

# Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie

Herausgegeben von Karl Horst Schmidt,  
Rolf Ködderitzsch und Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel  
unter Mitwirkung von Herbert Pilch

Band 53

---

*Sonderdruck*

ISBN 3-484-60452-2

---

Niemeyer



# INHALT

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| H. HARTMANN †, Was ist 'Wahrheit' (2)?: ein Vergleich französischer, keltischer, indischer, iranischer und griechischer Vorstellungen von der Wirklichkeit der Wahrheit; eine kulturgeschichtliche und sprachwissenschaftliche Analyse. Teil II | 1   |
| W. MEID, Keltische Religion im Zeugnis der Sprache  | 20  |
| P. DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, Die sprachliche Analyse keltischer Theonyme ("Fontes Epigraphici Religionis Celticae Antiquae" = F.E.R.C.A.N.)  | 41  |
| V. KALYGIN, Some archaic elements of Celtic cosmology   | 70  |
| J. ZEIDLER, On the etymology of <i>Grannus</i>  | 77  |
| T. MIKHAILOVA; N. NIKOLAEVA, The denotations of death in Goidelic: to the question of Celtic eschatological conceptions   | 93  |
| T. MARKEY; B. MEES, Prestino, patrimony and the Plinys  | 116 |
| K. SHIELDS, JR. On the origin of Celtic first and second person plural personal pronouns in *-s   | 168 |
| G. R. ISAAC, Prospects in Old Irish syntax  | 181 |
| K. MURRAY, A reading from <i>Scéla Mósauluim</i>  | 198 |
| ST. ZIMMER, <i>A uo penn bit pont</i> : aspects of leadership in Celtic and Indo-European   | 202 |
| A. SHISHA-HALEVY, Juncture features in Literary Modern Welsh: cohesion and delimitation – <i>Problematik</i> , typology of exponents and features   | 230 |
| Nachruf auf Hans Hartmann (1909–2000)   | 259 |

## BESPRECHUNGEN UND ANZEIGEN

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Ó LÚING, S.: <i>Celtic Studies in Europe, and other essays</i> (ST. ZIMMER)   | 267 |
| <i>Interpretation und Re-interpretation: aus Anlass des 100. Geburtstages von Leo Weisgerber (1899–1985) mit einem historiographischen Anhang und dem Schriftenverzeichnis Weisgerbers: XII. internationales Kolloquium des Studienkreises 'Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft'. Hrsg. von K. DUTZ (N. THOMAS)</i> | 269 |
| <i>Ptolemy: towards a linguistic atlas of the earliest Celtic place-names of Europe: Papers from a workshop [...] in [...] Aberystwyth, 11–12 April 1999. Ed. by D. N. PARSONS; P. SIMS-WILLIAMS (K. H. SCHMIDT)</i>  | 274 |
| BIRKHAN, H.: <i>Kelten: Bilder ihrer Kultur / Celts: Images of their culture</i> (H. L. C. TRISTRAM)  | 276 |
| <i>Religión, lengua y cultura prerromanas de Hispania. Ed. por F. VILLAR; M.ª P. FERNÁNDEZ ÁLVAREZ (K. H. SCHMIDT)</i>  | 278 |
| <i>MLH: Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum. Hrsg. von J. UNTERMANN Bd. V.1: Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften, von D. S. WODTKO (K. H. SCHMIDT)</i>   | 281 |
| DELAMARRE, X.: <i>Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental</i> (K. H. SCHMIDT)   | 283 |
| <i>Kelten in Nederland. Onder redactie van R. HOFMAN; B. SMELIK; L. TOORIANS (ST. ZIMMER)</i>   | 286 |
| TOORIANS, L.: <i>Keltisch en Germaans in de Nederlanden: taal in Nederland en België gedurende de Late IJzertijd en de Romeinse periode</i> (ST. ZIMMER)  | 291 |
| DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, P.: <i>Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen: Stammbildung und Derivation</i> (R. SCHMITT)   | 295 |

- WATKINS, C. 1962. *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb, I. The sigmatic aorist*. Dublin: DIAS.
- 1970. Studies in Indo-European legal language, institutions, and mythology. In: *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, ed. G. CARDONA et al., Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 321–354 (repr. in *Selected Writings* 1994, II 422–455).
- WILLIAMS, I., gol. 1930. *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- ZIMMER, St. 2001. The making of myth: Old Irish *Airgatlám*, Welsh *Llaw ereint*, Caledonian *Ἀργεντοκόρυς*. In: *Ogma, Essays in Celtic Studies in honour of Proinseas Ní Chatháin*, ed. M. RICHTER & J.-M. PICARD, Dublin: Four Courts Press, 295–297.
- (forthcoming). On the prehistory of OIr *lámshada*, W *llawir*. In: *Féilscribhinn Ghearóid Mhic Eoin*, ed. D. Ó HAODHA. Dublin: Four Courts Press.

# **Juncture Features in Literary Modern Welsh: Cohesion and Delimitation – *Problematik*, Typology of Exponents and Features<sup>1</sup>**

- 0.1. Basic terms and concepts
- 0.2. A closer look at Unit, Scope and Domain
  - 1.1. Illustration: some instances of delimiters and links as unit-demarcating signals. Immediately resolvable subtextual units
  - 1.2. Illustration of *textemic* junctural issues
- 2. Cohesion or juncture contours
- 3. Juncture paradigms: binary and multiple-term
- 4. Lenition juncture signalling
- 5. Zero in juncture signalling
- 6. Pronominal juncture, referential juncture, phoricity, vectors of reference
- 7. Junctural bracketing. Cohesive Immediate Constituents
- 8. Textual Integration Links (inclusion, discourse articulation). Conversion

## *0.1. Basic terms and concepts*

In the following pages, I wish to present some preliminary reflections and some relevant documentation, upon attempting to understand the grammatical phenomenology of cohesion or linkage. This, I believe, is of the most fascinating, perhaps *the* most fascinating topic of syntax, for here is something close to the very quintessence of textuality – hence, of grammaticality itself, bearing in mind Louis Hjelmslev's opening words in his *Prolegomena*: "The object of interest for linguistic science are texts"

---

<sup>1</sup> An expanded version of a paper presented on July 30, 1999, to the Eleventh Congress of Celtic Studies, University College, Cork. I have discussed juncture in several dialects of Coptic in SHISHA-HALEVY 1983; 1986, Chapter Six; SHISHA-HALEVY (forthcoming), Chapter Two.

