuyl idi ohonam (*O* 400–1)
Dydd da itt (*P* 42; *PKM* 61)
Diolwch y Duw (*P* 180)
Graessaw (etc.) wrthyt (*P* 278, 313, 371–2)
Aniolwch Duw itt (*PKM* 80)
Dial Duw arnaf (*P* 516)
Gwell itt, arglwydes (*O* 438)

1.1.3.6 Responsive: zero theme

Two subtypes are encountered, the first responds (by affirmation/denial) to a nexal question: *Ae amser ynni vynet y'r byrdeu? – Amser* (*O* 227–8) *Ae guell y gwna neb uy neges i wrthyt ti no mi uu hun* (*PKM* 69) – *Na well* (the interrogative construction here is not a Cleft Sentence, but a converted delocutive Nominal Sentence (1.1.2.2) with an *y-* nexus substantivation for theme); *Ae diogel hynny . . .? – Diogel, dioer* (*PKM* 86).

The second, rather more banal, responds by a nominal rheme to a nexus-constituent rhematic question: *Pa-ryw anifeileit yw y rei hynny? – Anifueileit bychein gwell eu kic no chic eidon* (*PKM* 68); *Pa-gantref yw hwnnw? Cantref Dinodig* (*PKM* 84).

Observation

A zero theme corresponds here in a sense to the responsive zero converter (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.3.2).

1.2 The theme-initial pattern set: text-grammatically marked nominal predication

We are concerned here with a functionally and formally very different set of patterns. Their paradigmatic uniqueness is in their being purpose-marked building-blocks of a cohesive informative structure. They are distinctively text-integrated. Two subgroups must be distinguished at this point.

The first is theme-initial, with the theme resumptive (usually explicitly or coreferentially) of an isolable segment in the foregoing context. Whereas in the basic rheme-initial patterns the formal theme is ana- or cataphoric and pronominal, in our case the phoricity (and cohesion) is typically not pronominal, but lexemic, and involves the information block. This pattern subset is of high cotextual integration: a segment of the preceding text reoccurs or is reintroduced, and is thus marked – alone, or with accompanying morphematic signals – as thematic, within the new complex sentence but also in the entire information stretch. By the same token, the rhematic constituent is not only characterized as rheme with reference to its theme, but as rhematic within its information block as well, i.e. as focal. By formally and explicitly overlapping and identifying theme with topic, the rheme is promoted to ultra-clausal prominence. Beside 'pro-formal' substitutive cohesion (which does not construct, but links) there is another type of coherent construction, that advances communication while placing foregoing information in a new light, giving it new or modified or specified reference: breaking up the forward direction of 'inexorable' linear progression (by the reintroduction of information), the limitation of textural linearity is bypassed. This pattern is essentially expositive-dialogic.

The second subset is more complex and its textual working more subtle, combining anaphoric lexematic, external cohesion with a special internal grammemic cataphoric focusing mechanism, effecting a rather sophisticated textual narratological role: the set contains special narrative forms as well as some dialogic ones.

Especially important in our specific corpus for understanding the textual operation of the various patterns are the specific informative textures and Communicative Dynamism contours of the respective narrative textemes. Whereas dialogue is ideally a 'plait' of two or more interwoven texts, internally mutually coherent by their respective (allocutive/reactive) subsystems, the narrative, actually a hypostatized subtype of many-layered (al)locution, is essentially monolithic and self-consistent. While rheme-initial patterns (basic and complex, including the Cleft Sentence) are essentially dialogic (descriptive narrative Nominal Sentences are often cases of 'narrator's allocution' in the 'narrator's channel', or exposition), this is not the case for theme-initial ones: they are often exponents of thematic/topical boundness in narrative. In dialogue, in the ideal component unit of [allocution + response (reaction)], the reaction constituent is a high-order rhematic with reference to the allocutive basis, which it presupposed (and of course, the allocution itself may be – and often is – topical, in resuming and reintroducing foregoing 'dialogic information'). The response is rhematically constructed on the allocution as theme. Of course, the dialogue sequence is no less linked than the

narrative ones, with closer juncture seams between allocution and reaction; yet narrative links are qualitatively different, and their hierarchical interplay with delimitations/boundary signals a particularly functional feature.

1.2.1 The copular Nominal Sentence: # Theme – yw – Rheme # PROFILE – Paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties

This is pattern very rare and restricted in our corpus, unlike its ModW correspondent. It is text-grammatically marked in all phases of the language.

(a) Constituency

Rhemes: clause – affirmative (topicalized, infinitival) or negative (nexus-substantively converted).

Theme: specific substantive.

Copula: *yw*.

Observations

1. The copula *yw* is a homonym of the thematic delocutive pronoun (above). Here lie the *mise en question* and my fundamental criticism of the grammatical consensus, namely, that in the rheme-initial and rheme-final constructions we have, not merely an inversion of sequence but two sharply distinct patterns. Incidentally, our construction goes unobserved in the grammatical literature (an exception is Morgan 1952: 286–7).

2. The copular pattern is very important in ModW (Shisha-Halevy 1998), with the copula *ydi/ydy(w)*, more rarely *yw*, and the theme constituency substantival (in all specificity gradings, from Proper Names to *un*), while the rheme constituency is primarily clausal (including *sut* . . . , *beth* . . ., *'i-cum infinitivo'* and other infinitival clause-forms, imperatives: this is the only pattern is to have a clausal rheme, in MW and ModW); Proper Names, *un*, adverbials etc.: *Y cwestiwn gwaelodol, a ddarlunir mor ddramatig yn achos Salman Rushdie, yw sut mae cysoni goddefgarwch / Yr un mwyaf amlwg ydy a oes angen gymaint o drannau . . . / Beth yw mewn gwirionedd yw cymdeithas . . . Beth sydd yn digwydd ydi bod pob cwmni yn penderfynu . . . Beth sydd yn tueddu digwydd yw bod pob cwmni yn gweithio . . . / Yr hydref yw amser medi a chynaefu . . . / Un sydd wedi meithrin y grefft yn lluyddianus yw Gareth Glyn* (Kate Roberts, *Y Faner*).

(b) Text-grammatical features

The weighty rhematic constituent[65] follows the copula immediately (in MW, I find no data regarding the junctural properties of this seam).

The theme is lexically resumptive and cohesive. As a text-functional angle of this sequencing, the theme-to-rheme order has a double role significance: first, a strong cohesive factor – a textual link in thematic progression configurations (Daneš's 'simple linear progression'); second, a factor of particular balancing.

[66] Cf. MacCoisdealbha 1976: 39ff. on the extent and complexity of a syntagm as a constructional factor.

The pattern occurs in dialogue and the 'Narrator's Channel', in near-identical configurations; it is distinctly non-narrative. Although attested in direct speech (usually with a locutive bias), it is still not essentially dialogic – it neither addresses, nor responds. Its truly typical textemic environment is exposition: indeed, this is the expositive pattern *par excellence*.

Neither negation nor other conversions are attested in MW for the copular NS (the rheme itself may be negatived, by *na(t)*).

(c) Documentation

(. . . a chyrchu penn gorssed a oed uch laws y llys, a elwit Grossed Arberth.) 'Arglwyd . . . kynnedyf yr orssed yw: pa-dylyedawc bynnac a eistedo arnei, nat o odyno heb un o'r deupeth . . .' (*P* 196)

('Mi a rodaf yt peir) a chynedyf y peir yw: y gwr a lader hediw yt, y uwrw yn y peir, ac erbyn auory y bot yn gystal ac y uu oreu, eithyr na byd . . .' (*B* 139–40): NB it is not the case that (editor's note, p. 27) 'there is no proper logical sequence between yw and y uwrw': on the contrary, there is here no anacoluthia whatever.)

. . . ac yn ouyn ni yw na byd it etiued o'r wreic yssyd gennyt (*P* 454)

1.2.2 The sef- pattern set of forward attention-directing narrative focalization[67]

This is, I believe, a pattern set of outstanding importance, especially from the narratological and narrative-grammar points of view. It is prevalently narrative (while occurring in dialogue too), with significant topic-theme and focus-rheme constituencies and relationships with other focusing (Cleft Sentence) and presentative pattern sets. In its internal structure, it seems to be cataphoric; its narrative role is that of a sort of ahead-pointing 'syntactic arrow' in the 'omniscient narrator's perspective'.

On the face of it, a focusing narrative pattern seems a *contradictio in adjecto*: narrativity and focusing seem hardly compatible. But of course this is not so; narrative focusing must be finely defined and described.

Observations

1. Cataphoric (pro)nominal predications, uncommon in Welsh, are of the first importance in all phases of Irish. See MacCoisdealbha 1976: esp. 12ff.; 1998: 10–46, for a brilliant treatment of the issue in its general-theoretical and particular-descriptive aspects; see Shisha-Halevy 1998: 198ff. for the repertory, profiles and illustration of ModI cataphoric Nominal Sentences.

2. It is difficult to be certain of the true synchronically cataphoric reference contour of *sef-* constructions. This depends on the synchronic analysability of *sef* itself as containing a nexus-exponent (*s-*) and a pronoun (*-ef*) – like French *c'est* or English *it's* or, more relevant, ModI *is é* – all introducing cataphoric constructions and the core of Cleft constructions.[68] If indeed *s-ef-* is thus interpreted, then those *sef*-constructions

[67] This section was conceived and formulated with Luisa Ferretti Cuomo to whom I am warmly grateful.

with a verbal sub-nexus topicalized would indeed be cataphoric, focalizing a formal neutric pronoun in a formal Cleft Sentence or rather Pseudo-Cleft ('what he did, was . . .),[69] while functionally still not 'simple focus' cases.

In an alternative synchronic analysis, *sef* may be a 'focusing at a distance' sentence-prefixed element, rather like Arabic *innâ-* (cf. on *innâ-mâ-* Polotsky 1994: 65ff. = 1971: 169ff.; Wright 1967: 284–5; Horn 1980). The element following *sef-* would be topical. Note in this context also the affinity of *sef-* patterns with the cataphoric *llyma* clauses, observed already in Watkins 1977/8: 391. Thus, *sef* topic-thematizes the segment it is prefixed to (a thematization simultaneously marking the rest of the complex as focal); in which case the construction is neither cataphoric nor a Cleft Sentence.

3. Almost without exception, ever since Pedersen's helpless 'adverbial erstarrte Verbindung' (1913: 427–8; usually translated by 'nun', introducing 'adverbial *sef-*?), *sef*-constructions have been discussed with focus on their internal structure, especially their cataphoric reference, and not their ultraclausal text-grammatical role. At the most, they have been characterized as 'focusing' (Poppe) or 'de-rhematizing' (H. Rosén). *Sef-* constructions have been specially treated first in Emrys Evans 1958/60, with a formal classification (41ff.), conjointly by 'subject' (noun, demonstrative pronoun, Proper Name) and 'predicate' (adverb, clause, etc.). Many subsequent general sketches of syntax discuss *sef*-constructions: for instance Poppe 1993: 102–3 ('cataphoric devices to highlight information in the following context'), usually carrying on the distinction, following Evans 1958/60 and then Simon Evans 1964: 52–3, between 'substantival' (Poppe 1989: 49; 1990: 453–4, for our *IIa*), 'adjectival' and 'adverbial' *sef* (Poppe 1993: 103; also 1990: 453 and 1991b: 167–8 for our *Ic*; see also Mac Cana 1976: 48ff.). 'Nominal' *sef* is considered to be a formal rheme (Poppe 1993: 102, again following Emrys Evans: *sef* predicate in a copular construction, referring to a verbal-noun expression). D. S. Thomson describes our construction (*Branwen*, introduction, p. xviii)[70] as used 'to show unequivocally that the verbal noun is intended to be emphasized. It may be used nominally and adjectivally, or adverbially) . . .'. The construction is briefly mentioned in Rosén 1989: 77 n. 51: 'setting apart and emphasizing the verbal notion . . . in the narrative tenses – through derhematization of all parts of the sentence except the verbal noun and its objects'. MacCoisdealbha (1976: 47ff.) sees *sef-* constructions as a type of Cleft Sentence (he is cogent in his distinction (54) between attributive and nexal interdependences of a relative and a preceding nominal). Elsewhere (82–3). MacCoisdealbha discusses the peculiar zero-determination of a nominal in cataphoric constructions. See also Watkins 1977/8: 391–2, who rightly associated *sef-* with the presentative constructions, yet mostly deliberates whether or not our patterns constitute an Abnormal Sentence or a Cleft Sentence. Precise functional statements are rare: indeed, the functional value of the construction has not been cleared up. Obviously, a subtler consideration of the internal as well as external relations of

[68] It must be borne in mind that, unlike Irish *is* featured in Nominal and Cleft Sentences, *ys* in MW is no longer functional as a copula, but is a component focuser (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.2).

[69] According to Evans 1958/60: 38-9, a CS turned into Abnormal Sentence.

[70] Cf. also D. L. Thomson in *Owein*, p. 31: '*sef* . . . anticipates some element in the sentence, and the following relative particle shows the relationship of *sef*, and therefore the anticipated element, to the verb'.

sef is called for than the definition of *sef* as 'nominal', 'adjectival' or 'adverbial' – a definition, the tenor-thread of subsequent descriptions, I find circular, question-begging and subjective-semantic rather than truly analytical: why would *sef* in *Sef y clywei arueu* . . . be adverbial ('Gwelir defnyddio *sef y* in adferfol o flaen berf lle bydd yn gynystyr â *felly, yna* (Saes *now, then*) neu'r cyffelyb', Evans 1958/60: 53)?

1.2.2.1 Synoptic formal-constituential overview of sef- patterns

Two subsets are attested in the corpus:

cataphoric focuser	theme=topic	rheme=focus
SEF	nominal conversion: actant thematization	INFINITIVE
set (I)	(a-b) [*a* – VERB] (a) 'a wnaeth/oruc' (b) 'a gahat yn y kynghor' (narrative)	
	nexus thematization: (c) [*y* – VERB] verbs of perception, *bot* (narrative)	ADVERB or ADV. NEXUS, OBJECT, EXISTANT SUBST.
	manner thematization: (d) (1–2) [*val-y* – VERB] resumptive noun+expansion (locutive dialogue)	NEXUS/CLAUSE or CLAUSE COMPLEX 'DIRECT SPEECH'
	expanded noun lexeme (e) (1–2) resumptive lexeme (lexical cohesion; verb thematic) naming specification. (Almost only narrative)	INFINITIVE ADVERBIAL PROPER NAME
set (II)	(a) *yw* + anaphoric demonstrative/personal pronoun/Proper Name (b) *oed/bu* + anaphoric demonstrative/personal pronoun	NEXUS CLAUSE PROPER NAME, SUBSTANTIVE^{spec} INFINITIVE

Observations

1. (Ie) Allomorphic specific theme-forms are formally and/or semantically in mutual compatibility ('selection) with respective specific rhemes (personal, place-colour-, number names). The expanding verb is *gwneuthur*, deriving or homolexemic.

2. It is evident that, while group (Ia-d) is a verbal-nexus thematization pattern set, group (IIb) is a Nominal Sentence-nexus thematizing one. The paradigmatic (appositive) resolution for the various subpatterns is as follows:

(Ia) is opposed to other 'narrative tenses', especially the Abnormal Sentence, the focalized infinitive Cleft Sentence (*'INFINITIVE a wnaeth'*), and the narrative infinitive (usually coordinated).

(Ic) is opposed to the nexus-presenting presentative patterns (*'llyma y clywei . . .'*): see below.

(IIa) and (IIb) are opposed to the expanded delocutive Nominal Sentence: #Proper Name *yw* + demonstrative#, and its narrative suppletives.

3. Note in the Four Branches an isolated example of advert-focalizing *sef* used, much like *ys-* (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.2) as an initial focusing exponent in the Cleft Sentence (*P* 169): *Sef ar y medwl hwnny yd oedwn inheu.* (Cf. perhaps the cataphoric focusing formal rheme in ModI, in cases like (*An Béal Bocht*) *Is é is ainm agus sloinne domsa féin Jams O'Donnel freisin / Is éard a bhí ann ná uisce beatha*; for adverbials, however, I find in this corpus the simple Cleft Sentence, or *I lár hoíche sin is ea a rugadh mise.*

4. Incidence and distribution of the *sef-* patterns in *Culhwch, Owein* and *Breudwyt Rhonabwy*. All or most Four Branches patterns are represented, yet with different functioning. In *Culhwch* (the construction is not discussed in R. Bromwich's introduction, with only token references in the index) the set is concentrated in especially dramatic episodes. The patterns are fully pertinent, narratologically speaking, heralding the Four Branches role (below), which seems to be in evolution. The patterns occur in the narrative one or two phases before achievement, narrative event-actions towards achievement; tension mounting towards the 'grand finale'.