(not "languages" or "a language" – which is only a seeming paradox). My corpus for the following observations is triple: some of Kate Roberts's short stories, and two novels (I am engaged in work on a comprehensive syntax of the corpus of K. R.'s fiction, on the basis of her editions and MSS, for which a pilot work, incorporating three monographic studies, appeared in 1998. The present paper may be seen as a cluster of preliminary work-notes to a chapter on juncture and textuality within this projected work).<sup>2</sup> A second source is John Emyr's collection of short stories, *Mynydd Gwaith a storïau eraill* (Denbych, 1984). A third source are some numbers of the defunct weekly magazine *Y Faner*.

Juncture phenomenology, and indeed textual fibre – texture – consists of the intricate dynamic interplay of LINKS (formal cohesion and close association signals) and the exponents of their reduction or negation, DELIMITERS. Both classes signal in their respective ways boundaries or "seams", and, across them, some grading of formal "togetherness". In this paper, I propose to view COHESION in its formal aspect of linkage as the basic positive property, the functional weakening or reduction or negation of which to a minimal, intermediate or maximal degree would indicate a grade of DELIMITATION.

Cohesion is broadly defined as the role, if any, and the extent to which an element of a text marks the fact that it has a formal association with a preceding and/or subsequent cotext or with an element therein. This may be presented as a formal presupposition or determination relationship between the cohesion exponent and its cotextual referate element, the former presupposing the latter. The possibilities here are: (1) positive cohesion signals (CSs) signalling the presence of relative cohesion in some degree; (2) negative cohesion signals, signalling the absence or the reduction or negation of cohesion; (3) formal indifference to cohesion. This last case is uncommon in Welsh; (1) and (2) are often the distinctive *signifiant* and *signifié* members in

<sup>2</sup> The abbreviations used here for Kate Roberts's works: DL = *Deian a Loli* (Caerdydd 1992 [1925]), G = *Gobaith* (Dinbych, 1982), HD = *Haul a Drycin* (Dinbych, 1981), HF = *Hyn o Fyd* (Dinbych 1964), SG = *Stryd y Glep* (Dinbych 1949), TB = *Tegwch y Bore* (Llandybïe, 1967), TH = *Tywyll Heno* (Dinbych, 1962), WD = *Yr Wylan Deg* (Dinbych, 1976).

their paradigms. (Note that the role of cohesion is not so much to signal "belonging together", absolute, prefabricated, or superimposed on the text – this would be tautological or trivial, seeing that, after all, a given textual utterance or its constituent parts have their "co-belonging" by definition, by the very co-presence in the text, and are judged in the decoding process to co-belong – but to determine and signal co-belonging and its negation at any given textual time and place. This is dynamic and constitutes a prime poetic device, as it were "ringing the changes" in the text. In fact, it is my contention that many fundamental distinctive notions of grammar, such as complex *vs.* simple, analytic *vs.* synthetic, even grammatical *vs.* lexical are but awkward and inadequate statements of junctural gradience, essentially pre-analytic and removed from textuality.

In a comprehensive study of juncture features, we scan the text for boundaries or seams, while isolating and examining the juncturally operative segments around them (links and delimiters), and then examine the obtaining paradigms or commutation classes for the structure of juncturally resolvable units, and (where quantification is at all possible) the gradience of linkage/delimitation. We have three procedurally related and consequent analytical goals:

(a) **seams or boundaries** are defined by delimiters – text- or unit-initial, medial (between segments, between elements and units) and final boundaries. These are in fact high-delimitation slots – typically, where several delimiters converge – flanked on either side by low-delimitation (high-linkage) areas. We attempt to formulate statements on boundaries and formal segment/unit linkage or delimitation features across them, which is different from the linkage flanking these boundaries, in the paradigmatic complexity level (where feasible, also scalar gradience), from text-level downwards.

(b) **Scopes, Juncture Domain Frames (JDFs) and junctural units:** in formulating statements concerning the validity of the formal linkage or delimitation features, it is crucial to determine the scopes or precise formal extents within which they obtain; for instance, "word" (not given *a priori* or universally), "lexeme", nexal pattern or clause, narrative block and sub-blocks, allocation-response complex and constituents. As a matter of

fact, it is the junctural properties of these extents that serve to define them as subtextual units.

(c) Studying the details of individual structurally defined operators of cohesion (links and delimiters).

Let me at this point define some terms I shall be using in the course of this exposition:

- **linkage:** marking of high-grade cohesion;
- **cohesion:** degree of formal mutual association of segments in a text;
- **link:** index, signal or exponent of linkage or cohesion;
- **delimitation:** negation or reduction of linkage;
- **delimiter:** index, signal or exponent of delimitation;
- **scope:** formal extent of validity for links and delimiters (examples: nucleus + verbal expansion; Nominal Sentence and other clause [nexus] patterns, such as verbal nexus ['finite verb']; the lexeme);
- **Juncture Domain Frame:** element(s) enframing a scope; over-all syntagmatic environment (examples: *ni/lenition* (to) *ddim*; topic (to) resumption);
- **unit:** constituent elements in a complex containing a boundary; the subtextual segments and elements held in cohesion
- **juncture order:** hierarchical rank or level, in the descending analysis (for instance, syntactic, syntagmatic, morphematic, lexematic, phonematic features of juncture).

Upon attempting to formulate a typology or taxonomy of cohesion signals, we must bear in mind the fundamental grammatical significance of textual typological variance, and, first of all, the **textemic** substructures and subsystems. In the basic and primary division, NARRATIVE is found to be drastically different from DIALOGIC juncture. This will be a leading motive in the present exposition. Then, there arise preliminary questions which must be properly considered, such as: is a uniform theory of CSs viable at all? Are CSs commensurate, or even comparable? Are they hierarchically structurable? To what extent is quantification, or measurement, at all feasible here?

## 0.2. *A Closer Look at Unit, Scope and Domain*

To what degree is the conventional model of "prefabricated units" or "building-blocks" ("word", "clause", "sentence" – even beyond the basic theoretical question of their universal applicability) at all valid for a given corpus? A narrative, for instance, is arguably not constituted by a series of clauses, but is a complex texture built around a concatenation of the formal expression of linguistic events. The most difficult, yet I believe the most important factor to realize here is that the unities in a text are neither absolute nor rigid. This is not really surprising, for the decoding analysis (by the reader or listener), which takes place continually at text-level, is linear and cumulative; all structuration is dynamic and ever-changing as further signals are transmitted and received, resolved, identified and valued. Moreover, any element simultaneously "belongs" – stands in association with – several other co-elements, and is indeed involved in several kinds of relationship ('functions', in the glossematic terminological sense) – for a typical instance, internally inside a group and externally to elements outside it, or even outside the text, to other texts and the pragmatic context. The textual and subtextual structure is multidimensional. Units do not exist absolutely and pre-analytically, which is why "sentences" and "clauses" as well as "words", not to mention the "levels" such as morphology and syntax are never empirically valid grammatical (as distinct from 'logical', i.e. extralinguistic, superimposed and always suspect) notions. Valid are instead "linked units of commutation in dialogue" – such as allocutions and responses, or "concatenation units in narrative" such as narrative evolution events, and so on, with their expansions and combinations. Inter-element associatedness is continually signalled and reported in real textual time as a textual base for retrospection and anaphora is accumulated – whereas for the prospective cotext, yet to come, expectations are manipulated, modified, satisfied or disappointed, and the already realized text reappraised accordingly. The text itself is also delimited, articulated and "chunked" dynamically. All this is the first realization in the cohesive view of the textual 'world'.



Returning now to the two primary framework concepts and their associations, concepts not easy to demarcate, let me give some further illustrations:

*Juncture Domain Frame*: focus is a set of marking phenomena resolvable only in (and by) a given domain. Note the crucial difference between focus in dialogue – typically contrastive – and in narrative, where prominence and highlighting have an entirely different sense, and are part of the poetic “staging” choices of the encoder (this is evident primarily in the distribution and functional ranges of *gwneud* constructions: *gwneud* operates within the verb-nexus complex, consisting of theme, rheme, nexus, actants and circumstants (SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 28 ff.). Another example: the JDF may be fairly extensive: for instance, from the interrogative converter *a* to the very last segment of the response; or from the first occurrence of a nominal to its last anaphoric recall.

*Scope* (of validity, where cohesion signals are in effect and may be delimitative as well as linking) is more general: lexemic (e.g. phonological and morphonological constraints or “rules” that are valid only within lexeme bounds, such as initial and final cluster restriction, syllabic structure, even incidence of phonemes and their realization as phones), lexico-morphemic (e.g. the validity extent for the *car* : *ceir*, *dangos* : *dengys* Umlaut morphological number patterns), or phrasal (e.g. the definite article + noun lexeme, or preposition + governed noun syntagm – of which unit the article marks the initial boundary; or various types of concord; and, most strikingly, the valency matrix, where the lexeme in or outside nexus is always an initial boundary signal, and the last actant slot a final delimiter; see below).

‘Lexemehood’ and ‘grammemehood’ or lexicality and grammaticality have obvious junctural implications, which correlate with the relative size of the respective paradigms; grammemes typically join in closer, lexemes in looser juncture. *Analysability* too has junctural associations.

**Clausal or nexal linkage scope** (constructional features of the Nom. sentence or the finite and periphrastic verbal nexus patterns). Ultraclausal and hypernexal scopes include for instance the complicated and manifold linkage signals characterizing and interconnecting allocution and response; note especially the pro-forms: *do/naddo*, *na-*, *ie/nage*, *gwneud* as response pro-

form; the no less complex gamut of narrative concatenation (e. g. theme continuity; V+ V and V + INF.); the links between protasis and apodosis; focus phenomena; and so on.

The formal grammemic feature misleadingly and infelicitously called "Word Order" may be a cohesive exponent within a given JDF, but is, more often than not, a mere epiphenomenon or constituent part of a complex pattern: cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2000: 78 f. Word-Order (to be kept distinct from "placement"! ) is certainly not an absolute "floating" quality in a given language, let alone a universally applicable phenomenon. With reference to TALLERMAN 1998a: 37 ff.: WO is not necessarily cohesive – it's a pattern-distinctive formal constituent, but can obtain between patterns (that is, in a combinatory higher-order pattern); for instance, inside the Cleft Sentence (31 ff.) or what I call *i-cum-infinitivo* (34 ff.). All this is fairly straightforward (though never simple); but TALLERMAN 1998b: 599 takes VSO order for Celtic as typologically given; and yet (I quote) "However, none of the Celtic languages exhibit VSO order in all clause types ... Some ... rarely exhibit that order in main clauses, and in each of the languages there are numerous optional and obligatory word order variations" – concluding "Celtic languages are atypical of VSO languages, and ... there is no single VSO type (!)". One cannot but ask, in Romanesco Italian, – "Chi me lo fa ffa'?" Why do we need this? What obliges us to insist on this *a priori* judgement? Why not break free from such distorting consensus and model?

In the main, less theoretical part of my paper, I propose to consider briefly and illustrate (1) some striking units, scopes and domain frames of cohesion, (2) cohesion contours, (3) the juncture slots and boundaries themselves, with the oppositions resolvable in them – binary (whether privative – *zero vs. non-zero*; lenition *vs. non-lenition* – or equipollent) or multiple; (4) some specific cohesion and delimitation signals, simple or complex (as in narrative chains, or response substructures in dialogue sets).

### 1.1. *Illustration: some instances of delimiters and links as unit-demarcating signals; immediately resolvable subtextual units*

(1) TB 111...*cyn mynd i'w gwely* "before going to her bed" / *..gyda'i challineb...* "with her prudence" (*w*, *i* linking/delimiting allomorphs of the possessive article *ei*).

(2) TB 111...*dyna'r dyn ydw i yn i licio*... "Here's the man I like" / *...yr athrawes arall...* "the other teacher" (*r*, *yr* linking/delimiting allomorphs of the definite article *y(r)*).

(3) TB 71...*mi fydda i'n meddwl* "I would have thought" / *...yng nghymeriad yr athrawes arall...* "in the other teacher's character" / TB 127 *Ydi, mae o'n well* "He is better indeed" (*n*, *yng+ng*, *n+lenition* linking/delimiting allomorphs of *yn*<sub>1</sub>, *yn*<sub>2</sub>, *yn*<sub>3</sub>).

(4) HF 38 *Galwai rhai ef* "some called him" / *pan benodwyd ef yn bennaeth* "when he was appointed chief" – unit closing (*yn*- marking the valency matrix boundary).

Contrast the case of trivalent homonym in

(5) *Galwai rhai ef yn gachgi*. "Some used to call him coward", with *yn*- a final boundary mark for the matrix.

(6) *Chwaraeir rhan Ifans y Saer gan Wynfford Elis Owen* "Evans the Carpenter's part was played by W.E.O." (final *gan*-), contrasted with

(7) ...*yn chwarae yng gêm derfynol Cwpan Rygby'r Byd* "playing in the final game of the Rugby World Cup" (*yn*<sup>nas</sup> not necessarily a final boundary signal).

(8) HF 38 *Yr oedd yn dda ganddi weld* "It was good for her to see" (lenition final boundary mark)

(9) HF 36 *Gorffwysant...tynnwyd...rowd...a chropiasant...* "They rested...One pulled... One gave...and they crawled..." (personal and impersonal suffixes closing concatenated narrative-event units). *Yna*- is of course a common initial boundary signal for subnarrative blocks (*fe*-, *dyna* are initial boundary signals for different-rank kinds of narrative blocking: see below).