(Y)sef a wnaeth . . . (+ INFINITIVE) 806 – a rare pattern (extremely important in the Four Branches).

(a) oed- (+ specification) 394, 1049–50
a daruu o- 1172
SUBST. *a-* . . . 2, 1000, 1085
y gwelas 1029–30
y dyuu (+ place PN specification.) 7, 18
yw honno (+ specific PN identification) 30
yd aeth (+ personal PN specification) 908–9 (*ysef*)

In *Owein*, the pattern is pre-residual; it is not yet fully formulaic; however, its narratological pertinence weakened and partly trivialized, albeit with distant echoes of its full Four Branches value:[71]

[71] Cf. D. L. Thomson in *Owein*, p. 32.

Sef a oruc . . . 666–7, 690–1, 632
y gwelei . . . 240, 289, 586, 670
oed hynny/ynteu (+ PN/number/specific N/nexus) 469, 696, 740, 800, 819–20.
yd oed/y bu . . . (+ adverbial time specification) 1–2, 620
y dywedeis (+ *na-*) . . . 692
y rodaf inneu (+ adv.) 444
y-mae- SUBST.$^{non\text{-}spec}$ (+adv?) – existent, focused
mal y- 450

Some of these exx. are presented below, coupled with the Four Branches ones.

In *Breudwyt Rhonabwy* the pattern is residual and formulaic, fully devalued and trivialized:

Sef a wnaeth 19.5–6 (*cynghor*)
a-VERB 1.11–12
y-VERB 1.13.19–20, 2.9, 4.1, 6.10, 7.26, 9.12–3, 10.25, 19.6
oed 1.2–3
yw 1.2–3
SUBST. *a-* 5.2–3

1.2.2.2 Striking general-formal features (all or individual patterns)

1. A sharply demarcated binary construction: *sef-* topical constituent || focal constituent.

2. The agent person of the verb nexus is delocutive, very rarely Narrator's locutive (i.e. non-dialogic 1st person).

3. The pattern set is affirmative only.[72]

4. Some resumptive/anaphoric/cohesive element is invariably included in the first constituent of the pattern. Pattern (Ie) is thus doubly phoric, Janus-faced – both anaphoric (by the resuming abstract subst.) and cataphoric.

5. In (Ie), *nil*-determination of the substantive following *sef* which, being resumptive, is anaphorically specific, yet in cataphoric environment: this may be described as cataphoric determination-indifferent specificity.

Observations

Similar ana-/cataphoric determination indifference is observable following cataphoric presentatives: *Lyma gerdet yssyd arnam ni* (W, *v.l R y ryw gerdet*; *B* 163); also, in ModI; *Is é ainm a bhí air ná Séadna*; also *sé rud* . . . (Munster), *sé ard* etc. (Connacht, etc.); *Sé dlí is mo a bhíodh acu* . . ., *Sé duine gur beartaíodh air* . . . (Ó Searcaigh 1958: 241–2). 'The article was omitted before a definite noun defined by a relative clause introduced by an emphasizing copula': Ó Siadhail 1983: 123–4).

6. *Sef* is proclitic, i.e. in close juncture to the topic-theme following it.

7. Beside the constituents mentioned above, the only additional elements in the construction are: connectives (*yna*) and augens pronominals (*ynteu*, similarly interclausal

[72] Note that the Cleft Sentence has both affirmative and negative forms.

connective); adverbials expanding the infinitive follow it. Both *yna* and *ynteu* follow the topic-theme (i.e. are interposed in the pattern, between topic and focus).

8. Like other complex narrative forms, notably *'INFINITIVE a wnaeth'*, the narrative *sef*-patterns are non-concatenating.

9. The pattern set is predominantly narrative. Dialogic instances, with drastically different roles, occur rarely in patterns (Id, e), with drastically different roles.

10. The patterns show unequal distribution in the corpus, with clear episodic concentration areas.

1.2.2.3 Illustration, contextual and functional characterization of individual patterns

In square brackets I add preliminary brief suggestions of narratologically significant traits).[73]

(Ia) 'Sef a wnaeth/oruc . . . INFINITIVE': the main narrative pattern

'Preparing or taking (cunning) action against (typically dangerous) magic or ruse'; 'setting the scene for (dangerous) magic or ruse', 'significant cognitive/perceptive 'finding out' preliminary action', 'emotionally revealing action presented as narratologially significant'.

FIRST EPISODE:
(At that point, the horsewoman rides by . . .) Sef a oruc y makwyf yna, yskynnu ar y march (*P* 238–4).

[taking cognitive preparatory 'finding out' action in the presence of magic]

SECOND EPISODIC GROUP:
(Women are brought to watch over the child . . .) Sef a wnaeth y gwraged kysču (*P* 462ff.)

[dramatic unexpectedness (sudden turn in the line of story); action contrary to instructions. Enabling the entry of dangerous magic; event preliminary to magical action]

(Every May-day the mare gives birth to a foal, which keeps mysteriously disappearing . . .) Sef a wnaeth Teirnon, ymdidan nosweith a'y wreic (*P* 513)

[taking action at last against dangerous magic: cunning, preparation for action against magic]

(The mare gives birth to a big lovely foal . . .) Sef a wnaeth Teirnon kyuodi ac edrych ar prafter yr ebawl (*P* 520–1)

[cunning; deliberation; cognitive 'finding out' in preparation for action against magic]

(He hears an increasing roar, sees a monstrous claw grabbing the foal!] Sef a wnaeth

[73] I wish to thank at this point Luisa Ferretti Cuomo, whose exquisite narratological sensitivity and brilliant analyses inspired this discussion of *sef*-.

ynteu Teirnon, tynnu cledyf a tharaw . . . (*P* 524–5).
[sudden dramatic action against dangerous magic]

THIRD EPISODIC GROUP
(They hear tell about Rhiannon and her punishment . . .) Sef a wnaeth Teirnon Twryf Uliant o achaws y douot a gawssei ymwarandaw am y chwedyl ac amouyn yn lut amdanaw, yny gigleu . . . mynychu cwynaw truanet damwein Riannon . . . Sef a wnaeth Teirnon ynteu, medylyaw ar hynny . . . (*P* 565ff.)

[significant cognitive/perceptive preparatory 'finding out' deliberative action]

FOURTH EPISODIC GROUP
(The Gael prepares a ruse: hiding an armed warrior in a hide bag on pegs on both sides of each of the hundred columns in the house . . .) Sef a wynaeth Efnyssyen dyuot ymlaen llu Ynys y Kedyrn ymywn ac edrych golygon orwyllt antrugarawc ar hyt y ty ac arganulot y bolyeu . . . (He asks what is in the bags, and gets the answer 'flour' . . .) Sef a wnaeth ynteu y deimlaw hyt ban gauas y benn a guascu y benn yny glyw y uyssed yn ymanodi yn y ureichell drwy yr ascwrn . . . (*B* 331ff., sim. 339, 342–3)

[preparing for action, significant cunning 'finding out' action; 'drawing out' and 'leading on' the adversary; dramatic unexpected turn in the line of story]

FIFTH EPISODE
(The town buys all leather artefacts only from Manawydan and his company, and none from the town's cobblers . . .) Sef a wnaeth y crydyon, adnabot bot eu hennil yn pallu udunt. (They hold counsel . . .) Sef a gausant yn eu kynghor duunaw ar eu llad (*PKM* 54)

[development of dangerous situation: significant cognitive/perceptive action, preliminary and leading to dangerous hostile action]

SIXTH EPISODIC GROUP
(Pryderi and Manawydan arise to hunt, prepare their hounds and go beyond the court . . .) Sef a wnaeth rei o'r cwn, kerdet o'e blaen a mynet y berth uechan oed gyr eu llaw . . . (the dogs retreat in a hurry from the copse, bristling with fear . . . a brilliant white boar rises up from the copse . . .) Sef a oruc y cwn o hyder y guyr ruthraw idaw . . . Sef snaeth ynteu adaw y berth a chilydaw dalym y wrth y guyr . . . (drawing them to the enchanted caer) (*PKM* 55)

[dangerous magic: development of dangerous situation, leading to exposure to extreme danger: (unwitting) action in magical environment; 'drawing out' the adversary; dangerous ruse]

SEVENTH EPISODIC GROUP
(Manawydan returns alone, without Pryderi . . .) Sef a wnaeth Riannon, edrych arnaw (Rhiannon condemns Manawydan for deserting Pryderi and sets out to save him; she too falls prey to enchantment and disappears where Pryderi had disappeared; Manawydan and Kicua, Pryderi's wife, are left alone with each other. Kicua laments her fate to be abused by Manawydan . . .) Sef a wnaeth Manawydan edrych ar hynny . . . (*PKM* 56–7)

[significant cognitive/perceptive 'finding out' and emotionally revealing actions, leading respectively to dangerous magic taking effect, but also to forming the special companionship of M and K, instrumental in M's future action against dangerous magic, and freeing from magic and restituting Pryderi and Rhiannon]

(They set out for Dyfed . . .) Sef a oruc Manawydan pan gychwynwys parth a Dyuet, dwyn beich o wenith gantaw (*PKM* 58)

[preparing for action and acting with cunning against dangerous magic; preparing for 'drawing out' the adversary; unexpected (and as yet incomprehensible) turn in the line of story][74]

(Manawydan goes by night to watch his third croft, after the first two have been mysteriously despoiled. Towards midnight, he hears a very great commotion . . .) Sef a wnaeth ynteu edrych: llyma eliwlu y byd o lygot . . . (*PKM* 60)

[significant cognitive/perceptive 'finding out' action; 'drawing out' the magical adversary]

(Having caught the thieving lame mouse, Manawydan sets about to hang him, in spite of a clerk and then a priest who come successively by and implore him to set it free, and even offer to buy its freedom.) Sef a wnaeth ynteu, maglu y llinin am uynwgyl y llygoden . . . (Then a bishop comes by.) Sef a wnaeth ynteu, gohir ar y weith (*PKM* 63)
[white magician preparing and counter-acting with cunning and against dangerous magic, 'drawing out' the adversary, at the climax of tension and proximity of danger]

EIGHTH EPISODIC GROUP

(Gilfaethwy so loves and desires and loved Goewin, Math's maiden, until he begins to waste away . . .) Sef a wnaeth Gwydyon y urawd synnyeit dydgweith arnaw yn graf (*PKM* 67)

[significant cognitive/perceptive 'finding out' action]

(Gwydyon tells Gilfaethwy he knows of his love for Goewin . . .) Sef a wnaeth ynteu yna, pan wybu ef adnabot o'y urawt y uedwl, dodi ucheneit dromhaf yn y byt . . . (*PKM* 68)
[emotionally revealing acting, loaded as narratologically significant: 'significant sigh']

NINTH EPISODIC GROUP

(Gwydion makes Aranrhod shoes too large for her; she tells him so, and orders another pair) Sef a wnaeth ef gwneuthur rei ereill yn llei lawer no'y throet a'y hanuon idi . . . (*PKM* 80)

[white magician counter-acting with cunning against dangerous magic; 'drawing out' the adversary; unexpected turn in the line of story]

(Witch Aranrhod comes on board the ship where her nameless son is; the wren alights on board . . .) Sef a wnaeth y mab y uwrw a'y uedru y rwg giewyn y esgeir a'r ascwrn.

[74] In this important episode, the core and culmination of the Third Branch, we witness no less than the 'healing of the land', the chthonic godship corrupted by evil (by Christianity?). Conjunction with the land is symbolized by the sowing and cultivation of wheat.

Sef a wnaeth hitheu, chwerthin (*PKM* 80)
[respectively, magically significant action and instinctive emotionally revealing action, loaded as narratologically significant: 'significant laughter']

TENTH EPISODIC GROUP
(Blodeuedd invites Gronw in to her court. They sit next to each other) Sef a wnaeth Blodeuedd, edrych arnaw ef, ac yr awr yd edrych nit oed gyueir arni hi ny bei yn llawn o'e garyat ef (*PKM* 85)

[significant cognitive/perceptive 'finding out' action, with crucial emotional consequence: 'significant look']

Owein: much rarer – a marginal, partly formalized narrative tense:

(Lunet goes to the Countess and tells her all Owein said . . .) Sef a oruc y iarlles yna chwerthin . . . (632)

[~ '(significant?) laughter': cf. the ninth episodic group above, *PKM* 80]

(Owein comes upon a serpent in a cleft in a rock, threatening a pure white lion . . .) Sef a oruc Owein yna, dispeilyau cledyf a nessau (666–7)

[~preparatory act to taking action against magic + investigative act, 'finding out'; 'drawing out' the adversary]

Lunet tells Owein of a young man [=Owein himself] whom she loved, who came from the Emperor's court and went back there, never to return) Sef a oruc deu o weissyon ystauell y iarlles y oganu ef y'm gwyd i, a'e alw yn dwyllwr bradwr (690–1)

['drawing out' the adversary]

(Ib) 'Sef a gahat yn y kynghor rodi . . .'

A formalized (i.e. formulaic and devalued) linking device: introducing 'solemn important decisions in counsel' (' . . . a Counsel was held; what was decided in Counsel, was . . .).

(yn y lle trannoeth kymryt kynghor) Sef a gahat yn y kynghor rodi Branwen y Uatholwcy . . . (*B* 44–5)

[common turn of phrase (also 122–3, 240–1, 324–5, *O* 446–7, etc.): formulaic narrative 'familiar landmark'.]

(Ic) 'Sef y gwelei y gweison yn saethu', 'Sef y bu yn hynny trimis'

Narrative-plot formalized focusing of [SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBIAL] nexus or rhematic adverbial (see below, Appendix III) or (once) existent. Very rare in the Four Branches (where it is usually coupled with (a), but typical of *Owein*. The verbs are either perceptive-cognitive (*gwelet, clybot*) or *bot*, and are thematically weak or empty. Unlike Ib and Ie, this pattern does not build its 'thematic progression' pacing effect on lexical cohesion, and therefore its link with the preceding context is considerably

looser; in fact, this pattern is relatively delimitative, and its Communicative Dynamism grading accordingly rather high.

(. . . a guascu penn hwnnw.) Sef y clywei arueu am benn hwnnw (*B* 344)
(Yr amherawdyr Arthur oed yg Kaer Lion . . .) Sef yd oed yn eisted diwarnawt yn y ystauell . . . (*O* 1–2)
(Ac ual yd oed O. uelly] sef y gwelei heol gyfarwyneb ac ef ac ystret o tei o bop tu y'r heol (*O* 289)
(. . . a cherdet a oruc ar hyt y glynn . . . yny doeth y'r dyffryn. A'r dyffryn a gerdawd yny welei y gaer, a pharth a'r gaer y deuth.) Sef y gwelei y gweison yn saethu eu kyllel . . . (*O* 240)
(A hynny a oruc y vorwyn y wassanaethu ar fwyt a diawt a than a gwely ac enneint hyny uu iach . . .) Sef y bu yn hynny trimis (*O* 620)
(Y tharaw a oruc Owin a chledyf . . . a sychu y gledyf, a dyfot y fford val kynt.) Sef y gwelei y lleu yn y ganlyn ac yn gware yn y glych . . . (*O* 670f.)
(Ac eissyoes nessau a orugant attaw a'y deimlau a'y edrych yn graff.) Sef y gwelynt gwytheu yn llamu arnaw . . . (*O* 586–7)
(A'r bore trannoeth wynt a glywynt twryf anveitrawl y ueint.) Sef oed hynny y gwr mawr yn duyot (*O* 740)
('Deu uab oed im, a mynet uyn deu uab y'r mynyd doe y hela') Sef y mae bwystuil yno (*P* 729)

Id(1) (Minheu a allaf) Sef ual y gallaf: . . .'

A highly cohesive linking device, cohering lexically (by replication) between verbal nexus forms (finite verbs) or verb clauses. As a rule, appositively ('namely', 'to wit') supplying narratologically crucial information. Essentially dialogic and locutive (1st person), it occurs also in report; rare in narrative (there only in descriptive sub-textemes). Middle-high Communicative Dynamism grading.

(Mi a wnaf a thi gedymdeithas gadarn.) Sef ual y gwnaf: mi a'th rodaf di . . . (*P* 52–3)
(Minheu a allaf dy rydhau . . .) Sef ual y gallaf . . . (*PKM* 69)
(. . . ac Owein a gedwis y ffynnawn . . .) Sef mal y kedwys: . . . (*O* 450–1)
(Kyrch . . . a doeth am uym penn . . .) Sef kyrch a doeth . . . (*PKM* 74)
(. . . ac eisted.) Sef ual yd eistedyssant: brenhin Ynys y Kedeirn a Manawydan uab Llyr o'r neill parth idaw a Matholwch o'r parth arall, a Branwen uerch Lyr gyt ac ynteu (*B* 52ff., sim. *P* 306ff. 601–2).

Id(2) 'Sef attep a rodes Puyll: . . .'

A delimitative or loosely linked high Communicative Dynamism narrative form to introduce reactive speech supplying narratologically crucial information. High Communicative Dynamism grading.

(Following Benedigeidvran's injunction not to open the door, and a detailed account of the company's progress) Sef a wnaeth H. dydgweith: 'Meuyl ar uy maryf i' heb ef, 'onyt agoraf y drws' (*B* 450–1).

(Pwyll's chief subjects come together to ask him to divorce his wife . . .) Sef attep a rodes Pwyll: 'Nyt oed achaws ganthunt wy y erchi y mi yscar a'm gwreic . . .' (*P* 496)

Ie '(Nyt archaf onyt rac eisseu . . .) Sef arch a archaf lloneit y got . . .'

A lexically cohesive (resumptive-repetitive),[75] specificatory marked 'thematic progression' Functional Sentence Perspective construction. It is thus foregrounding and pace-setting in narrative, by gradually specifying actants and circumstants of foregoing verbs and contextualizing/specifying/quantifying/naming foregoing nominals. It has a low or medium Communicative Dynamism grading. The construction is documented almost only in *Pwyll* and *Branwen*:

(Nyt archaf onyt rac eisseu . . .) Sef arch a archaf lloneit y got uechan . . . (*P* 375)
(. . . phenyt a gymerth . . .) Sef penyt a dodet arni, bot yn y llys honno yn Arberth . . . eisted ohonei gyr llaw hwnnw beunyd, a dywedut y pawb a delei o'r a debyckei nas gwyppei y gyffranc honno oll . . . (*P* 501–2)
(. . . ymdidan a wnaethon.) Sef ymdidan a uu gan Teirnon, menegi y holl gyfranc . . . (*P* 606)
(. . . ony chaei dial a sarahet.) Sef dial a wynaethant, gyrru Branwen o un ystauell ac ef, a'y chymell y bobi yn y llys . . . (*B* 218)
(A ystryw a wnaeth y Gwydyl.) Sef ystryw a wnaethant dodi guanas o bop parth y bop colouyn . . . a dodi boly croyn ar bob guanas . . . (*B* 328ff.)
(. . . dyuot yn y uryt ac yn y uedwl uynet y hela.) Sef kyueir o'y gyuoeith a mynnei y hela, Cuch Glynn (*P* 3–4)
(. . . unlliw ac wynt . . .) Sef lliw oed arnunt claerwyn llathreit (*P* 20)
(y ducpwyt gwraged . . .) Sef riuedi o wraged a ducpwyt chwech wraged (*P* 464)
(Peri a wnaethont bedydyaw y mab . . .) Sef enw a dodet arnaw, Gwri Wallt Euryn (*P* 546; simi. *B* 211, etc.)
(. . . yny doeth yn y uryt wreika.) Sef gwreic a uynnawd Kicua uerch Wynn Gohoyw . . . (*P* 651)
(A chanadeu a aeth . . .) Sef kennadeu a aeth, Idic uab Anarawc ac Eueyd Hir. (*B* 89–90, sim. *B* 245ff., 388–9)
(. . . a gwystlaw a wnaeth . . .) Sef a wystlwys Gwrgi Gwastra (*PKM* 72)
(. . . adaw seithwyr . . . yma . . .) Sef seithwyr oedynt, Cradawc uab bran, ac Euhyd Hir, ac Unic Glew Yscwyd, c Idic uab Anarawc Walltgrwn, a Fodor uab Eruyll, ac Wlch Minasgwrn, a Llashar uab Llayssar Llaesgygwyt . . . (*B* 245)
(. . . ny bydei uyw, namyn tra uei y deudroet ymlyc croth morwyn . . .) Sef oed yn uorwyn gyt ac ef Goewin uerch Pebyn . . . (*PKM* 67)
. . . Arthur a gwyr y dy gytac ef . . .) Sef oed meint y nifer teir mil . . . (*O* 469)

Ie(2) '(. . .) Sef lle y cauas Uendigeiduran yg Kaer Seint yn Avon'

(. . . ac y bu reit y wyr y Deheu enkil.) Sef lle yd enkilyssant, hyt lle elwir etwa Nant Call (*PKM* 72)

[75] On the significance of repetition in narrative, cf. Lüthi 1984: 76ff.

(A'r llythyr a rwymwyt am uon eskyll yr ederyn, a'y annuon parth a Chymry, a'r ederyn a doeth y'r ynys honn.) Sef lle y cauas Uendigeiduran yg Kaer Seint yn Avon (*B* 231)

(IIa-b) 'Sef yw/oed hwnnw/hynny Proper name/SUBST.'

In narrative, this pattern presents 'Narrator's Channel' subsidiary information, glossing and identification-assisting details, and not properly narrative information. It then differs from (Ie) in its cohesion properties: no lexical cohesion here, but delocutive prenominal-anaphoric reference (once, a Proper-Name reference, for a metonomastic gloss); but also narratologically, for (Ie) as part of the narrative proper. In dialogue, the pattern effects focusing and/or dramatizing specification.

Observations

1 In general, since this pattern coheres with the preceding cotext pronominally and anphorically, it is, more than any other *sef-* construction, strikingly opposed to unmarked syntagmatic progression in which nominals are represented by delocutive pronominals. (It is also the one case where the construction cannot be analysed as a Cleft Sentence, but must indeed be seen as a focusing-at-a-distance case).[76] In this paradigm, our pattern IIb is evidently (and again on contradistinction to [I e]) a delimitation signaling true or literary meta-narrative glossing, while (II a) has a clear focusing effect ('no less than . . .' or similar for the exx. from *PKM* 86 and 91). Observe also that in the case of (IIb), the narrator's 'inside information' intervention opens, as it were, a communicative channel with the audience and creates an interlocutive familiarity effect with it; it is accompanied by an expectation-and-curiosity-enhancing delayed-specification information contour.

2. Note the deixis distinction (not in *Owein*) between *hynny* 'it', in dialogue, referring to the preceding cotext, and *hwnnw*, in the Narrator's Channel, 'this', referring to a person aforementioned.

3. In general, our pattern recalls *a hynny* topicalization configurations, see above (with the difference that *hynny* prepares for adverbial, not naming or clausal [infinitival] specification).

4. In later language, *sef-*, no longer analysable within a constructional system, has come to introduce a specificational (mostly Proper-Name) apposition ('namely'): '*gwlad* bell, sef Patagonia'.

(a) (Gwr yssyd gyuerbyn y gyuoeth a'm kyuoeth inheu . . .) Sef yw hwnnw Hafgan brenhin o Annwyn (*P* 47)
(Mi a wnaf yssyd waeth it.) Sef yw hynny . . . di ellwng yn rith ederyn . . . (*PKM* 91)
(. . . yr na bei ammot y rof a'm gwlat amdanunt . . .) Sef yw hynny nat elhont y genhyf . . . (*PKM* 69)
(. . . ac y mae y enw yn parawt.) Sef yw hwnnw Bleidwn (*PKM* 76)
(. . . dy alw uyth yn Blodewed.) Sef yw Blodeuded tylluan o'r ieith yr awr honn (*PKM* 91)

[76] It is not later than the others, but attested as early as *Culhwch ac Olwen*.

(b) (A'r neill o'r gweisson hynny, gwas da oed . . .) Sef oed hwnnw Nissyen (*B* 10)
(Pryderi uab Pwyll oed arglwyd ar un cantref ar ugeint yn y Deheu.) Sef oed y rei hynny seith cantref Dyuet (*PKM* 67)
(. . . twryf anveitrawl y ueint.) Sef oed hynny y gwr mawr yn dyuot (*O* 740)
(. . . gwraang a doeth o lys yr amherawdyr . . . [extensive summary recounting of the foregoing plot]) Sef oed ynteu Owein vab Uryen (*O* 696–7)
(Ac ef a welei uarchawc . . .) Sef oed hwnnw Y Du Traws (*O* 800–1)
(. . . yny aeth ar y gyfoeth e hun.) Sef oed hynny trychant cledyf Kenuerchyn a'r vranhes (*O* 819–20)

1.2.2.4 Text-grammatical and narratological functional evaluation

While it need not be said that the precise functional definition of the *sef-* set patterns can only be conceived on the basis of a full systemic opposition study, with all other narrative constructions (or 'forms': notably the Abnormal Sentence, the '*INFINITIVE – a-wnaeth*' narrative Cleft Sentence,[77] the narrative infinitive), I shall attempt here to highlight in brief the role of construction (Ia), in which the rheme is infinitival and the theme a relative conversion of finite *gwneuthur*, either substantival or adnominal (expanding a verbal abstract), resuming, somewhat reformulating and amplifying the observations made above, under (b) and (c).

Pattern (Ia) is different from all other *sef-* patterns in that it is the only one that contains no anaphoric resumptive grammemic or lexemic exponent other than the person-index in the suffix pronoun. This seems relatable to a narratological cataphoric role, viz. preparing for and anticipating a narratological focus or a catastrophic peak; in other words, cataphoric significance. In a manner of speaking, these are 'local arrows' provided by the narrator – saying, as it were, 'watch this act – this will turn out later to be important or even decisive'. These predications are in their own location significant, not central or crucial. The rhemes predicated by the pattern never convey episode-peak information; their significance is as yet enfolded, but will unfold, become clear later in the story. The distribution of occurrences for this pattern is remarkable: we find clusters of this pattern set concentrated around major episodes.

The pattern is not descriptive, but plot-progressing, in a kind of 'half-step' thematic progression. This concerns and informs the narration rate of progress or tempo, the narrative pacing. In the act of thematization, the theme telescopes an eventual complex into a compact point-like 'jumping board' or skip, for highlighted evolvement, often (yet not always) dramatic, abrupt, unexpected action (at its most typical, it is paraphrasable as 'and do you know?/you'll never guess what happened', 'just imagine' or 'but at this stage', 'only at that point'). This 'cataphoric narrative vectoring' amounts to a tension-generating, attention-enhancing dramatic narration technique role, very probably an orality feature or simulation of one.[78] This belongs in the 'Omniscient Narrator's Channel', as a non-diegetic narrator's hint or 'narrative aid' to his audience, in the 'com-

[77] Usually signalling inter-scenic or inter-episodic seams, 'narrative change', narrative dips (or 'low-lighting'), as against our highlighting type of narrative function. See Shisha-Halevy 1998: 32ff., 41ff.

plicating action' macrostructural constituents of the narrative texture.[79] All this, in conjunction with the formal text-junctural properties of the pattern: delimitation with regard to the dynamic texture of the narrative.

The narratological value of the pattern lies also in its constituting a signifier on the narration level. Scanning its contextual references, we find it predicates jointly or alternatively the following:

- (at last) counteracting, or preparing to counteract dangerous magic (unnatural intervention) or ruse;
- cunning: tricking the trickster;
- significant ('realizing, anagnoretic') laughter/sigh or look.

This construction co-signals to the reader that we are in the onset or in the middle of combat with black magic or treachery of an alien adversary; that we witness the first (often investigative) or advanced steps in counteracting these; that human cunning will be, or is, set against unnatural trickery.

Two kinds of verb are represented. Their semantic grouping is:

(a) cognition/perception/cognitive concentration; emotional/mental signalling – observing, checking, investigating: laughter of understanding, sigh of realization; looking/watching, listening, realizing, understanding; (feigned) 'not heeding', i.e. indifference (Manawydan, for instance, pays no attention to the bishop, waiting for him to address him first and thus reveal his hand);

(b) conjunction (including stimulating/bringing-to conjunction) or disjunction – arriving, leaving; proceed, go on ahead prepare; draw on (entice); send, throw/hit, feel, be united with, have intercourse with, tie (rope around neck), cut off; take (away).

These actions 'towards achievement', one or two phases before achievement, are usually willed and conscious, but rarely unconscious; applied (a) to questing and investigating (information-eliciting action) – 'anagnoresis'; (b) to coming to meet (also experiencing?) and combating evil magic; also (a + b) together. Indeed, one may suggest this is the requirement for successfully resolving the problem.

Observations

1. Compare in ModW the use of *fe-* to introduce clauses containing significant cognitive/perceptive or emotionally revealing action (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.2.1).

2. My principal thesis and main point here is that the above constitutes part of the functional spectrum of narrative focusing. For while the 'absolute' or dialogic conception of focusing, e.g.lexemic focusing, is relatively straightforward and semantically predictable and even paraphrasable, the real puzzle in the narrative signalling code is the difficulty of encompassing focusing in simple terms: sensitivity to subtle narratological modulations is evidently a *sine qua non* here.

[78] 'A kind of anticipation or foreshadowing creating tension': Lüthi 1984: 91.

[79] Cf. Fleischman 1990 (see 435, *s.v.*).

2. *Incidental-Contingent (Circumstanced) Noun Predication*

2.1 The yn-marked rheme

This important construction, mentioned above on several occasions, predicating rhemes of circumstanced/contingent validity, may be examined from a double perspective: first, the general '*yn* + N' 'predicative (rhematic)/appositive/adverbial adjunct' functional spectrum; second, the 'nominal predictation' paradigmatic perspective, i.e. the resolution and determination of the paradigmatic opposition, schematically:

(#mae) THEME yn-RHEME#
#RHEME yw THEME# (etc.).

It must be observed that the nexus exponent in this construction is *yn*-, which is thus the 'copula' and not the rheme. Thus it is *yn* that is focalized (as made conventionally evident typographically by italics) for nexus focusing, and not the rhematic noun lexeme.[80] This is hardly the way grammatical opinion has so far seen the problem. The focus of discussion has usually been on the *mae* constituent (which is probably why some systemic facts suggested below have rarely been observed), which in turn is considered secondary to the rheme-final sequencing factor. Thus, an association such as 'cas yw'r gwr (< y mae'r gwr yn gas)'; (cf. Morgan 1952: 271ff.) is objectionable and, as has been said above, reinforces the feeling that two patterns have been fundamentally misunderstood and confused. In fact, most descriptive studies associate the functional difference between the two noun predication patterns to the difference in word order sets – while, as I see it, order is but one constituent of the composite pattern featuring (ordered sequence of categories): for we have here a separate pattern, involving distinctive rheme/theme constituencies, nexus exponence and sequencing. To compound the confusion, this sequencing difference is often correlated with the simplistic semantic dichotomy of 'descriptive'/'state' (*yn*-rhemes) vs. 'identifying'/'classifying' (NS rhemes) constructions, missing the very semantic core of the distinction; and obscuring also the very fine association of copula (with its theme) and existential statement, a vexed question in Indo-European and general syntax.

Observations

1. See for instance Awbery 1984: 262–3; Jones and Thomas 1977; 42ff., Simon Evans 1970/2, like many others following Morris-Jones 1931: 197–8, Richards 1938 and Morgan 1952, also in applying the 'pure' vs. 'impure' terminology (see above) to (respectively) certain NS patterns and *yn*-predication. Simon Evans probably goes further than most in seeing the placement factor as central and focal, even including the (I believe) distinct infixed-lenition predication as a free variant of *yn*-: 'When the Predicate follows the copula, the predicative particle yn (or i) may be placed before it, but this is often omitted' (1970/2: 143, for Early Modern Welsh). Evans even includes here (144 ff.) the adverb rheme. So too earlier, in Simon Evans 1964, in a similar for-

[80] Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.1.1, 1998: 193–8.

mulation (§145): 'When the noun or adjective comes after the copula, yn/y may be used with it . . . Very often, however, the nominal predicate is found in this position without yn/y' (see also Rolant 1986). A different relation of *yw* and *mae* – but one which still has sequencing as its primary parameters – is generatively formulated for ModW in Thorne 1993: §279: 'In a copula clause that selects Complement+Predicator +Subject structure . . . the copula is realized by *yw ydyw ydy ydi* . . . If any emphasis is required, a verb noun, adverb or adverbial expression may occur initially but the copula is realized by *y mae/mae* . . . If the emphasized complement is a noun, pronoun or adjective, *yw* is selected . . . ' What I find here especially objectionable, from the point of view of descriptive method, is the aprioristic but nondescript overhead 'copula clause' and 'Complement+Predicator+Subject' structure, the 'selection' (by whom?) of a given sequence and the 'requirement' of emphasis, and the attribution of emphasis to *yw-* NS.