(10) HF 15 *Mwtrodd Cwlin ef cyn ei fwyta...Rhuthrodd Neddw iddo, a bwytaodd y lleill ef yn foneddigaidd. ## Yna daethant yn nês at ei gilydd...* "Colin crumbled it before eating it...Neddw rushed at it, and the others ate it in a well-bred way. Then they drew close to each other..."

The infinitive is a final boundary signal in cases of narrative hyper-event complexes (SHISHA-HELEVY 1997), like:

(11) MG 41 *Sgrechiodd Pat a chodi ei llaw at wyneb ei mam a chrafu blaen ei hewinedd i'w boch* "Pat screamed and raised her hand to her mother's face and scratched the tips of her nails into her cheek".

(12) G 12 *Dyn wedi cael lwc heb ei cheisio ydyw* "He's a man who got lucky without trying" (*ydyw* a final boundary signal for the nexal pattern).

(13) MG 118 *Rhamantydd ydw i welwch chi* "I'm a romantic, you see" (the lenited *welwch chi* marking the final boundary of clausal information unit. Compare here the frequent discourse signal *wyddoch chi...* "you know"; also cases of parenthetical performatives like *gredaf*, *debygaf*, "I believe", "I suppose", doubly marked, by lenition (see below) as well as by the discarding tense and person.

(14) TB 296 *Ddaw hi ddim yma nŵan iti* "She won't come here now, you know" (*iti* marking final boundary. Cf. SHISHA-HELEVY 1998: 190f.)

(15) TB 264 ...*a allai roi'r cyfan yr oedd ar Richard ei eisiau ganddi iddo* "whether she could give all Richard needed from her, to him" (*iddo* closing the actantial complex).

## 1.2. Illustration of textemic junctural issues:

(a) The dialogue is constituted in its fullest form by a complex of allocutive and responsive/reactive constituents (two distinct, compatible and mutually coherent substructures and grammatical systems, the latter presupposing the former); the cohesive sequenced combination of these defines a full "alternating discourse". Note that the non-phoric, quintessentially "naming" interlocutive (1st/2nd-person) personal reference, pivotal to the dialogue, is cohesive in a way very different – in a deictic-

pragmatic phoricity – from the typically delocutive, 3rd-person cohesion of narrative grammar, which is quintessentially textual: there are of course numerous other differences between the interlocutive and delocutive perspectives, not least the important functional differences in the discourse signalling converters *mi- vs. fe-* (SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: § 3.2.1). In the examples below of dialogic juncture and cohesion, the response-slot grammar is the more striking: note the apocritic-presentative Cleft Sentence-like response (discussed in SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 28 f.); also especially the frequent focalization, esp. nexus focussing (*ibid.* 47 ff.); and, of course the typical pro-forms (*ibid.* 58 ff.), tensed in Welsh.

(16) MG 40 “*Eich barn chi ydi hynna yntê. Gadwch lonydd imi...*” – “*Llonydd! Mi gei di lonydd, yr ast fach flêr.*” “Well, this is your opinion. Leave me in peace” – “Peace! You’ll get some peace, you slovenly little bitch!” (affective lexical cohesion).

(17) MG 117 “*Damwain ddrwg?*” – “*Pedair ambiwlans wnes i gyfri*” “Bad accident?” – “I counted (no less than) four ambulances”.

(18) MG 43 “*Iawn imi ista yma?*” – “*Ydi. / “Be sy? Wedi cael digon?*” – “*Do.*” “All right for me to sit here?” – “Yes” (‘It is’) / “What’s the matter? Had enough?” – “Yes” (‘I did’).

(19) TH 54 “*...ella y teimli di’n well at yr wnos nesa*” – “*Na wna*” “Maybe you’ll feel better towards next week” “No I won’t”.

(20) “*Yr wyf i yn dy garu di*” (“But) I do love you” (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: 167 f.)

(21) “*...Ydi, mae ef yn gall*” “He is wise”.

(22) MG 36 “*Mae hi’n oes mul ers imi dy weld di ddwetha*” – “*Ydi.*” / “*Ti’n edrach yn dda.*” – “*Ydw i, dwad?*” “*Argo wyt?*” – “*teimlo ‘mod i wedi rhoi pwysa.*” “It’s donkey’s years since I last saw you” – “It is”. – “You look well” – “Say, do I really?” – “Upon my word you do” – “I feel I’ve put on weight”.

(23) HF 35 f. “*Be’ sy Mari?*” – “*Meddwl am yr Athro Jones-Jones yr oeddwn i*” “What’s the matter, Mary?” – “I’ve been thinking of Professor Jones-Jones.” (The Cleft Sentence here is delimitative and simultaneously cohesive as response. Contrast the non-responsive correspondent in ex. (3)).

(24) MG 93 “*Bore da, Idwal. Be ga’ i ‘neud i dy helpu di?*” – “*...Hel stori ydw i ar ewthanasia*” “Good morning, Idwal. What can I do for you?” – “I’m looking for a story on euthanasia”.

The performative, including the so-called synchronous present, represents a special kind of locutive allocation, which in fact formally neutralizes the allocation/response opposition (SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: 187 ff.) Observe that, like the responsive, the performative proper is marked primarily by a *zero converter* (some languages, such as Ancient Egyptian, have a special “magical” allocutive Second-Person performative “You shall...” effecting an action by or state of the interlocutor).

(25) “O’r gorau, edrychaf ymlaen at hynny.” “All right, I look forward to this”.

Also *diolchaf* “I thank (you)”, *ofnaf* “I fear”, *gofynnaf* “I ask (you)”, *fetia(f)* “I bet”, *ysgrifennaf* “I (herewith) write”, *cofiaf* “I remember”, revealing a continuum between the actual “performing-by-utterance” and merely utterance-synchronous action.

(b) **Narrative:** this texteme is in many senses of a more complicated texture than the dialogue (since it is self-contained, with “built-in pragmatics”, with information structuring, including focus, essentially distinctive) and generally more sophisticated in cohesive features. I have discussed some points of Welsh narrative grammar also with reference to juncture in the first of my studies of Kate Roberts syntax (1997). It is out of the question for me to discuss here in detail narrative grammar and the prime role juncture plays in narrative staging; I shall only point out the role that juncture contours have for narrative rate or pacing and for information chunking or blocking; the so to speak “cinematic” potential for sequential complexity of verbal narrative<sup>3</sup> – shots, cut-aways, flash-backs, close-ups, zoom-ins and zoom-outs, scenes, episodes – owes much to linkage and delimitation. Elsewhere I have suggested a macrostructural distinction of Comment Mode and Evolution Mode in narrative, to replace the current Fore- and Background which are too schematic and broad to the degree of vagueness; Mode-switching (corresponding to Harald Weinrich’s *Tempusübergang*) – a major text-grammatical and poetic device – is perhaps the most important delimitative factor in narrative texture, beside the basic linkage/delimitation one between the entries in the plot-carrying narrative chain. A striking linkage factor in Welsh is the opposition between PRETERITE + *a-* + INFINITIVE (“hyper-eventing” in information blocking/chunking: cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1997) and PRETERITE + *a-* + PRETERITE. Other noteworthy boundaries and delimitations are defined by *fe-* vs. *zero* in narrative and the interface “seam” of dialogue in narrative.