2. A good discussion of the *yn-* predicate issue is in my opinion the by now venerable but still cogent Richards 1935. In a careful analysis and classification, Richards defines the nominal predicate as well as other nexal types by predicate constituency (97–8), offers an oppositive and evaluative presentation (e.g. 100), a precise parameter inventory and elementary formal compatibility properties (100ff.). Stressed here as significant are the incompatibility of *yn-* with proper names and comparatives/equatives (this seems in fact to be a case of inadmissibility of higher-than-zero specificity or actualized nominal rhemes: the comparative and equative suffixes are actualizer nuclei). However, Richards does not offer a functional definition, and, like most, his treatment is essentially diachronic-comparative, and again subjugates the occurrence of *yn* to a 'given' order (102ff.).

3. Tischhäuser 1971 merits a special critique. This important, detailed and interesting study, is nonetheless immediately faulted on relevant and sometimes crucial issues of structural theory and method, and is therefore useful for raising and stressing such points. My criticism regards especially the following points: the author's lighthandedness with regard to the implications of the *signifié/significant* linguistic-sign 'package' (i.e. 'different form – different function': see for instance 208 and *passim*); the vague conceptualization of emphasis ('Betontheit': e.g. 198, 206, 207); laxness in pattern distinction, and indeed in the conceptualization of 'pattern'; simplistic and wholly untheoretical acceptance of the substantive vs. adjective dichotomy, problematic in general but especially acute in the context of *yn*-rhemes (e.g. 199, 204); want of sensitivity concerning the problematics of identity vs. homonymy in general (for instance 205–6, 'Quasi-homonymie'? 208, 'statt . . . gibt es auch . . .'; 212, 215); of zero vs. non-pertinent absence ('nil) (e.g. 204); of alternation, variation and distribution in general (e.g. 202); of synchrony and diachrony (e.g. 214). Tischhäuser's description is not corpus-based, but draws its data from grammar-books – the original sin and shipwreck point of so many grammatical descriptions. I find unacceptable, in point of method, such statements as 'Bei emphatischer Stellung des Subjekts bestand freilich kein Bedürfnis, das Prädikatsnomen zu kennzeichnen . . . Hier wird sich der *yn* Gebrauch vom Nominalsatz übertragen haben' (214), which illustrates conjointly several of the above points. Some further reservations, on points of terminology and analysis: *yn-* with infinitive is not 'participial' (206) but converbal, gerundial-adverbial;

questionable, descriptively speaking, are 'ungekennzeichnet' (208: zero? no marking? a different pattern?); 'Normalsatz' (211); 'Alternativkonstrukton' (212). All this notwithstanding, Tischhäuser is certainly right in considering *yn-* rhemes 'nominal rhemes' (214 and *passim*) and in identifying the formal identity of adverb and predicative adjective (207), as well as in numerous other insights.

4. Some brief observations on the Irish incidental/circumstanced-state nominal predication pattern (see Shisha-Halevy 1998: 201ff.). *Tá* + [rhematic adjective/i^n + possessive article + substantive] vs. *is* + [substantive/adjective, in a varied and highly complicated pattern set] is a famous functional opposition, part of the broader opposition of *tá-* vs. *is-* nexus: the former predicating statal adverbials (including *go-* marked 'adverbialized' adjectives and i^n + possessive article + substantives) and unmarked adjectives, the latter substantives, adjectives, pronominals and some adverbials. *Tá-* predicating adjectives and in particular i^n + possessive article + substantives ('*i mo/i^n a fhear*') recalls, and to an extent is eminently comparable with, but does not match, the Welsh incidental pattern. One immediate structural difference is the formal differentiation in ModI between rhematic substantives and adjectives (*bhí tú dáiríre / d'éiríodar súgach / nuair a bhí mise óg, i mo ghirseach* . . .);[81] another is the very different Nominal Sentence pattern set in opposition to the incidental pattern in Irish and Welsh; another is the Irish differentiation between *go*-marked ('adverbialized') and unmarked adjectives in the incidental nexus pattern; yet another is the fact that, unlike the Welsh construction, the Irish construction is 'symmetrical on the i^n-axis', i.e. the theme carries the i^n-marking when the rheme if focalized: *Fear misniúil a bhí ina athair; Duine borb balcánta a bhí ann; Níl ionaibh ach scata stundaí* (Pádraic Breathnach and Myles na gCopaleen). One cannot but compare this striking phenomenon, which in fact keeps i^n- always medial and as it were infixed, with the lenition-infixation in nominal lexus.

5. For the opposition sector of *is-* vs. *tá- ina-*, the current functional-semantic statements suggest permanence vs. non-permanence or temporary/accidental condition, or time/circumstance-dependent condition for the statal *tá-* predication. (For the adjectival rhemes of *tá-*, the semantic specifics are finer or more complex, with some areas of neutralization: adjectives predicated only in the Nominal Sentence and others predicated only by *tá-*.)

6. Dillon 1927: 316, 349–50, 1928: 307ff., is the basic diachronic-evolutive account, with very little or no synchronic value statements (beside the elementary 'condition or state'). Lewy and Wagner 1967: 217ff. describe *is* predication as 'wesenhaftes Sein', opposed to *tá-* by the opposition of 'wesenhaft' to 'gelegentlich'. This, it is suggested, extends also to the formal order opposition in noun + adjective syntagms. A third formal opposition in Irish, allegedly coextensive with our inherent-essential *vs.* occasional-incidental predication, is that of *is le-*' for 'permanent (or inalienable?) possession' as against tá ag-, 'temporary possession': see Hartmann 1954: 97, Schmidt 1992: 150–1. The latter claims must be taken with reserve, pending precise conclusions of

[81] The i^n- + possessive article rheme or nexus exponent features also with a subgroup of verbal 'infinitive' rhemes (intransitives, esp. verb lexemes denoting motion and posture, in paradigm or neutralization with *ag-* + infinitive for other verbs: see Ó Dochartaigh 1976, 1977/9, and Caerwyn Williams 1972, for Welsh 'yn ei eistedd'; *ar-* + infinitive for yet another, statal, subclass).

specific studies. Ó Siadhail 1989: 225ff. includes *tá* + *i*^{n}*a*- as 'classificatory copula sentences', attributing to them dynamic semantics ('implication of not only 'being' but of 'becoming'); cf. also Ó Siadhail 1983; *passim* and esp. 125–6, confronting the functioning of *is* and *tá* synchronically and diachronically; note also pp. 118–19 (*tá* for a 'change of state'), 125–6 (the encroaching of *tá* on *is* – due to exposure to English?).

7. Similar formal/functional oppositions of inherent *vs.* incidental nominal predication are of course known outside Celtic, and might conform to a hypergeographical, non-genetic *Sprachbund*. Most famous in Europe is the opposition in Spanish of *ser vs. estar* (an analogue noted in Celtological discussion as early as 1911, by Ó Maille (*Ériu* 6:57–8), in the context of Irish, not Welsh syntax). For classic Hispanist statements instructive for Irish and Welsh, cf. Ruiz 1963 (*ser*: 'relación atributiva, como definitoria, como pensada no susceptible de cambio, pensada fuera de la temporalidad, en sí misma': *estar* [admits adjectives] 'cuantos sólo sean susceptibles de atribuirse en pura relación atributiva y cuantos contengan notas que el hablante no pueda concebir dentro de la duración, como susceptibles de cambio, sea cambio total sea cambio de grado'); Schou 1974 (esp. 468ff., 472ff., 482ff.); Falk 1979 (see esp. §§2.5–6; §§5.1–2, 5.5–6, criticizing the traditional characterization of *ser* as 'inherent, essential, objective, conceptual' and *estar* as 'accidental, contingent, subjective, affective'), sees 'The estar-relation [as] based on a conception of the subject as an entity varying in the course of time with respect to a qualifying dimension . . . This relation is analogous to the locative structure'; Delbeque 1998. In certain Italian dialects, a similar use of *stare* is considered a 'meridionalism' (Hispanic influence?): Serianni 1988: xi, §138.[82] In French we may have a partly comparable opposition, yet formally marked in the theme, not in the rheme: *c'est . . . vs. il est . . .*, a well known, very complicated opposition usually discussed in the context of pronominal usage. See the special studies by Rosenberg 1970 (a 'personal appreciation' modality marked by *ce*: Chapter 3 ('C'est beau, les sentiments filiaux'); (semi-)generic characterization by *ce*, 104ff.; *il* with situational, *ce* with situational or contextual reference); see also De Boer 1954: §§71–2, 201 and, for English, Bolinger 1967.

8. Outside Indo-European, Egyptian-Coptic supplies a strikingly matching parallel. In Old, Middle and Late Egyptian, the Nominal Sentence stands in opposition to the '*m* of predication' adverbial-rheme nexal construction (*m* homonymous with the preposition 'in': ME *jw*.f *m* nsw 'He is [in the status of a] king'); in Sahidic Coptic, the Nominal Sentence pattern set is opposed to the adverbial-rheme nexus predicating the auxiliary *o* (statal passive of 'make') with the predicative-marking *n*- (f-*o* *n*-rro 'He is ['made as', in the status of a] king').

9. Observe that while the *yn*-rheme constitutes a slot where the opposition substantive vs. adjectives is neutralized, the syntagmatic-functional spectrum of *yn*/^{en}-nouns may be synthesized as 'adverbally/adnexally actualized lexeme'. *Yn*^{len}- also marks deadjectival derived adverbials. The neutralization (or merging) condition of adverbial-adverbal adjunct/predicative adjective is of course familiar, especially if we correlate morphological immutability ('immovability'), alias 'freezing of concord', with the

[82] Hengeveld 1992: 3ff. sees *estar* as a 'semi-copula', which, I think, illustrates the loop of terminological inertia involved.

non-attributive role; as in Indo-European – Romance (*dire vrai, guardar dritto*), Germanic (be/become/be considered/walk fast, *schnell sein/gehen*). Also, outside Indo-European, partly in Egyptian (the *nfr sw/sy* 'He is beautiful' adjectival predication pattern), Coptic (*n*-marked nominals), Semitic (cf. Polotsky 1976: 5–6; Goldenberg 1991: 719ff.). Adjectival immutability and concord cancelling involves formal specificity (zero-determination, in Welsh) as well as the substantival status of adjectives, correlated with a constant formal 'built-in' nucleus (note again our adjective/substantive neutralization). The marking of adverbiality by gender immutability (freezing of the unmarked term), or of a 'neuter singular') is ubiquitous, in Indo-European and outside it.[83]

10. While the incidence of the (homonymous?) 'deriving-adverbializing' *yn-* is to an extent syntactically motivated (cf. the simplistic statement in Karlsson 19871: 7 'the adverb is formed by prefixing the particle *yn* . . . if the adverb precedes the verb, the adjective is used without *yn*'),[84] its distribution is far from simple. The focal adverb (preceding *yd/yr*-VERB) occurs without the deriving *yn-* (or another adverbializing signal): *da y medreist* (PKM 64); see above. Some adjective-homonymous adverbials do occur as pre-modifiers before other adjectives (*gweddol dda*), while others, of a restricted list, occur before the infinitive in conjugation (*yn newydd ddyfod*, etc.).[85]

11. The frequent *yn llawen* 'gladly' is attitudinal: (a) alone, as an affirmative apocritic (response) clause (*PKM* 58, 69), (b) still in response, adverbial (e.g. *P* 377; *PKM* 82, 85, 87), (c) combining (a) and (b); *a gwna ditheu yn llawen* (*PKM* 61). *Llawen* occurs frequently also as a narrative Nominal Sentence rheme: *Llawen yw genhyf inheu* (*PKM* 50; cf. also *O* 201 (comparative), 424); I find in the corpus no example for *llawen* as an *yn*-rheme. Some selected examples for the 'deriving-adverbializing' *yn-*: *yn uuan* (*PKM* 55), *yn gyntaf* (*PKM* 74), *yn digrif* (*PKM* 52), *yn lut* (*PKM* 86), *yn gryf* (*P* 549); *yn ogyuuch a hi* (*P* 592), *yn dangneudus* (*B* 127), *yn hir* (*B* 393–4), *yn da* (*P* 106; *PKM* 86), *yn llwydanus* (*PKM* 92), *yn gyngyflymet* (*PKM* 88).

2.2 Formal statements

(a) Lenition

The incidental-rheme morpheme is *yn*^{len}: lenition is in this case almost always marked orthographically: this is remarkable, in a corpus where lenition/non lenitition *variance* is the general rule. It is important to distinguish between our construction and the lenition-infix in the theme-initial NS pattern, where the lenition is not a reflex of zeroed

[83] Cf. Hoffmann 1952/6, for an important discussion of the 'rhematic adverbial' in Indic.

[84] Note that in Coptic, esp. in the Bohairic dialect, *n-* adverbials (as in Welsh, Coptic *n-* subsumes the main adverbial, predicative and direct-object functions) are restricted to the post-adjunctal and post-predicative placements: . . . *n-kalôs* '. . . well', . . . *m-pairêti* 'in this manner', as against *#kalôs* . . . 'It is proper (that) . . .', *#pairêti* . . . 'Thus . . .'.

[85] In 'Mawr y dywawt y gwr ymi y uot ef' (*O* 123), the focalized adjectival rheme is constituent of a clause included, integrated as object of 'he said'; cf. the ModW (Islwyn Ffowc Elis, *Cysgod y Cryman* 72), 'mecanic y bwriadodd y Brenin Mawr imi fod', which differs only in the 'i- cum infinitivo' form of the 'that' clause, where MW has the possessive article as agent expression. Cf. also (*P* 109) 'a ssegwr y digawn pawb ohonawc uot'.

yn, but marks nexal dependence: *Ennein yssyd reit y mi* (*P* 419–20). Lenition is an essential marker of the complex 'adverbal' syntactic-status category 'object+predicative+adverb'; *yn*^{len}- is a 'predicative actant' exponent,[86] and analytically resolves the two last constituents of this categorical conglomerate from the first.

Observation

Typologically, this pertinent lenition morphoneme is immediately comparable with the Arabic 'accusative'/predicative morph *-an* (Wright 1967; ii. 45ff., 109ff., etc.) and, for the analytical exponence by means of a preposition, to later Egyptian and Coptic *m-/n-* (Shisha-Halevy 1986a: chapters 1, 3 and *passim*; Polotsky 1990: 207ff).

(b) Determination

The *yn*-rheme is a striking instance of *nil-* (not *zero*) determination, i.e. the bare noun lexeme, with no specificity-exponence paradigm present.[94] This specificity-indifferent 'predicative base' is eminently comparable to the derivation bases in denominal word-formation (as in '*child*-ish', *crazi*-ly).

(c) Nominal constituencies

Without being biased by an *a priori* conception of the 'adjective vs. substantive' traditional part-of-speech dichotomy, and setting out from a truly analytical point of reference, one must realize that in the *yn*-rheme (as in most Nominal Sentence rhemes) is a meeting-point (or merging neutralization) of the two constituents of the *nomen* entity. However, from the examination of the paradigmatic relations between the two nexal patterns (below) it turns out that opposition, while never really frequent, obtains only between adjectival rhemes.

2.3 Systemics

This is tricky ground, and here is the main part of the structural work to be done, namely charting the respective ranges of opposition and neutralization. Here one discovers that in a broad range of synctactic statuses or slots the *yn*-rheme is not opposed to the NS-rheme: for instance, the adnexal adjunct (or 'rhematic apposition'), or the *yn*-rheme as predicative of {*bot*}: the NS does not occur adenxally. (Incidentally, since the NS is atemporal, verbal nexus forms supply verbal categories to nominal rhemes: on the other hand, the nexal pattern predicating the *yn*-rheme is fully temporal.)

The syntagmatic spectrum of the yn-marked nominal rheme may be presented schematically as follows ('N' = NOUN, 'S' + SUBSTANTIVE, 'A' = ADJECTIVE:

adnominal	appositive	copular	mae [. . .] *yn*-N	non-copular	llyma/nachaf
yn-N	*yn*-N	vbs.*yn*-N		verbs + *yn*-N	*yn*-A

[86] Cf. Helbig 1983: 106ff.

Observations

1. *yn-* + INFINITIVE: the converb:[87] 'gerund' or 'adverbial infinitive'. The converb or gerund constitutes a special case of *yn*-marked adverbial-slto nominal. Focalized in the Cleft Sentence it is *yn-* or *zero*-marked (see above): *>caru Goewin yd wyt ti* (*PKM* 68) vs. *yn hela yd oedwn* (*B* 156); *yn ymgeissaw . . . y mynnwn vy mot* (*O* 251–1). The converb occurs persistently in the same slot as other *yn*-rhemes: narrative tense, *a*-adnex, presented nexus, etc.

Consequently, we must distinguish *dyfod*$_1$ (substantival) and *dyfod*$_2$ (adverbial, i.e. converbal); cf. Tischhäuser 1971: 206, and the structurally necessary distinction of English *-ing*$_1$ – substantival ('verbal noun', as in 'swimming is good for you', and *-ing*$_2$ – gerundial (not 'participial', unless in the sense of the syntactically special Classical *participium coniunctum*, or the self-contradictory 'adverbial participle). In Coptic and Demotic Egyptian too we find the two *'sôtm'* ('hear') substantival and adverbial infinitives (cf. Polotsky 1990: 229ff.; Shisha-Halevy 1986: 118ff.); in English and Egyptian alike we have the synchronic consequences of the diachronic zeroing of a preposition (English *a(t)*-, Egyptian *ḥr-*), which as it were installs the adverbiality factor, now only paradigmatically marked, in the infinitive itself. In Welsh, the fact that the infinitive does not mutate following *yn-* symptomizes both its high grade of grammaticalization and is, in a sense, a 'prepositional zero'.

2. For the distinction of *yn*-status following bod/copular verbs or non-copular verbs, cf. Rolant 1986 (*'anhepgor'* and *dewisol*, respectively). On the copular verbs with *yn-*, see also Tischhäuser 1971: 202.

2.3.1. No-opposition environment

(1) 'Rhematic apposition': [(SUBSTANTIVE$^{spec./non\text{-}spec.}$/PN) *yn*-NOUN]

. . . a'r urenhines y gyt ac wynt, yn deccaf gwreic . . . (*P* 83)
. . . rodi Branwen uerch Lyr ym, yn tryded prif rieni . . . ac uerch y urenhin ynys y Kederyn (*B* 696).
. . . ar uarch yn gyweir . . . (*PKM* 62)
Yr a dywettei hi yn dec ac yn druan ny chaffei namyn yr un atteb (*P* 489–90)

Observations

1. The special syntactic status of 'adnominal rhematic adverbial' is not restricted to non-specific nuclei, unlike non-rhematic adverbial satellites (*y uarchoges doe* (*P* 236) is a case of nominal, not adverbial expansion); this adds to its definitive features.

2. Appositive *yn* occurs already in Old Welsh (*Juvencus*: Lambert 1987: 303–4).

3. Our 'rhematic apposition' approximates the traditional 'is-thaethiad enwol' (Richards 1935: 104ff. and 1938: 20ff., following in the German terminological tradition of the 'deprimiertes Prädikat', 'halprädikativ', etc., cf. Plank 1985), and overlaps with Jespersen's 'nexus subjunct'.

[87] See Haspelmath 1995, esp. 3ff. (converb defined as 'a non-finite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination'), 45-6.

(2) adnexal [Substantive + Adverb] nexus pattern: a- SUBSTANTIVE^{spec} *yn-* SUBSTANTIVE/ADJECTIVE]

For rhematic substantives, we find here designations of kinship, status, social role etc. (typically, with prepositional complements: *i, gan, gyt a, ar*).

. . . a'y lywenyt yn wastat kyn no hynny . . . (*B* 132)
. . . a'r mab yn uab y Pwyll Penn Annwn (*P* 570–1)
. . . a Phendaran Dyuet yn was ieuanc gyt ac wy (*B* 248)
. . . a Chynon mab Clydno yn gyfarwyd udunt (*O* 470)
. . . ac eu clusteu yn gochyon (*P* 21)
. . . a'r mab yn petwyryd (*P* 587)
. . . a'r penn yn dilwgyr genhwch (*B* 399)
. . . yn brithaw cordwal a hynny yn eurett (*PKM* 79)
. . . a hwnnw yn aeduet (*PKM* 59)
. . . ac ynteu yna a meint gwr yndaw ac yn delediwaf gwas (*PKM* 83)
. . . eithyr tei y llys yn wac (*PKM* 51–2: note here *eithyr* as adnexal connector)

See also Appendix III below.

(3) Presented nexus: Presentative (nachaf, llyma) + [SUBSTANTIVE^{spec} *yn-* ADJECTIVE]: superordinating narrative highlighting

. . . a llyma y mab yn gryf (*P* 533)
Dyuot a'r esgidyeu idi. Nachaf yr esgidyeu yn ormod (*PKM* 80)
. . . ac y edrych un o'e rofdeu y doeth. Nachaf honno yn aedfed (*PKM* 59)

Observation

Note the following possible instance of Presentative *nachaf* + [*yn*-Adj.-Subst.], that is 'Presentative + Rheme + Theme': *Nachaf yn ardiawc gan U. yr ymdidan ac yn drist* (*B* 131). Compare: *llyma yn goleuhau pob lle* (*PKM* 51), presented rhematic *yn*-infinitive in nexus. These instances are important, insofar they document the existence of a rheme-initial adverbial nexus pattern, a probable matrix for the adverbial-focus Cleft Sentence.

*(4) yn-*N *rhematic ('predicative') to copular {bot}*

For a number of adjective and substantive lexemes, here is a case of neat syntactic-status alternation between the Nominal Sentence rhemes and *yn-* rhemes, viz. the NS in autonomous (non-included), typically dialogic or (rarely) negative 'that' conversion status, as against *yn-* in included status (converters or junctors, typically in temporal clauses). Often, *yn-* may in this case be considered a narrative alternant of the NS:

Nominal Sentence	**{bot} yn-N**
. . . ac oed llesach y'r march pei. . . (*P* 272–3)	. . . pan welsant bod yn llesach udunt uynet (*B* 198)
. . . hyt nat oed well genti y byw. . . (*PKM* 57)	. . . pan welsant bot yn well udunt kymryt hun (*B* 59)
Teckaf yw itti gwneuthur. . . (*O* 17)	. . . gwedy bot yn degach genthi kymryt. . . (*P* 500)
	. . . gywedut idi y bot yn deckaf o'r gwraged (*O* 363–4)
Go athrist yw genhyf welet. . . (*PKM* 49)	. . . bot yn athrist gan yr unben bychanet (*B* 133)
Drwc uyd ganthunt. . . (*O* 304–5)	. . . o uot yn drwc wrthyf (*PKM* 81)
y mab hwn, mab iti yw (*PKM* 78)	. . . nit adnappo uot y mab yn uab y Pwyll (*P* 612–13)
Gwir yw na- (*PKM* 62)	Pa delw y gallei uot yn wir a dywedeisti (*PKM* 87R)
Diheu yw ytti nat. . . (*O* 110–11)	. . . gwedy bot yn diheu gantaw ef na- (*PKM* 56)
Ae amser ynni vynet y'r byrdeu? (*O* 227–8)	. . . gwedy bot yn amser ymadaw. . . (*PKM* 82)

(5) yn-NOUN predicative complement to 'copular' and 'non-copular' verbs

I believe the dichotomy of copular vs. non-copular is not really tenable as a lexical phenomenon (i.e. on the 'lexical-semantic' level); the operative and analytically viable and structurally valid dichotomies are those resolvable (1) between predicative and derivational 'adverbializing' *yn*-, (2) between valential object-actant nexus and rhematic adjunctal circumstant.

(a) 'Copular verbs are transitives, with [SUBSTANTIVE$^{spec.}$/Pronoun/Proper Noun + *yn*-N] as object actant (a construction common in the Four Branches). The nexus is a fully valential constituent of the verb's dependency matrix. Note that the actual (realized syntagmatic) sequence is often difficult from the structural one ('VERB + NEXUS OBJECT'). For example,

Edrych a oruc ar Arthur a'e welet yn trist (*O* 456)
Mi a'th roessum yn wreic y Uanawydan (*PKM* 50)
. . . a gadu y deu lu yn segur (*PKM* 73)
eu rannu yn deu hanher (*O* 700)

In the case of an impersonal verb, we do not have an explicit thematic object nominal:

. . . pan wnaethpwyt yn webb (*B* 153)
. . . a'r ty a adeilwyt yn uawr ac yn braf (*B* 327–8)

(b) Intransitives and transitives, with *yn*- a rhematic circumstant, not entering a valential matrix (a construction less frequent in the Four Branches); in the case of adjectival lexemes, this role of the *yn*-rheme may partly overlap the 'adverbializing' one; here the *yn*-circumstant may occur among others, usually the last in the group:

. . . a del/ar ny del yn waredawc . . . /yn uuyd . . . (*P* 127–8)
Ac yna y dygwydwys y gwr mawr yn varw (*O* 754)
Mi a af yn yspyttywr (*O* 808)
Owein a trigywys yn llys Arthur o hynny allan yn pennteulu ac yn annwyl idaw (*O* 818–19; also *B* 249)
. . . ac a arlwyssant yn bwyt (v.l. Ø-) (*O* 68f.).

(6) yn-NOUN: a rhematic naming complement

This features in the following naming paradigm, where it is involved in the opposition between PN and naming zero-determined appellative (either generic or with genus-notion 'name' specific);[88] schematically:

(y gelwit, a elwir [etc.]) (Ø)-Proper Name (e.g. *PKM* 71 [*passim*, 77, 84, 88)
yn/y-NOUN (*PKM* 79, 81 = 54)
yn-Bodewuedd (*PKM* 91; *v.l.* Ø-: [Appelative/Proper Name])
(Ø)- 'llech Gronwy' (*PKM* 92)

Observations

1. This is, I belive, an important case, allowing an insight into the mechanism responsible for special status of the Proper Name. The syntax of naming constructions in particular and Proper Names generally is still largely uncharted territory, in Welsh as in other languages, esp. as far as the signalling of 'properness' is concerned: I believe' properness' (or its privative counterpart, 'appellativity') to be a gradient, scalar property, rather than an entity; a property signalled for scale location by the convergence of morphosyntactic (in Welsh, also morphophonemic) features.[89] Welsh, so far as I know, is unique in also explicitly signalling the rhematic status of the 'naming actant', thereby resolving it from the general adverbal '(second) object' slot.

2. Like other *yn*-rhemes, the naming rheme may be focalized adverbally, with *yn*-zeroed: *moch y gelwir* (*PKM* 68).

2.3.2 Opposition and contrast environments

When opposition obtains or seems potentially probable, *yn*-rhemes are marked for incidental, contingent, circumstance-referred or circumstance-dependent descriptive predication; role and status predication; role in society, in the world; 'magical role'.

Observations

1. Some instances of adjectival *yn*-rhemes embody or contain lexically as well as signal syntactically the 'incidentality' feature: . . . *a phan uo ef yn rwymedic yn y got* . . . (*P* 350); *Y mae y-enw yn barawt* (*PKM* 76, 87); . . . *yny fyd y ty yn burwen* (*B* 186); . . . *yny uyd y pleit* . . . *yn wenn* (*B* 186) – 'white-hot', not 'white' (cf. the case of *morwyn*$_1$ ('[ancillary] handmaiden') and *morwyn*$_2$ ('virgin'), below.

[88] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989: 140.

[89] The principal theme of Shisha-Halevy 1989.

2. A famous *locus* reads: . . . *yny uyd yn daran ewic* / . . . *yny uyd yn garw* / . . . *a uu yn ewic – bit uaed coet*; *a uu baed coet – bit bleidast*; *a uu garneu – bit uleid* (*PKM* 75–6). Here we find the 'form as role' – manifestation as magic role. Note that only the first item of the catalogue has the marked *yn*-rheme: others have the lenition-infix marked nexus construction.

Cases of presumed valid opposition of the NS-rheme and *yn*-rhemes are rare.

Relatively clear cases present in pairs the opposition of kinship/status/role (narrative delocutive sphere) vs. pronoun-substantive identifying (interlocutive [1st/2nd person] sphere) predication:

(1) Yd-oed yn arglwyd ar Went Is Coed Teirnon Twryf Uliant (*P* 508). Uy-arlwydes-i yw hon racko (*O* 365)
(2) . . . yny uyd yn uab brasinet telediw (*PKM* 76) . . . a'r mab yn uab y Pwyll Penn Annwn (*P* 570–1). Y mab hwn, mab iti yw (*PKM* 78)
(3) Sef oed yn uorwyn y gyt ac ef Goewin uerch Pebin (*PKM* 67)
A uorwyn, a-wyt-uorwyn di (*PKM* 77)

The nexus-pattern opposition here corresponds to a lexical one of *morwyn*$_1$ ('[ancillary] haidmaiden') and *morwyn*$_2$ ('virgin), respectively; antonymic to the latter is *gwreic* as in *Gwreic wyf i* (*PKM* 74).

In the case of the adjective *hyspys* 'clear, obvious', the cases of contrast are instructive: we observe that *yn*-rhemes correlate with non-basic (derived equative) adjectives, NS with basic ones:

NOMINAL SENTENCE	*yn*-RHEMES
hyspys	*cyn-hyspysed*
(*O* 125, 181, 351–2)	(*B* 453–4 + editor's note)

2.4 The y-/yn- problem

In the Four Branches, we find a considerable number (approximately fifteen) of occurrences of *yn* (in R) varying with *y*- (in W), and that before all types of consonants. More rarely, we find *y*- as a consensus (before labels only), leniting, in a role recalling that of *yn*-. (Note that the variant *y*- is also encountered for a different constructino outside the scope of noun predication, namely the *yn*- + INFINITIVE converb). The various editors do not as a rule consider this a case of 'phonetic'- orthographical variation, but a distinct prepositional morph (*y*- is probably the most homonymically loaded morph in Middle Welsh). The syntactic distribution of *y*- is very similar to that of *yn*-, and almost all constructions are represented here.

Observation

Arwyn Watkins 1962, in the most important and indeed only structural treatment of the phenomenon (with a comparative-historical study), decides explicitly for the different-entity (albeit homonymy, and synonymy) analysis. See also the earlier Morris-

Jones 1913: 439, §222 + note; Watkins 1958, 1960: 369; Simon Evans 1964: 20, 139 (not phon. variant but different preposition).

Some examples for *y/yn-* + NOUN (adjective, role/quality substantive):

... yn dyuot y ogyuuch [W; R yn] (*P* 207)
a dywedwn uy mot y ueichawc [cons.] (*P* 543)
... adaw y drws y agoret [W; R *yn*] (*P* 530)
... gwedy bot y barawt yr ystauell [cons.] (*B* 178: NB ed.; 'the predicative and adverbial particle y-')
... a Chradawc uab Bran y benhaf [W; R *yn* (*B* 242–3)
... ac adaw seithwyr y dywyssog ym [W; R *yn*] (*B* 242)
Y trydyd drws oed y gayat [W; R *yn*] (*B* 436)
... am na'th elwir y uorwyn [W; R *yn*] (*PKM* 79)
Mi a rodaf Duw y uach it (*PKM* 57)

Some examples for *y/yn-* with infinitive:

... ual y bydant y kerdet [W; R *yn*] (*B* 44)
... ac adar R. y canu [W; R *yn*] (*B* 395)

3. Lenition-Infix Nexus Patterns

I would here but draw attention briefly to this special noun predication construction, discussed in some detail elsewhere (Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.4.2). Note that this is not a case of zeroing of *yn-*, but a distinct construction, in which the lenition morpheme, residing always in the second nexal constituent (or structurally between the two, realized in the second), marks the nexal interdependence: 'a hwnnw uu y trydyd dyn a torres y galon o anivyset' (*B* 422: note the discontinuous relative *a* – *y-* with inalienable possessive association).

APPENDIX I:

The Literary Modern Welsh Nominal Sentence pattern repertory

The main pattern isolated in the course of a syntactical study of Kate Robert's short stories and novels (alongside a corpus consisting of a random selection from *Y Faner*) are presented and illustrated below from Shisha-Halevy 1998: Chapter 3.