Some passages illustrating the rich variety of narrative cohesion/delimitation features and paradigms (the links/delimiters in *italics*):

(a) “Erliebte Rede” “style indirect libre” – mapping of the narrative system over dialogue)

<sup>3</sup> It is in a way sobering to reflect on the increasing sophistication of cinematic syntax as a means of handling narrative sophistication in verbal narrative, when we now have to resort to cinematic meta-language to convey the niceties of narrative grammar.

(26) MG 120 *Cawsant ddigon o arian i brynu ty a magu plant. O oedden, roedden nhw'n hapus iawn...* "They got enough money to buy a house and raise children. O they were quite happy indeed..."

(27) MG 39 *Gwenodd arni'i hun yn y drych. Doedd gwen, rywsut, ddim yn gwe-ddu â'r steil newydd. Felly gugodd.* "She smiled at herself in the mirror. Somehow, a smile was not in keeping with the new style. So she frowned."

(b) INFINITIVE *a wnaeth* (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 38 ff., 45 ff., 49 ff.); *mi- /fe-* in narrative (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: §3.2.1); narrative focussing and narrative texture (the fact that these constructions are not renderable in English by means of a grammatical feature constitutes a striking typological trait);

(28) MG 110 *...yn fatgoffa o John Wayne pan ymladdodd ei frwydr fawr olaf yn erbyn y "Big C". Colli'r frwydr wnaeth Wayne, yn y diwedd* "reminding me of John Wayne when he fought his battle against the 'Big C'. Wayne lost the battle, at the end".

(29) MG 127 (knocking on the door on an unexpected visit; Anya opens and her face is shown in the half-open door) *Anadlu ei syndod wnaeth Anya cyn iddi yngan gair* "Anya breathed her surprise before she intoned a single word".

(30) MG 128 ("Are you glad to be back?" shouted Alwen...) *Chwerthin wnaeth hi wrth adrodd cefndir ei thait* "She laughed upon relating the background of her trip".

(31) MG 91 ff. *Dyn a chanddo gefndir da oedd Paul Salisbury.... Fe gefais y ffrainc o siarad ag ef un bore yn niwedd yr haf rai blynyddoedd yn ôl... Embrioleg oedd ei pwn. Ond yn ei oriau hamdden fe ymddiddorai yn stem yr ymenydd â'r berthynas anorffod rhwng hwnnw a marwolaeth... Euthanasia: gair cyfarwydd iawn bellach... Fel arbenigwr ar angau enillodd Paul Salisbury enw o fod yn flaengar ei ddaliadau... Mynd i'w weld o wnes i ar gais fy ngolygydd...* "Paul Salisbury was a man with a good background... I got the privilege of talking to him one morning at the end of the summer some years ago... Embryology was his field... But in his hours of leisure he interested himself in the base of the brain and the inevitable association between it and death... Euthanasia: a rather familiar word by now... As an expert on death, Paul Salisbury won a name for being of progressive convictions... I went to see him at my editor's request..."

(c) Paragraph-initial, evolution-resuming/impelling delimiters<sup>4</sup>

(32) DL 91 [Deian is eager to try for a scholarship, but is torn between studies and play]. *Modd bynnag, adeg yr ysgoloriaeth a ddaeth...* "Anyway, scholarship time came..."

(33) DL 92 *Bore drannoeth a ddaeth...* "Tomorrow morning came,..."

(d) *Dyna/dyma* delimitation in narrative: dynamic or dramatic tableau, slow motion or "zoom-in" amplified evolution:

(34) MG 122 *Rŵan dyma nhw'n dechrau crynhoi a sefyll yr ochr arall i'r afon... Nid sefyll yn llonydd ychwaith, ond rhedeg a neidio a llafarganu a wnaent* "Now they start to gather on the other side of the river. Not standing still, but running about and jumping and singing loudly".

(35) MG 126 *Felly, dyma wagio'n gwydrau am y tro olaf ac edrych ar ein gilydd.* "Thus, we empty our glasses for the last time and look at each other".

(e) The narrative incise *meddai* (etc.) delimits information units, with prosodic (and rhythmic?) constraints:

<sup>4</sup> Cf. (as regards function) perhaps the much discussed, so-called "Arriva le général" 'inversion' construction in French and comparable narrative inversion in Italian.

(36) MG 34 *Gwisgai... fenyg lledr truchus, rhai tebyg meddyliodd Pat, i'r menyg yr arferai Erich eu gwisgo* "He was wearing...thick leather gloves, ones similar, thought Pat, to the gloves Erich used to wear". Note the non-parenthetic nature of *meddyliodd*, as evident in the absence of lenition (as against *debygai* in ex. 97; see below).

(37) TB 316 *clywsai Bobi yn dweud meddai ef ei fod wedi ei phrynu* "He had heard Bobi say - he said - that he had bought it...":

(f) Theme continuity vs. switching (binary and privative. Note the concomitant effect of preterite to imperfect (and back) tense-switching and *a*/-zero alternation):

(38) TB 76 f. *Sleifiodd allan o'r capel yn sydyn, penderfynodd fyned am dro ar ei phen ei hun...Newidiodd ei meddwl...Cerdodd i gyfeiriad y mynydd...Dringodd o'r ffordd ac eistedd ar garreg...Porai'r defaid yn fân brysyr ddi-baid...Daeth avel bach oer a unaeth iddi godi a meddwl am ei chinio. Daeth hen syniad gwirion efo'r avel...* "She slipped out of the Chapel suddenly, decided to go for a walk on her own...Changed her mind...Went in the direction of the mountain...Climbed out of the way and sat on a rock...The sheep were grazing in a quick, busy, unceasing manner... A small cold breeze came and made her rise and think of her dinner. A queer silly idea came with the breeze..."

(39) HF 28 *Cododd Nedw duth...a thuthiodd yr holl ffordd. Stopiodd duthio wedi cyrraedd y brif stryd. Lloriodd yn fannu. Gwelodd Mari ddyn yn dwad ar hyd y stryd yn dal ambarél wrth ei ben...Pan welodd o'r car a'r mul, dyma fo'n dal yr ambarél o'i flaen...* "Nedw raised a trot...and trotted the whole way. (He) stopped trotting upon reaching the main street. (He) settled down there. Mary saw a man coming along the street holding an umbrella to his head... Seeing the cart and the mule, he holds the umbrella before him..."