1.1. Pronominal-theme delocutive: # RHEME *-yw/ydi [+ suffix-pronoun] (Theme)* #

'Lleusa drws nesa ydi hi', 'Ych brawd ydi o?' 'Dim ond het ydi hi'

1.2 Pronominal-theme expanded delocutive: # *RHEME* - *yw/ydi* (formal theme) - *Theme#*

'Ab eos ydi hwn', 'Pobl'di pawb', 'Pleser yw byw yn eu plith', 'Hunanol ydi pawb mewn ocsiwn', 'Nid dyna ydi i henw i'

1.2.1. Negative-nexus binominal suppletive: # *Nid - Rheme* + (*mo-*) Theme #

'Nid Arab mohono', 'Nid da gan yr hen bregethwr mo hyn', 'Nid felly hi'

*1.3. Topicalized delocutive (not attested in the corpus described): # *Topic - Rheme - Theme* #

2. The copular pattern: # *Theme – Copula (yw/ydi) – Rheme* #

'Teitl y llun yw 'chwillo', 'Yr hydref yw amser medi a cynaefu', '. . . a'm cred i ydyw mai dyna mae'r teledu yn ei wneud i bobl', 'Y peth sy'n ofnadwy ydi, fod yr athrawon . . . yn curo plant'

3. The Interlocutive Pattern: # *Rheme – Interlocutive Theme* #

'Cath wyfi-i', 'Sâl ydach-chi?'

4.1-6. The binominal # *Rheme – Theme* # *pattern set*

4.1 # *Rheme - Clause-Content Theme* #

'Anodd gin i gredu hynny', 'Gwell inni beidio â dal ein hanadl', ' . . . a gresyn hynny', 'Hei lwc y daw rhyw les o ddarledu'r rhaglen', 'Biti na fasi pawb yr yn fath *a chi*'

4.2 (II) # 'Qualifying' Rheme – substantive Theme #

'mwya ffŵl fi', 'Mawr y beirniadau . . .'

4.3 (III) # Adjective – inalienable Subst. #

'Gwyn dy fyd di!', 'dyn sâl i feddwl'

4.4 (IV) Cleft Sentence and related constructions (focused rhemes)

'Twm? Pwy Dwm?, 'Pwy sydd yna?', 'Yn cysur a ddaeth i'w bywyd', 'Dyna o leiaf a gredai'r bechgyn ieuainc', 'Gwir a ddywedodd y Sacsoniaid'

4.5 (V) Affective-exclamative # *Rheme* – i-/o/â- *Theme* #

'Tyst ohonoch chi' 'Druan â hi', 'Yr hen gnaues ddrwg i chi' 'Yr hen drwyn iddi'

5. Deictic-existential presentative statement: # *dyna/dyma (presentant) – presentate* #

'Dyna'r polisi', 'Dyna ffact', 'Ai dyma ddiwedd y daith iddo ef?', 'Dyna ichi bedi ledi', 'Dyma drefnu taith'

APPENDIX II:

The Presentative Deictic-Existential Introduction of Nominals

Formal-syntactic and functional-semantic definition of constructional terms

We are concerned here with a special non-verbal, extratemporal binary construction that formally manifests an actantial rather than nexal interdependence, and resembles in some aspects existential statements.

The presentant is the initial element: *llyma, llyna, nachaf*.

The presentate is the second element: noun syntagm (lenited), pronoun (in ModW) or *y*-substantial clause; or an entire nexus.

The construction constitutes a statement of deictic ('indicational') introduction/existence into/in discourse: the presentative is in this sense formal-'thematic', the presentate 'rhematic'; the actantial-valential dependence probably means only that the presentate is formally governed by the presentant.

Observations

1. The only other case of commutation of lenited noun with an *y*-clause is that of the direct object. And indeed, we may view the presentate as an object-actant of the presentative. In Romance (*me voilà, eccotelo*) this is equally clear: cf. Genaust 1975 (esp. 84-5, 90ff.) for French, and Shisha-Halevy 1998: 184–92 for descriptive discussion of the ModW pattern and comparative notes.

2. Unlike ModW (*dyna, dyma-*), we find in our MW corpus no instance of the negator *nid*-opening the construction; nor do we have the expanded delocutive type # *dyna yw-* +SUBST.# (Shisha-Halevy 1998: 132).

3. The usual rendering of our constructions (e.g. by 'behold', or 'here is', or 'hier' (e.g. in Poppe 1991a: e.g. 250, cf. also 33 n. 1) and so on - French *voici, voilà*, as used in R. L. Thomson's *Pwyll*, seems better) symptomizes the prevailing descriptive aporia regarding the grammatical category of presentatives, which are neither imperatives (like ModI *féach* or Classical Greek ἰδοῦ), nor located adverbial-theme or adverbial-rheme nexus patterns, and in fact begs the analytical question. I find the etymological suggestions (*GPC* 2269, 2273) even less illuminating than the above renderings: 'Dyma, wele . . . yma; hwn(hon) yw, y rhain yw; here (is, are), lo, behold, this is (these are)'. (In later texts, *llyma* does function as adverb: e.g. Llyma yd oedwn . . . [*Breudwyt Maxen Wledic* 6.7]).

4. The relative distribution of *llyma/llyna* and *nachaf* varies from one text to another: in *Pwyll, nachaf* does not occur; in *Branwen, nachaf* is very rare; in Owein, *nachaf* is narrative only, *llyma/llyna* dialogic.

Presentation in narrative: llyma, nachaf

(1) # llyma/nachaf - [SUBSTANTIVE/PRONOUN + *yn* - [INFINITIVE]#

This constitutes a narrative tense, non-concatenating and in fact a delimitation in both the text-junctural and narratological textures. On the high-order Functional Sentence Perspective level, the pattern marks the superordinated rhematic constituent following an adverbial (*yna-, ar hynny, y gyt ac*-VERB, *yn ôl-* INF., adverbial verbal clauses, etc.). In its textual paradigm in this slot, our construction commutes with and is evidently opposed to other narrative tense forms, such as the Abnormal Sentence (e.g. *P* 203, cf. 213-14), 'INFINITIVE *a wnaeth*' (*P* 193-4, 221-2), 'INFINITIVE' (*B* 354, 378-9), narrative Cleft Sentence (*B* 59-69, 209-10); negative finite verb (*B* 308-9). However, narratologically and text-grammatically it seems opposed in particular to the inter-episode-seam/narrative-coda periphrastic tense 'INFINITIVE *a wnaeth*' and especially cataphoric forward-

attention-directing '*Sef a wnaeth* INFINITIVE' as a marker of episodic dramatic superordinative highlighting. Typically, we encounter here narrative changes, staged in a kind of 'movement under camera' as vividly visualized. Sudden or unexpected change or development, which heralds or opens an important episode, a narrative peak, is perhaps most typical here. (Like the *sef-* narrative tense, its distribution in the Four Branches is uneven, most instances concentrated in the second half of the cycle. *Nachaf*, for its part, is not necessarily formally superordinated, but more sequeling.[90]

Constituencies:

Presentants: *llyma* and *nachaf*. Not *llyna*?

Presentate nominals: specific/non-specific, indefinite

Pronouns: *hi, hithau*

Verbs: movement, change in posture ('come', 'go', 'jump', 'meet', 'descend', 'rise', 'alight and stand', 'overtake', 'come upon'); change in general ('increase', 'begin', 'rain'[?].

Observations

1. ModW *dyma* + INFINITIVE seems the later functional (not formal) correspondent to our construction: 'Rhyw brynhawn Sadwrn, daeth cefndyr i'm tad o Llanrog i edrych amdano . . . a gofyn iddo fyned gyda hwynt i weld twll Dorothea. Dyma gychwyn a thros Ros y Cilgwyn . . . (Kate Roberts, *Y Lôn Wen*).

2. The presentative construction in narrative also has a pacing (or rhythm) effect, as a corollary of its highlighting role. In general, it is associated with the 'narrative present' rare in MW (cf. Poppe 1995) but more usual in ModW narrative. The so-called narrative peak, presenting crucial events of generally information (cf. Fleischman 1990: 77, 141-2) is often characterized by slowing-down and descriptive visualization, eventive or non-eventive (ibid. 150, 266-7); these are 'zones of linguistic turbulence' (ibid. 142).

3. For narrative infinitival presentation in Romance, cf. Lombard 1936: 238 n. 2, 257 ff., Herczeg 1972: 570ff.

Representative documentation:

. . . a pharth a pherued y llanerch llyma yr erchwys a oed yn y ol yn ymordiwes ac ef (*P* 16)
. . . ac ar hynny, gyt ac y kyuodes ef, llyma gennadeu Matholwch yn dyuot attaw ef (*B* 298-9)
. . . gyt ac y hegyr, llyma hitheu yn bwrw neit allan (*PKM* 89)
. . . yn ol llef y corn, llyma hyd blin yn mynet heibaw (*PKM* 84)
. . . ac ar hynny, llyma y dryw yn seuyll ar wwrd y llog (*PKM* 80)
. . . val y bydant y kerdet, llyma gyweithyd yn kyuaruot ac wynt (*B* 411-12)
. . . ac ar hynny, nachaf un o'r llongeu yn raculaenu (*B* 23)
. . . val y byd ynteu yn dodi . . . nachaf offeirat yn dyuot ataw (*PKM* 62)
A ffan vyd digrifhaf genhyf gwarandaw ar yr adar yn canu, nachaf tuchan yn dyfot ar hyt y dyffryn . . . (*O* 183-4)
. . . nachaf y guenith yn kyuot yn oreu yn y byt (*PKM* 59)

NB: a sequeling, rather than superordinating presentation. So too in the next examples:

. . . nachaf y liw a'y wed a'y ansawd yn atueilaw (*PKM* 67)

[90] Russell 1987 is mostly historical-etymological, considering *nachaf* exclamative.

Ac ar hynny, nachaf Efnyssen . . . yn dywanu y lety meirch Matholwch (*B* 65)
Ac yn y lle nachaf y llew yn dyfot attaw . . . (*O* 677)

(1′) *#llyma*-[yn-INFINITIVE + SUBSTANTIVE/PRONOUN] #
This is in fact the preceding pattern, yet presenting an initial adverbial rheme + nominal theme nexus. This rare nexal pattern (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995) is important, inasmuch as it sems to constitute the matrix for the normal adverb-focalizing Cleft sentence (#ADVERBIAL - VERB#), just as 'Pwy enw . . .' etc. underlies the (pro)noun-focalizing Cleft Sentence: . . . yn ol y nywl llyma yn goleuhaw pob lle' (*PKM* 51).
(2) *#llyma/nachaf*- [SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBIAL]#
Descriptive narrative tense: neither superordinative nor dramatic.
Representative documentation:

Ac ar hynny, llyma y teulu am penn y llys (*P* 388-9)
Ryvedu hynny yn uawr a wnaeth a dyuot y edrych grofd arall: nachaf honno yn aeduet (*PKM* 59)
Dyuot a'r esgiyeu idi. Nachaf yr esgidyeu yn ormod (*PKM* 80)

(2′) *nachaf*-[ADVERBIAL + SUBSTANTIVE]: presentation of adverbial-rheme nexus
See above, I'. 'Ac nachaf yn ardiawc yr ymdidan ac yn drist . . .' (*B* 131) – if the editor's emendation *yn>yr* (see editor's note, pp. 26-27) is accepted as correct.
(3) *#llyma/nachaf* - SUBSTANTIVE#
Presentates:
(i) specific substantive, expanded by relative conversion: (re)introduction into narrative discourse;
(ii) Proper Name (protagonistic): (re)introduction into narrative discourse
(iii) non-specific noun (lenited): deictic-existential introduction into narrative discourse (located or unlocated).
Note that, although the dramatic effect is in the Four Branches very pronounced, this is not a case of superordination. In *Owein*, *nachaf*- is descriptive rather than dramatic.
Representative documentation:

A llyna y godwrw mwyaf a uu gan uniuer un ty . . . (*B* 370)
O'r a welsei o holl lyssoed y dayar llyna y llys diswallaf o uwyt a llyn . . . (*P* 91)
ar hynny, llyma Pryderi a Riannon (*PKM* 65)
. . . ef a glywei twrwf mawr, ac yn ol y twrwf, llyma grauanc uawr drwy fenestyr ar y ty . . . (*P* 523)
. . . ac ual y bydant yn eisted yuelly, llyma dwrwf, a chan ueint y twrwf, llyma gawat o nywl yn dyuot (*PKM* 51)

The only instance of *nachaf* in this contruction is a rare example of *llyma* and *nachaf* in syntagmatic opposition: the former seems to be narrative-superordinative, the second a case of *Erlebte Rede* (style *indirect libre*):

A ual y byd am hanner nos yvelly, nachaf twryf myhaf yn y byt. Sef a wraenth ynteu edrych: llyma eliwlu y byd o lygot (*PKM* 60)
A ffarth a'r gaer y deuthum ac nachaf deu was pengrych melyn . . . (*O* 41)
Ac ar hynny nachaf kawgeu aryant a dwfyr y ymolchi yndunt . . . (*O* 76)

(4) # *Llyma y-* VERB#: presentation of verbal nexus
Only 'hear' and 'see' are attested in the imperfect tense. This is a narrative tense-form, signalling 'narratologically important or significant perception'; superordinative and typically (though not exclusively) cataphoric, in the sense of preparing for or indicating the commencing of a (micro-)episode (and paragraph). Alternatively,the pattern concludes a micro-episode. In either case, 'at that point . . .' seems an apt rendering.

Representative documentation:

(When they arrived there, there was mustering in the land . . .) ar hynny llyma y clywynt yr utkyrn a'r dygyuor yn y wlat (*PKM* 71)
Ym penn y ulwydyn o'r un dyd, llyma y clywei odorun adan paret yr ystauel . . . (*PKM* 75; sim. 76)
(He went out), a phan daw llyma y gwelei bleid, a bleidast, a chrubothon cryf . . . (*PKM* 76)
Ac ual y byd yuelly, llyma y gwelei yscolheic yn duyot attaw . . . (*PKM* 61)

(5) Meta-narrative information: closing announcement
Only in Branwen, '. . . *Llyma ual y teruyna y geing honn*' (all other Branches have '*yvelly y teruyna*')

Presentation in Dialogue

This presentation is very different in function from narrative presentation.

(i) Typically, we find here cataphoric response or reaction – a double and bi-directional (in a sense, chiastic) text-grammatical characterization, since the reactive substructure of dialogue is retro-dependent:

Llyma/llyna – SUBSTANTIVE (+ expansion)
Llyma/llyna ual- VERB
Llyna a- VERB

Only *llyma/llyna* are found as presentants (with *llyna* prevalent); *nachaf* does not occur in dialogue. *Llyma* and *llyna* occur frequently as variant readings (e.g. *P* 81, 178, 288, 403). Again the distribution in the Four Branches is uneven (most exx. in *Pwyll*; in *Owein*, the construction does not occur at all).

Observation

Juncturally, the boundary between presentative and presentate is clearly open. The lenition of non-specific substantives is not a symptom or signal of close juncture, but of a syntactic rectional relationship (consider *P* 71-2, 285-6, 282; *PKM* 56).

Representative documentation:

'Llyma dy gynghor di', heb Riannon yna. 'Yd wyt yn y lle y perthyn arnat llonydu eircheit a cherdoryon . . .' (*P* 403)
'Llyma wed y keffy', heb ynteu. 'Gwr yssyd gyferbyn y gyuoeth a'm kyuoeth inheu yssyd yn ryeulu arnaf yn wastat . . . ac yr guaret gormes hwnnw y arnaf . . . y keffy uyg kerennyd' (*P* 45)
'Llyna gerdet yssyd arnam ni, Arglwyd . . . wreic honn . . . ym penn pethewnos a mis y byd beichogi idi . . . (*B* 163-4)
'Llyma y gyfranc ual y bu' - a'e datkanu oll o Pwyll udunt (*P* 178; sim. *PKM* 56)
'Llyna', heb y Pwyll, 'y neges oreu genhyf i: dy dyuot ti idi' (*P* 282-3)

NB: this ('This – said P – is for me the best errand: your coming on it [i.e. the errand]') seems the more witty and indeed least banal interpretation and analysis of this *locus*, which is not specially commented upon in the editions. 'That . . . is for me the most pleasing errand thou couldst come on' is Jones and Jones's translation.

'Llyna uy neges inheu: ymadolwyn a thidi' (*PKM* 69)
'Llyna y gwr y mynyssit uy rodi idaw . . . Gwawl uab Clut' (*P* 326-7)

In this example the role of our pattern appears to be in a sense that of a dialogic allo-form of the naming narrative *sef* pattern; see above.

'Llyma oll' heb y Teirnon, a menegi y dadyl oll (*P* 539, sim. *PKM* 60)
'. . . a llyma y peth lleiaf a gymeraf y gantaw . . .' (*PKM* 91)

Contrast here the anaphoric sequel . . . *a hynny leiaf peth . . . a gymeraf y ganthaw. Llyna a uynhaf, no bo hut byth ar seith cantref Dyuet* (PKM 64)

(ii) Non-cataphoric presentation. These relatively very rare instances, mostly non-reactive, are all cases of 'exophoric' extratextual-situational (pragmatic) reference:

Llyma beth eres (*B* 264)
Llyma, heb y Pwyll, y uarchogaes doe (*P* 235-6)
Llyma yr aniveileit a dywedeisti uot bwch arnunt (*PKM* 87)
Och . . . paham? Llyna y llynghes yng kylch y ty (*PKM* 83)

APPENDIX III

The [PRONOUN/SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBIAL] nexus pattern

This is an included-nexus ('adnexal', i.e. nexus-adjoining) nexal pattern, important as a textual building-block, especially in narrative textemes. It is easy to lose sight of as a nexal unit (and not every 'SUBST. + ADV.' sequence is nexal), since it but rarely occurs as an 'autonomous' clause. Actually, this is a formally marked form of the statal-existential adverbial-rheme nexus pattern with the statal copula (*mae* etc.) zeroed, as a formal signal-nexus between a substantival/pronominal theme and an adverbial rheme, that is, radically different from the Nominal Sentence nexus discussed here. However, the fact that the *yn*-marked nominal rheme (above) evidently shares the rheme paradigm in this pattern will inevitably render it relevant to the present study of the nominal rhemes, just as the rhematic converbal/gerundial 'preoposition+infinitive' phrases constitute an essential component of the verbal system. (Observe that by 'included' I do not mean 'subordinated', but 'having constituent status in a larger complex)'.

The following (a) is probably best recognized and isolated as an adnexal segment.
(a) *a-*/(neg. *heb-*) + [PRONOUN/SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBIAL]
(1) Adnominal – only to indefinite nuclei
Résumptive suffix in the preposition phrase.
Adverb constituency: possessive rheme (*gan-, i-), am-, ar-*
Selective documentation:

gwreic a bronneu genti (*PKM* 78)
(g)wr heb gyfoeth idaw (*PKM* 84)

These examples illustrate perhaps the difference between the inalienable-possession signal *i-* and an unmarked/'alienable-possession' *gan-*; in the latter case we have here 'breast for suckling' (which may for instance be hired). This issue must be further investigated.

. . . gwas a gwisc o bali amdanaw (*P* 311)
. . . gwr . . . a drygweith anorles arnaw (*B* 159–60)
. . . mynyd mawr . . . a hwnnw ar gerdet (*B* 265–6)
. . . deu was . . . ractal eur am pen pob vn onadunt . . . dwy wintas o gordwal newyd am traet pob vn, a gwaegeu eur ar vynygleu eu traet yn eu kau (*O* 41ff.)
gwr . . . athrugar mawr . . . a gwreic yn ei ol (*B* 160)

Observation

This is a striking case – also of typological significance – of nucleus specificity conditioning the form of satellite (expansion). (Outside Indo-European, Semitic and Egyptian-Coptic feature related phenomena.)

(b) Narrative (1) . . . a - [SUBSTANTIVE^{spec}/PRON. + *yn-* INFINITIVE]

Not a plot carrying or event-foregrounding concatenating 'narrative tense', *stricto sensu*, this is a descriptive narrative form for expressing concomitant 'zooming', 'close-shot', 'slow-motion' view of the action – in fact, often H. Weinrich's 'relief', [91] which is no less than text-grammatically (as against sentence-grammatically) meaningful subordination.[92] It is in reality a narrative sub-link:

(. . . ef a glywei llef erchwys arall) . . . a hynny yn dyuot yn erbyn y erchwys ef, (*P* 12–13)
A chyn y pedwyryd wynt eu hun yn peri eu hatcassu . . . (*B* 169–70)
A'r lleu vyth yn disgrechu am vot gouut ar Owein. (*O* 775)

(c) Narrative (2) . . . (a-) [SUBSTANTIVE^{spec}?PRONOUN + ADVERBIAL]

This expresses a descriptive circumstance in the narrative foreground.

Abverb constituency: *yn-, gan-, y gyt ac-, y uynyd; yn*-Noun

. . . ac yn kyrchu parth ac attunt a cherdet rugyl ebrwyd ganthunt, y gwynt yn eu ol (*B* 15)
Pwyll ynteu Penn Annwn a doeth y'r berllan . . . a'r got ganthaw (*P* 366)
. . . ac y guelynt dyrchauael taryan yn uch no bwrd y llong a swch y tarian y uynyd yn arwyd tangneued (*B* 25)
Bendigeiduran a doeth y'r tir a llynghes y gyt ac ef . . . (*B* 290)
. . . kerdet a wnaeth y seithwyr parth a Hardlech a'r penn ganthunt (*B* 410f.)

[91] Weinrich 1977: 91ff.

[92] Ibid. 143ff.

(d) Narrative (3): Nexus presented. Presentative narrative superordination-highlighting tense: llyma/nachaf - [SUBSTANTIVE^{spec} + yn-INFINITIVE]

See above, Appendix II.

(e) Dialogue - allocutive/reactive subsystems (rare)

'Chwedleu o lys Arthur gennyt?' (*B* 261-2; *O* 424-5; cf. Shisha-Halevy 1995: §3.3.2 Obs. 4) 'Beth oed yr eskeir aruchel a'r llynn o bop parth y'r eskeir?' 'Ef – heb hi – yn edrych ar yr ynys honn' (*B* 279): this proves the open juncture of this nexus type.

Observations

1. 'Adnexal' is currently used to describe the functional specific of the Coptic and Egyptian so-called 'circumstantial' (adverbial) finite converb forms (Shisha-Halevy 1986a; Funk 1991); 'Koprädikativ' (as in Plank 1985) covers approximately the same functional range.

2. Some references to discussions of our construction: *a* [PRON./SUBST. + ADV] is not an 'independent nominal phrase' (so Richards 1938: §32-3; Simon Evans 1972: 172ff.); its characterization as 'absolute' (not in the sense of 'independent', but in that of the indo-European 'absolute ablative/genitive') is yet another instance of De Boer's 'tyrannie du Latin' – Latin terminological programming (see Richards 1948: 373; cf. also the doubly alien 'nominative absolute' used by Ó Siadhail 1984: 125, of ModI *agus* [PRON./SUBST.+ADV]). On the adnominal role of the construction, see Simon Evans 1971: 126 ('equivalent of relative nexus').

3. Comparable subnexal constructions occur in other European languages. See Sandmann 1968 on the Romance type, French 'le menton sur l'epaule elle observait'. Note, however, that in Romance, (a) an adjective shares the rhematic paradigm (~Welsh *yn-* + Noun), (b) the rheme may precede the theme if an overt adnexal link is present, and (c) the high inalienability possession-factor of the rheme noun: 'en taille fléchie, la tête de côté', Italian *con-* [N+Adv./adj.] 'con cavi gli occhi', 'con in tasca molti soldi'. Eriksson's important monograph (1980) treats the French phenomenon in its widest scope: note esp. 67ff. (the narrative role), 71ff. ('descriptive'), 80ff. (temporal), 130ff. ('nexal object'), 260ff. (adnomina). In English, the comparables are *with-* and *and-* adnexals. Cf. Quirk *et al.* 1987: §11.44 ('irregular Sentences', sublcassified as 'various logical subject-plus-component constructions'; cf. also 'with' as subordinator, §14.15). Jespersen on 'and' and 'with' is apt and cogent: see Jespersen 1966: iii. 17.85, v. 6.85, vii. 6.44 ('loosely connected nexus', '*and* followed by a subject and predicate implied a contrast and generally indicates surprise', again, 'absolute constructions', 'resembles a nexus tertiary').

4. Irish *agus* as adnexal link is a familar and important structural and typological trait: Lewy 1942: §92; Hartmann 1960 (esp. on 'agus (ocus) é ag treacht': formal analysis, historical and synchronic examination). Greene 1966: 54-5; Ó Siadhail 1989 ('agus + nominative absolute type') includes two Welsh exx. (135). Ó Siadhail does not consider the possibility that the English feature is due to Welsh influence. Boyle 1973 is generative.

Terminological Defining Glossary

The following may be added to the definitions in *Studia Celtica* 29, 213–15.

Cleft Sentence: (specially discussed): a complex, sharply dichotomous clause-pattern serving to focus any element other than the finite verb (verbal nexus), by marking the latter as substantival and by this token as thematic or topical. (In Welsh grammatical terminology, ≈ 'Mixed Sentence' or 'Mixed Order').

Context: the pragmatic-situational environment or setting of a linguistic form of paradigm.

Cotext: the textual environment of a linguistic form or paradigm.

Converb: a finite or non-finite verb form with adverbial syntactic status and/or properties (in some schools, a specialized use of 'gerund' in this sense is encountered).

Deixis: indication: oriented reference of textual elements with regard to space and time, esp. in relation to the interlocutive (locutive/allocutive) and delocutive pivotal environments of discourse.

Endophoric reference: (in Nominal Sentence patterning): pronominal reference to a referate inside and not exeeding the pattern extent.

Exophoric reference: (in Nominal Sentence patterning): pronominal reference to a referate outside the pattern extent.

Inalienable possession: a formally marked, language-specific, gradient property of 'intimate' or 'close' association, esp. of noun lexemes.

Nominal Sentence: a special set of nexus patterns, the constituents of which are at least a nominal or pronominal rheme and theme, and (in some cases) a copula which is not itself a verbal nexus syntagm.

Bibliography

Ahlqvist, A. 1972. Some aspects of the copula in Irish, *Éigse*, 14, 269–74.
Awbery, G. H. 1948. Welsh, in P. Trudgill (ed.), *Language in the British Isles* (Cambridge), 259–77.
Barri, N. 1975. Adjectifs antéposés et adjectifs postposés comme signes linguistiques différents, *FL*, 209–20.
Baudiš, 1913. Nominalsätze und Nominalprädikate im Irischen, *ZCPh*, 9, 309–35.
Beckman, N. 1934. *Västeropeisk Syntax* (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 40; Göteborg).
Benveniste, E. 1950. La Phrase nominal, *BSL*, 46, 19–36.
——(=*Problèmes de linguistique générale*; i (1966), 151–75.
Bloch, A. A. 1986. *Studies in Arabic Syntax and Semantics* (Weisbaden).
Bloch, J. 1906. *La Phrase nominale et Sanskrit* (= *MSL* 14; Paris).
Bolinger, D. 1967. Adjectives in English: attribution and predication, *Lingua*, 18, 1–34.
Boone, A. 1987. Les Constructions *il est linguiste, c'est un linguiste, Langue française*, 75, 94–106.
Boyle, D. 1973. Ach and agus as coordinate and subordinate conjunctions in Gaelic, in Corum,

Smirth-Stark and Weiser (eds.), *You Take the High Node and I Take the Low Node* (Chicago), 220–8.
Caerwyn Williams, J. G. 1972. Welsh yn ei eistedd, yn ei orwedd, yn ei sefyll, in Pilch and Thurow (eds.), *Indo-Celtica: Gedächtnisschrift Alf Sommerfelt* (Munich).
——1976. *MIW neu, neut* as copula, *Celtica*, 11, 278–85.
——1980. Remarks on a linguistic drift, *Celtica*, 13, 67–82.
Cohen, D. 1984. *La Phrase nominale et l'evolution du système verbale en sémitique* (Paris).
Comrie, C. I. B. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge).
De Boer, C. 1928. Études de syntaxe française, V: Facteurs troublants dans les études de syntaxe française, *RLR*, 4, 301–10.
——1954. *Syntaxe du français moderne* (Leiden)
Declerck, R. 1983. Predictational clefts, *Lingua*, 61, 9–45.
Declerck, R. 1988. *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts and Pseudo-Clefts* (Leuven-Louvain).
Delbeque, N. 1998. De la relación sujeto-atributo con las cópulas *ser y estar*, *Travaux de linguistique hispanique: Actes du VII Colloque de Linguistique Hispanique* (G. Luquet, ed.) Paris 307–32.
Dillon, M. 1927–8. Nominal predicates in Irish, I, *ZCPh*, 16, 313–56, II, *ZCPh*, 18, 307–46.
Elffers-van Ketel, G. 1991. *The Historiography of Grammatical Concepts: 19th and 20th-Century Changes in the Subject-Predicate Conception and the Problem of Their Historical Reconstruction* (Amsterdam and Atlanta (Ga.).
Eriksson, O. 1980. *L'attribut de localisation et les nexus locatifs en français moderne.* (= Romanica Gothoburgensia, 18; Göteborg).
Evans, E. 1958. Cystrawennau 'SEP' mewn Cymraeg Canol, *BBCS*, 18, 38–54.
——1964. Gohiro'r rhagenw mewn Cymraeg Ganol, *BBCS*, 21, 141–5.
Evans, D. Simon. 1955. Rhai sylwadau ar y goddrych, *BBCS*, 16, 76–87.
——1964. *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin)
——1968. The sentence in Early Modern Welsh, *BBCS*, 22, 311–37.
——1970/72. Nominal constructions in Early Modern Welsh, *BBCS*, 24/2, 139–76.
Falk, J. 1979. *SER y ESTAR con atributos adjectivales. Anotaciones sobre el enpleo de la cópula en catalán y en castellano* (=Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Romanica Upsaliensia, 29; Uppsala).
Fife, J. 1988. *Functional Syntax: A Case Study in Middle Welsh* (Lublin).
——and Poppe, E. (eds.) 1991. *Studies in Brythonic Word Order* (Philadelphia, New York and Amsterdam).
Fleischman, S. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (London).
——1991. Towards a theory of tense-aspect in narrative discourse, in Gvozdanovic and Janssen (eds.), *The Function of Tense in Texts* (Amsterdam).
Forsgren, M. 1978. *La Place de l'adjectif en français contemporain, étude quantitative et sémantique* (Uppsala).
Funk, W.-P. 1991. Formen und Funktionen des interlokutiven Nominalsatzes in den koptischen Dialekten, *Langues orientales anciennes: philologie et linguistique*, 3, 1–75.
Gabelenz, G. von der. 1869. Ideen zur einen vergleichenden Syntax, *Zeitschrift z. Völkerpsychologie*, 6, 376–84.
Galand, L. 1964. L'Énoncé verbal en berbère: étude de fonction, *CFS*, 21, 33–53.
Genaust, H. 1975. *Voici* und *voilà*: eine textsyntaktische Analyse, in Schecker and Wunderli (eds.), *Text-grammatik: Beiträge zum problem der Textualität* (Tübingen), 76–106.
Goldenberg, G. 1983. On Syriac sentence structure, in M. Sokoloff (ed.), *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Tradition* (Ramat-Gan).
——1991. On predicative adjectives and Syriac syntax, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 48, 716–26.