(g) infinitive linkage/delimitation, information chunking or blocking

(40) HF 38 *Rhoes Mari un sgrech ac yna rhedodd allan* "Mary gave one scream and then rushed out".

(41) MG 30...*penderfynodd yn sydyn yr âi yno. Herio'i ofnau a wynebu'r Gwaith...* "He suddenly decided he would go there. Challenge his fears and face the Works..."

(42) MG 32 *Gwyddai Ifan fod ei gyfog yn codi. Ymlusgodd yn ei ôl gan simsanu. I lawr yn ôl gydag ymyl y mur. Eistedd ar graig. Anadlu'n furiadus...* "Ifan knew his vomit was rising. He crept back tottering. Back down along the wall's edge. Sat (lit. 'sit') on a rock. Breathed ('breathe') purposefully".

(43) HF 35 *Heliwyd pawb i'r car a dechrau tuthio. Dechreuodd Mari chwerthin...* "Everybody was chased to the cart and (they) started to trot (rather 'a trot was started', lit. 'start trotting'). Mary started to laugh".

(44) HD 32 ff.: ("Gwacter", "Emptiness") *DYDD SUL. Teimlo'n flin. Cael fy nef-fro o gwsg braf am 6.30 a.m. Methu deall pam mae'n rhaid ein deffro mor fore...Cael slemp o'molchi...Ceisio bwyta fy uwd heb golli dim ar y gwely. Yr uwd yn dda, yn feddal ac nid yn lwmf caled...Llawer o ymwelwyr yn y prynhawn. Teimlo bod fy mhen yn wag. O.M. yn dwad yma...* "SUNDAY. Feeling irritable. Getting awakened from a good sleep at 6.30. Failing to understand why it's necessary to wake us up that early... Getting a splash of washing... Trying to eat my porridge without losing anything on the bed. The porridge good, soft and not a hard lump... Many visitors in the afternoon. Feeling my head (is) empty. O.M. coming here after tea..."

(h) *a*- and *y*- initial delimiters of different relative Domain Frames:

(45) TB 321 *Dyna a fedyliai Ann, a dyna y methai ei wneud* "That's what Ann thought, and that's what she failed to do".

## 2. *Cohesion or Juncture Contours*

The obvious fact, that linkage and delimitation within a given sub-textual stretch (JDF) are not of the same order and grade, and that the accumulated linear interplay of links and delimiters along such a stretch is distinctively patterned and constitutes a formal constant, enables us to isolate characteristic contours for given syntagmatic patternings and environments. Observe that we're not only dealing with the binary prosodic distinction of close *vs.* open juncture, but at least with four relative grades, determined by the convergence of links – closest (or 'tightest'), closer, less open (or 'loose'), open. These basic grading is further refinable with the precise application of the parameters of commutabilities (paradigm constituencies: the smaller the paradigm, the more grammemic, and in general entering closer juncture) and compatibilities (e.g. cases of conditioning or rection as against mere adjunction) within the boundaries concerned (for instance, cases of enclitics privileged to occur where tonic elements are not) or across these boundaries (for instance, the commutabilities of adjectives before substantives, or pronominal suffixes, or possessive articles). Observe also that the fact that a juncture is close does not imply that it is 'closest': further links may obtain between close-juncture segments (such as assimilation or concord), 'tightening' their juncture. The criteria for juncture grading (always relative) include suprasegmentals, prosodic and morphophonemic considerations, discontinuity of complex elements, commutability and relative size of paradigms – paradigmatic juncture – degree of allomorphic conditioning of segments by others (or presupposition dependency between them: predictability or expectation of sequel) and several other types of (inter)dependence. Juncture is in fact a multidimensional function: the paradigmatic dimension, itself anchored in the syntagmatic-and-paradigmatic environmental factor, is very important, for defining not only the segmental value, but also the junctural properties of the slot in point. We can thus talk of peaks of closer to closest juncture, or valleys of opener to most open juncture (cf. ROSEN 1964: 184 ff.), with the valleys (if any) demarcating immediate constituents – these too being relative and hierarchical.



- (46) *an=ghofio*  
 (47) *fy=nhad+i* "my father"  
 (48) *hen=ferch, pa=lle* "old maid", "what place"  
 (49) *diolch=a=f* "I thank"  
 (50) *mi=yf=ais-i + o* "I drank it"  
 (51) *ga=ei-damaid* "will I get a piece?"  
 (52) *bron+yn=rhy=dew, yn=bur=ddistaw* "almost too thick", "fairly quiet"  
 (53) *yn-dy=le+di* "in your place"  
 (54) *Mi-d=i+adra++fory* "I will go home tomorrow"  
 (55) *Cafodd-Ann=ddigon-o=bethau+ i=feddwl+amdanynt+++cyn-mynd+ i'=w-gwely* "Ann got enough things to think about [them] before going to her bed"  
 (56) *cwrs++ un-diwrnod+++arbennig* "the course of one special day"  
 (57) *Gwir+y=gair* "The word is true" (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 165 f.)  
 (58) *Fy=nalgylch+i+yw-De=Lerpwl* (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 143 ff.)
- (-, =, ≡ closeness [rising scale], +, ++, +++ openness [rising scale]).

### 3. Juncture paradigms: binary and multiple-term

The numerous binary juncture paradigms obtaining in seams (or boundary slots) may be either privative (i.e. containing a zero term) or they may be equipollent. In the latter case, they allow for gradation. Some examples for the two types:

(a) zeroing *vs.* repetition of a foregoing element, i.e. substitute (*un, gwneud*) *vs.* lexical repetition of foregoing element (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 74 ff., 87 ff. Not in italics, the linking element):

(59) *Mae'r syniad o "Gymru yn Ewrop" yn un cyfoes.* "The idea of 'Wales in Europe' is a contemporary one"

(60) ...*bod talpau helaeth o ddeialog wedi eu tocio o'r un Gymraeg.* "that extensive chunks of dialogue have been clipped from the Welsh one"

(61) TC 111...*soffa blwsh yn lle unrawn* "a plush sofa instead of a horse-hair one"

as contrasted with and opposed to

(62) SG 55 *Mae pobl sâl a phobl mewn jêl a seilam yn clywed pob dim o flaen pobl eraill* "Sick people and people in jail and asylum hear everything before other people".

(63) SG 72 *Mae hi wedi penderfynu gadael y siop a chymryd y siop fechan yma ar y sgwâr* "She has decided to leave the shop and take the small shop on the square".