Greene, D. 1966. *The Irish Language* (Dublin).
——1967. Old Irish *is . . . dom 'I am'*, in W. Meid (ed.), *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie* (Festschrift Pokorny; Innsbruck), pp. 171–3.
——1976. 'The preposition I^{n} as subject marker, *Celtica*, 11, 61–7.
Hahn, A. 1969. *Naming Constructions in Some Indo-European Languages*, IL: Urbana, American Philological Association.
Harris, M. 1989. Markedness and clause structure, in O. M. Tomic (ed.), *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony* (Berlin), 333–58.
Hartmann, H. 1954. *Das Passiv: Eine Studie zur Geistegeschichte der Kelten, Italiker und Arier* (Heidelberg).
——1960. 'Der Typus *ocus é* im Irischen, in *Indogermanica: Festschrift W. Krause* (Heidelberg), 8–23.
Haspelmath, M. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category, in M. Haspelmath and I. König (eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 13; Berlin and New York), 1–55.
Helbig, A. 1983. *Studien zur deutschen Syntax*, i (Leipzig).
Hengeveld, K. H. 1992. *Non-Verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony* (Functional Grammar Series, 15, Berlin and New York).
Henry, A. 1960. *Études de syntaxe expressive. Ancien français et français moderne* (Brussels).
Herczeg, G. 1972. 'Infinito descrittivo e narrativo in Italiano, in *Saggi languistici e stillistici* (Florence), 568–84.
Hjelmslev, L. 1948. Le Verbe et la phrase nominale, in *Mélanges Mazouzeu* (Paris), 253–81.
Hoffmann, K. 1952/6. Zum prädikativen Adverb, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 1, 42–53.
Horn, J. 1980. 'innamâ und die Zweiten Tempora oder: Wie man Polotsky nicht beikommen kann, *Göttinger Miszellen*, 39, 61–88.
Isaac, G. R. 1996. *The Verb in the Book of Aneirin: Studies in Syntax, Morphology and Etymology* (Tübingen: Niemeyer) (=Beihefte der ZCPh 12).
Jespersen, O. 1966. *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, iii, v, vii (London).
Jones, M. 1972. The items *byth* and *erioed*, *SC*, 7, 93–122.
——and Thomas, A. R. 1977. *The Welsh Language: Studies in its Syntax and Semantics* (Cardiff).
Jones, M. R. 1975/6. The article in Welsh, *SC*, 10/11, 326–44.
Karlsson, K. E. 1981. *Syntax and Affixation: The Evolution of -mente in Latin and Romance* (Tübingen).
King, G. 1993. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London).
Kirsner, R. S. 1979. *The Problem of Presentative Sentences in Modern Dutch* (Amsterdam, New York and Oxford).
Koeppel, R. 1993. *Satbezogene Verweisformen* (Tübingen).
Lambert, P.-Y. 1987. Les Gloses grammaticales brittoniques, *EC*, 24, 285–308.
Lambrecht, K. 1988. Presentational cleft construction in spoken French, in J. Haiman and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 135–79.
Lanérès, N. 1994. La Phrase nominale en grec: nouvelle approche, *BSL*, 89, 229–54.
Lemhagen, G. 1979. *La Concurrence entre l'infinitif et la subordonnée complétive par* que *en français contemporain* (Uppsala).
Lerch, E. 1931. *Hauptprobleme der französischen Sprache I–II* (Braunschweig).
Lewin, A. 1985. The distinction between nominal and verbal sentences according to the Arab grammarians, *Zeit. arab. Ling.*, 15, 118–27.
Lewis, H. 1967. Welsh *oes* 'is', in W. Meid (ed.), *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie* (Festschrift Pokorny; Innsbruck), 215–16.
Lewy, E. 1942. *Der Bau der europäischen Sprachen* (Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, 48 C/2; Dublin).

Lewy, E. and Wagner, H. 1967. Versuch einer kurzen Beschreibumg des Altirischen, in W. Meid (ed.), *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie* (Festschrift Pokorny; Innsbruck), 217–22.
Lombard, 1936. *L'Infinitif de narration dans les langues romanes* (Uppsala and Leipzig).
Loprieno, A. 1988. On the typological order of constituents in Egyptian, *JAAL*, 1, 26–57.
Lüthi, M. 1984. *The Fairy Tale as Art Form and Portrait of Man* (Bloomington, IN).
Mac Cana, P. 1959. Cystrawen y cyplad, *BBCS*, 18/2, 182–3.
——1966. An old nominal relative sentence in Welsh, *Celtica*, 7, 95–115.
——1975/6. Notes on the affixed pronouns in Welsh, *SC*, 10/11, 318–25.
——1990. On the uses of the conjunctive pronouns in Middle Welsh, in M. Ball, J. Fife, E. Poppe and J. Rowlands (eds.), *Celtic Linguistics: Festschrift T. Arwyn Watkins* (Amsterdam), 411–33.
——1991. Further notes on constituent order in Welsh, in J. Fife and E. Poppe (eds.), *Studies in Brythonic Word Order* (Philadelphia, New York and Amsterdam), 45–80.
MacCoisdealbha, P. 1976. *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish* (Ruhruniversität Bochum Dissertation).
——1977. Die Syntax des Satzes im Altirischen, in K. H. Schmidt (ed.), *Indogermanisch und Keltisch, Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesselschaft* (Wiesbaden), 34–43.
——1998. *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish: Selected Studies from a Descriptive, Historical and Comparative Point of View* (new edn., Graham R. Isaac, Tübingen).
Macaulay, D. 1965. A grammatical approach to IS and related patterns, *Scottish and Gaelic Studies*, 10, 216–34.
Mahon, W. J. 1984. Some notes on the demonstrative-initial construction in Jeffers and Mahon (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Harvard Celtic Colloquium* (Cambridge, MA), 141–8.
Meillet, A. 1906. La Phrase nominale en indo-européen, *MSL*, 14, 1–26.
Migron, S. 1994/5. The cleft sentence in Vedic prose: a sketch, *Münchener Studien z. Sprachwissenschaft*, 55, 99–122.
Moreschini Quattordio, A. M. 1965. Sintagmi nominali predicativi in indiano antico e in celtico, *Studi e saggi linguistici* (suppl. L'Italia dialettale), 5, 56–64.
Moreschini Quattordio, A. M. 1966. La frase nominale nelle lingue indo-europee, *Studi e saggi linguistici*, 6, 1–53.
Morgan, T. J. 1948/50. Nodiad ar y frawddeg enwol, *BBCS*, 13, 10–12.
——1952. *Y Treigladau a'u Cystrawen* (Cardiff).
Morris-Jones, J. 1913. *A Welsh Grammar Historical and Comparative* (Oxford).
——1931. *Welsh Syntax: An Unfinished Draft* (Cardiff).
Niccacci, A. 1993. The simple nominal sentence clause (SNC) or verbless clause in biblical Hebrew, *Zeitschrift f. Althebraistik*, 6, 216–27.
Ó Dochartaigh, C. 1977/9. Tá sé ina shuí, etc., *Éigse*, 17, 89–103.
——1984. Irish, in P. Trudgill (ed.), *Language in the British Isles* (Cambridge), 289–305.
Olsson, H. 1986. *La Concurrence entre il, ce et cela (ça) comme sujet d'expressions impersonnelles en français contemporain* (Umeå).
O'Nolan, G. 1919. *Studies in Modern Irish*, i (Dublin).
——1934. *The New Era Grammar of Modern Irish* (Dublin and Cork).
Ó Sé, D. 1987. The copula and preverbal particles in West Kerry Irish, *Celtica*, 18, 98–110.
——1990. Tense and mood in Irish copula sentences, *Ériu*, 41, 61–75.
Ó Searcaigh, S. 1958. Some uses and omissions of the article in Irish . . ., *Journal of Celtic Studies*, 2, 239–48.
Ó Siadhail, M. 1983. The erosion of the copula in the modern Irish dialects, *Celtica*, 151, 177–27.
——1984. Agus (is)/and: a shared syntactic feature, *Celtica*, 16, 125–37.
——1989. *Modern Irish: Grammatical Structure and Dialectal Variation* (Cambridge).
Plank, R. 1985. Prädikativ und Koprädikativ, *Zeitschrift f. germanistische linguistik*, 13, 154–87.

Polotsky, H. J. 1944. *Études de syntaxe copte* (le Caire: Société d'archéologie copte).
——1965. *Egyptian Tenses*, Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 11/5 (Jerusalem).
——1971. *Collected Papers* (Jerusalem).
——1976. Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique, *Israel Oriental Studies*, 5: 1–50.
——1987. *Grundlagen des Koptischen Satzbaus, I* (Decatur: Scholars Press) (= American Studies in Papyrology, 27).
——1990. *Grundlagen des Koptischen Satzbaus, II* (Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press) (= American Studies in Papyrology, 29).
Poppe, E. 1989. Constituent-ordering in *Breudwyt Maxen Wledic*, *BBCS*, 36, 43–63.
——1990. Word-order patterns in *Breudwyt Ronabwy*, in M. Ball, J. Fife *et al.* (eds.), *Celtic Linguistics: Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd. Readings in the Brythonic Languages. Festschrift T. Arwyn Watkins* (Amsterdam), 445–60.
——1991a. *Untersuchungen zur Worstellung im Mittelkymrischen. Temporalbestimmungen und Funktionale Satzperspektive* (Hamburg).
——1991b. Word-order in *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys*, in J. Fife and E. Poppe (eds.), *Studies in the Brythonic Word Order* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 155–204.
——1993. Word-order in Middle Welsh: the case of *Kedymdeithas Amlyn ac Amic*, *BBCS*, 40, 95–117.
——1995. Notes on the Narrative Present in Middle Welsh, in J. E. Eska, R. G. Gruffydd, and N. Jacobs (eds.), *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica: Essays in honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans* (Cardiff), 138–50.
Richards, M. 1934. Yr *yn* traethiadol yn y Pedair Cainc, *BBCS*, 7, 96–112.
——1938. *Cystrawen y Frawddeg Gymraeg* (Cardiff).
——1948. Syntactical notes I: the negation of the verb noun in Welsh, *EC*, 4, 369–78.
——1949. Syntactical notes II: the subject of the verb noun in Welsh, *EC*, 5, 51–81.
Rolant, E. 1986. Y dibeniad yn Gymraeg, *BBCS*, 33, 41–94.
Rosén, H. 1989. Periphrasis and figura etymologica in some sources of Middle Irish, *ZCPh*, 43, 53–83.
——1992. Die Arten der Prolepse im Lateinischen in typologischer Sicht, in Pange and Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch: Akten d. Kolloquiums der idg. Gesellschaft* (Innsbruck), 243–62.
——1994. The definite article in the making, nominal constituent order and related phenomena, in J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 129–50.
Rosenberg, S. N. 1970. *Modern French CE: The Neuter Pronoun in Adjectival Predication* (The Hague and Paris).
Rothenberg, M. 1975. Quelques remarques sur les relations syntaxiques de l'adjectif qualificatif en français contemporain, *Folia Linguistica*, 4, 231–68.
Rouveret, A. 1996. *Bod* in the present tense and in other tenses, in R. D. Borsley and I. Roberts (eds.), *The Syntax of the Celtic Languages: A Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge), 125–70.
Ruiz, Ricardo Navas 1963. *SER y ESTAR: Estudio sobre el sistema atributivo del español* (Acta Salamanticensia, 7/3; Salamanca).
Russell, P. 1987. Middle Welsh *nachaf* 'behold', *BBCS*, 34, 128–31.
Sandmann, M. 1968. 'Possessifs' et 'predicatifs', *RLingRom*, 32, 305–23.
Satzinger, H. 1976. *Neuägyptische Studien, die Partikel IR, das Tempussystem* (Vienna).
——1991. May themes follow on rhemes, and why might they do so?, *Lingua Aegyptia*, 1, 293–300.
Schenkel, W. 1971. Die Valenz im adnominalen Raum, in G. Helbig (ed.), *Beiträge zur Valenztheorie* (Janua Linguarum, s. minor 15; The Hague and Paris), 67–83.
Schiefer, E. 1974. Zur Abgrenzung von Nominalsatz und Ellipse, *KZ*, 88, 199–217.
Schmidt, K. H. 1992. Celtic movements in the first millennium BC, *Indo-European Studies*, 20, 145–78.

Schou, L. 1974. Construcciones SER + adverbio, *Studia Neophilologica*, 46, 460–90.
Serianni, L. 1988. *Grammatica Italiana: Italiano comune e lingua letteraria* (Turin).
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1978. Quelques thématisations marginales du verbe en néo-égyptien, *Orientalia Lovanensia Periodica*, 9, 51–67.
——1984a. Notes on some coptic nominal sentence patterns, in *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens* (Westendorf Festschrift, 1; Göttingen), 175–89.
——1984b. The existential statement in the Sahidic New Testament, *Göttinger Miszellen* 77, 67–77.
——1986a. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic* (Rome).
——1986b. *Irf* in the Coffin Texts: a functional tableau, *JAOS*, 106, 641–58.
——1987. Grammatical discovery procedure and the Egyptian-Coptic nominal sentence, *Orientalia*, 56, 147–75.
——1989. *The Proper Name: Structural Prolegomena to its Syntax - a Case Study in Coptic* (Vienna).
——1995. Structural sketches of Middle Welsh Syntax, *SC*, 29, 127–223.
——1998. *Structural Studies of Modern Literary Welsh Syntax: Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts* (Münster).
Sommerfelt, A. 1965. Sentence patterns in the dialect of Torr, *Lochlann*, 3, 255–77.
Sornicola, R. 1985. Tipologia linguistica e strategia di discorse: alcuni problemi di sintassi IE comparata, *Lingua e stile* 20/1, 3–38.
——1988/9. Il relativo in irlandese antico: un riconsiderazione, I–II, *IF* 93, 124–67; 94, 234–71.
Stassen, L. 1994. Typology versus mythology: the case of the zero-copula, *NJL*, 17, 105–26.
Steinthal, H. and Misteli, F. 1893. *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues* (Berlin).
Stempel, W.-D. 1981. 'L'Amour, elle appelle, ça', 'L'amour tu ne connais pas', in C. Rohrer (ed.), *Logos Semanticos IV, Grammar* (Coseriu Festschrift, Berlin, New York and Madrid), 351–67.
Stern, L. C. 1880. *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig).
Strachan, J. 1909. *Introduction to Early Welsh* (Manchester).
Tarvainen, H. 1981. *Einführung in die Dependenzgrammatik* (Tübingen).
Thomas, P. Wynn, 1996. *Gramadeg y Gymraeg* (Caerdydd).
Thorne, D. A. 1993. *A Comprehensive Welsh Grammar* (Oxford).
Thun, H. 1975. Die Präsentation durch *que* im volkstümlichen Französisch, in K. Braunmüller and W. Kürschner (eds.), *Grammatik: Akten des 10 linguistischen Kolloquiums,* II (Tübingen), 265–76.
Tischhäuser, H. 1971. Die Prädikativen Ergänzungen des Kymrischen, in *Donum Indogermanicum: Festschrift A. Scherer* (Heidelberg), 198–223.
Tober, A. 1902. *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik,* 2nd edn., II Reihe (Leipzig).
Wagner, H. 1959. *Das Verbum in den Sprachen der britischen Inselm* (Tübingen).
——1977. Wortstellung im Keltischen und Indogermanischen, in K. H. Schmidt (ed.), *Indogermanisch und Keltisch, Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden), 204–35.
Wagner, R. L. 1980. *Essais de linguistique française* (Paris).
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1956. Y frawddeg enwol amhur, *BBCS*, 17, 21–30.
——1958. Yr arddodiad HG (h)i, CC y (yn), yn, *BBCS*, 17, 137–58.
——1960. CC y/yn berfenwol, *BBCS*, 18, 362.
——1962. Ffurfiant a chystrawen y geirynnau adferfol/traethiadol mewn Cymraeg, Cernyweg a Llydaweg, *BBCS*, 19, 291–315.
——1977/8. Trefn yn y frawddeg Gymraeg, *SC*, 12/13, 367–95.
——1991. The function of the cleft and non-cleft constituent orders in modern Welsh, in J. Fife and E. Poppe (eds.), *Studies in Brythonic Word Order* (Philadelphia, New York and Amsterdam), 329–51.
——1997. The *sef* [. . .] realization of the Welsh identificatory copular sentence, in A. Ahlqvist and V. Capková (eds.), *Dán do Oide: Essays in Memory of Conn R. Ó Cleirigh* (Dublin), 579–91.
——and Mac Cana, P. 1958. Cystrawennau'r cyplad mewn Hen Gymraeg, *BBCS*, 18, 1–25.

Watkins, C. 1970. Language of gods and language of men, in J. Puhvel (ed.), *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans: Studies in Indo-European Comparative Mythology* (Berkeley, CA), 1–17.

Weil, H. 1879. *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes*, 3rd edn. (Paris).

Weinrich, H. 1966. La place de l'adjectif en français, *Vox Romanica*, 25, 82–9.

Weinrich, H. 1977. *Tempus: besprochene und erzählte Welt*, 3rd edn. (Stuttgart).

Williams, S. J. 1980. *A Welsh Grammar* (Cardiff).

Wright, W. 1967. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd edn., revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje (Cambridge).

Zeuss, C. and Ebel, H. 1871. *Grammatica Celtica*, 2nd edn. (Berlin and Paris), ii.

Zimmer, S. 1990. The Welsh Bahuvrîhis, in M. Ball, J. Fife, E. Poppe and E. Rowland (eds.), *Celtic Linguistics: Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd. Readings in the Brythonic Languages. Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 375–402.