(b) lenition/absence of (or zero) lenition: see in detail below.

(c) In narrative, the delimiters *ac yna* or *ac ar hynny* *vs.* *a + zero delimiter* (the latter further opposed to *a + infinitive*):

(64) HF 38 Rhoes Mari un sgrech *ac yna* rhedodd allan "Mary gave one scream and then rushed out"

(65) TB 119 "*Medra*", *meddai Ann*, "*clwy yr ogle da sy'n dwad o'r ty*". *Ac ar hynny rhedodd i gyfarfod â'r postman oedd wrth y llidiart*. "I can – said Ann – feel the good smells coming from the house. And at that point she ran to meet the postman who was at the gate". (Note here also the absence of lenition in *clwy* [not collated with K. R.'s autograph], a delimiter coinciding with the narrative incise *meddai*, a powerful inter-colon delimiter),

as contrasted with and opposed to both

(66) HF 55 *Roes ei bron i'r babi ac aeth i'r gilan i nôl llaeth enwyn* "She gave the baby her breast and went to the nook to get buttermilk"

and

(67) HF 30 *Yna cymerodd ddarn o sialc a dechrau guneud llinellau* "Then she took a piece of chalk and began to draw lines".

(d) In narrative yet again: the coordinated PRETERITE + IN-FINITIVE event block already mentioned is opposed as a high-cohesion *marked zero term* to the unmarked PRETERITE + PRETERITE, the marked term signalling a "hypereventing" block. Further, in narrative texturing, *fe-* (delimitation) is opposed to *zero* (linkage), and of course the *zero* theme to the *non-zero* one. In fact, the articulation of the narrative sequence into what we may respectively define as episodes, scenes, events and hyper-events, even "shots", the shift back and forth between Evolution Mode and Comment Mode (as effected especially by tense switching), the interface of dialogue and narrative proper, and then such cinematic devices as zooming in and out, slow and fast motion, fadeout etc., are all mainly juncturally operated.

(68) HF 35 *Heliwyd pawb i'r car a dechrau tuthio. Dechreuodd Mari chwerthin* "Everybody was chased to the cart and (they) started to trot. Mary started laughing..."

(69) TB 107 ## *Fe dyfodd Mrs. Huws y gweinidog yn gyfaredd ar Ann Owen. Ni allai ddweud yn hollol pam...* "The minister's Mrs. Huws exerted a fascination on Ann. She couldn't entirely say why..."

(70) HF 65 f. *Eisteddodd drachefn, a'r tro hwn edrychodd ar ei dodrefn o'r ochr arall i'r bedd. Rhyw ddiwrnod fe'u didolid i gyd oddi wrth ei gilydd; âi'r dresel i un man, y gist i le arall, y bwrdd derw i fan arall... Cofiodd y munud nesaf mai o'r ochr arall i'r bedd y gwelai hyn, ac ni faliai. Dislanodd y pigiad a roesai'r meddwl iddi... ## Âi fe âi. Eithr oeddodd eto ac eistedd...* "She sat down again, and this time looked at her furniture from the other side of the grave. Some day they would be separated from each other; the dresser would go to one place, the chest to another place, the oak table to another place... She remembered the next moment that it was from the other side of the grave that she was seeing this, but didn't care. The pang this thought had given her disappeared... She would go. And yet she still tarried and sat..."

(71) TB 47 *Yr oeddynt yn y lobi erbyn hyn ac yn hollol sydyn dechreuodd Ann grio. Ebwch sydyn a stopio. "Wel, mae gynno fo chwaer sy'n gefn iawn iddo beth bynnag. Nos dawch, Miss Owen". – "Nos dawch". Brawddeg olaf Mr. Prys oedd yr unig beth a ddangosodd i Ann fod ganddo ronyn o deimlad.* "They were in the hall by now and all at once Ann started crying. A sudden gasp and stop. – "Well, at least

he has a sister who's a real support for him. Good night to you, Miss Owen'. – 'Good night to you'. Mr. Pry's last sentence was the only thing that showed Ann he had the least bit of feeling".

(72) TB 139 ## *Fe aeth yfed diferyn o rum mewn tafarn yn beth mawr. Fe chwyddodd y gwydrad bychan hunnw yn chwartiau o wermod i Ann Owen. . . Fe glywodd Lyd Edwards am y peth ac yr oedd yn ormod o detasiwn iddi hi allu dal ei thafod ar y mater, ac fe'i cododd wedi i ddyddiau fyned heibio, ac wedi i Ann feddwl na byddai mwy o sôn amdano, ac fel arfer fe wnaeth hynny o flaen yr athrawon eraill.* "Drinking a drop of rum in a pub became a big thing. The small glassful swelled into quarts of wormwood for Ann Owen. . . Lyd Edwards heard of the thing and it was too great a temptation for her to be able to hold her tongue on the matter, and (she) raised it after days went past, and after Ann thought there would not be any further mention of it, and (she) usually did this in front of the other teachers".

The so-called Imperfect (the 'fuzzy' or 'parallel reality' tense) and the Pluperfect are instructive from the junctural perspective. On their own they are cohesive, inasmuch as they presuppose other narrative tenses – narrative carriers, usually the Preterite – or an array of such tenses (in "Evolution Mode"), and are valued by this presupposed narrative constituent. Even where the imperfect is absolutely initial in the narrative, as often in Kate Roberts's fiction, topical or thematic, supplying the so-called "obtaining situation" or "situational frame", it is still cohesive. Yet these tenses are also simultaneously disruptive and delimitative in narrative texture (cf. Harald Weinrich's "relief"). This is thus also an interesting instance of the so-called 'non-initial main clause' (an Egyptological notion), and also of the distorting effect of the traditional binary '(sub)ordination' model.

(e) A privative binary paradigm characterizes the adnominal phrasal juncture opposition of relative *bod* (i. e. *sy[dd]*) vs. *zero*, in compatibility with *definite* and *indefinite* nominal nuclei respectively:

(73) TB 320 *bara crasu a thoddion arno* "toast with dripping (lit. 'toasted bread and dripping on it')"

as against

(74) WD 12 *yr enwau Saesneg sydd ar bob dim* "the English names that are on everything" ("that all things have").

(f) Non-privative is the opposition of the negative converters *na-* vs. *nid-* – the former links, the latter delimits.<sup>5</sup>

(1) following a nominal:

(75) *Pan yw dyn mewn cyfyngder nid yw yn dyfalu am gyfiawnder. . .* "When a man is in straits, he does not make conjectures about justice" (sharp delimitation, bounding two entirely separate patterns).

<sup>5</sup> The converters *nid-* and *na(c)-* are similarly opposed, but in a different junctural order, the former unmarked and asseverative, the latter responsive (hence cohesive). Observe that the affirmative correspondent to this opposition is privative, with *zero* conversion (the responsive, SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: § 3.3.2–3) the cohesive term.

(76) MG 91 ...*lle nid anamlwg* "a place not unnoticeable"

(77) ...*lle nad oed cartref sicr a diogel* "a place that wasn't a secure and safe home"

## (2) or in adverbial/ad-clausal status

(78) ...*yn golygu nid yn unig rheolaeth*... "implying not only control..."

(79) *Mae'n debyg nad oes dim yn dadlennu ei gymeriad yn fwy eglur nac ar-gyfwng* "It seems that nothing reveals his character more clearly than a crisis".

## 4. LENITION juncture signalling

Among the familiar formal signals of juncture, mutations, and especially lenition and zero lenition, i. e. meaningful absence of lenition, are probably the most familiar.<sup>6</sup> Being much more than a mere morphophonemic phenomenon, I believe viewing lenition as a juncture feature enhances our understanding of this quintessentially Celtic phenomenon. Here is a privative binary paradigm which is strikingly ambiguous, for lenition can either signal cohesion linkage or (less usually) a delimitation. This ambiguity is resolved also conjointly with the dual nature of lenition as either distinctive (pertinent, environment-creating) or conditioned (by environment, e. g. by prepositions).

### (a) Lenition Linkage:

(1) Lenition as copula in a Nominal Sentence – link between theme and rheme, *signifiant* of nexus:

(80) MG 157 *Bu farw* "He died".

(2) Lenition is a copular link also in the *i-cum infinitivo* affirmative nexal pattern: this is indeed, a closer-juncture verb-form rather than a "syntactical construction" – integrated in the text as one of the means of affirmative nexus substantivation: [*i*-AGENS + <sup>len</sup>INFINITIVE] (alternating with and/or opposed to *y*-conversion; *na(d)*- being the suppletive negation for both):

(81) *Y piti yw fod rhaid i drychineb ddigwydd cyn inni ddysgu'r gwirionedd* "the pity is that it is necessary for a disaster to happen before we learn (lit. 'before-for-us-to-learn') the truth".

<sup>6</sup> Of course, the definite article intervenes between the lexeme body and the conditioning factor, defining a different boundary than a zero-determined lexeme.

(82) *Sut y bu iddo uneud ffortiwn* "how it happened that he made (lit. 'was for-him-to-make') a fortune"

(83) TB 239 *Beth a wnaeth i ti ofyn?* "What made you ask?"

Interestingly, this nexal link is cancelled or 'disabled' in an uncommon instance of the nexal construction delimited, by a conditioned infixed resumptive object pronoun:

(84) TB 272 *y rhai cyntaf i Ynys y Grug eu gweld erioed* "the first ones for Ynys y Grug to see (in Welsh 'see them') ever".

(3) Lenition following prepositions (and actually marking prepositions and prepositional phrases as such):<sup>7</sup>

(85) *heb gerdyn / i fynd / am gyfiaunder..* "without a card" / "to go" / "for justice"

Several lenition signals compatibly as subsequent (but different-rank) links:

(86) TB 319 ...*mae'n rhaid i ddiwrnod ddwad* ... "A day must come (lit. It's necessary for a day to come)"...

(4) Lenition as *Fügemorphem* in compounding (even where traditionally not written as one word); zero lenition characterizes a broad spectrum of segment independence, from absence of any association (the strongest delimitation) to a non-compound phrasal syntagm:

(87) *hen ferch, pa beth, ar unwaith, yn gorlifo, gwaglaw, ymddangosai* "old maid", "what thing", "at once", "overflowing", "empty-handed", "he appeared"

(88) *yn rhy dew, yn bur ddistaw* "too thick", "very quiet"

(5) Lenition as feminine concord index<sup>8</sup> (feminine nucleus, nominal attributive expansion) with a zero lenition oppositum for a masculine, or rather gender-unmarked *non-feminine*<sup>9</sup> nucleus (non-lenition concord). The feminine is juncturally opposed to the masculine, as a marked term, signalled by closer, the masculine, unmarked, by opener juncture:

<sup>7</sup> The zero lenition of the infinitive after *yn-* and *wedi-* in the converbs (*yn mynd*, *wedi mynd*) is an index of the high grammaticalization grade and converbal nature of these syntagms, not of their non-prepositional nature. Absence of mutation between two segments may in other cases indicate their structural non-adjacency, which may conflict with an actual syntagmatic adjacency: MG 144 *yn dy le di* "in your place".

<sup>8</sup> Observe that lenition itself does not concord, i.e. we find no case of a nucleus and its expansion lenited by the same cause.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. THOMAS 1996:§ 4.57 ("anfenywaidd")

(89) MG 40 *yr ast fach flêr / y(r) wraig ddoe*<sup>10</sup> / *breast ddwbl* "(you) slovenly little bitch!" / yesterday's woman / double breast

as against

(90) *dyn bach tawel/spatrum redyd mawr* "a little silent man", "a large credit" but also

(91) TB 301...*anaddas i fod yn wraig gweinidog* "unsuitable to be a minister's wife"

which shows by its *zero* lenition a different, (looser?) type of expansion of feminine nuclei, with its *signifié* possession.

(6) Lenition as Proper-Name/Personal-Pronoun concord index (a marked term; cf. the feminine above):

(92) "*Ti, frithyll bach...*" "you, little Trout" (an *englyn*)

(93) *Paulos dywyll* "dark Paul"

As against

(94) *y tro cyntaf* "the first time"

(7) Lenition as object-actant marker, thus indicating an adverbial syntactic rank as well as verb + noun cohesion. The object slot is mobile in the verb clause; if expanded, lenition marks only the nucleus and *zero* lenition delimits it from its expansion. *Zero* lenition of a nominal in the verb-clause indicates in Modern Welsh the non-expanding agens (revealing the different, less tight since more pattern-intrinsic):

(95) HD 49 ...*a chafodd, ynghanol y doliau a'r ceffylau bach, ful bach* "and found, among the dolls and the horses, a small mule".

(96) HF 35 '*Does gynnoch chi ddim hawl; 'dydan ni'n gwneud dim drwg* "You haven't any right; we're not doing any wrong thing".

(97) HD 25 *Cafodd ganiatâd* "He got permission".

(98) TB 129 *Agorodd llythyr Mrs. Huws, llythyr hir heb gerdyn* "She opened Mrs. Huws's letter, a long letter without a card" (note that the validity scope of the object lenition does not extend here to its *appositum*: its lapse of validity constitutes in itself a delimitation).

(b) Lenition as delimiter (less usual):

(1) Parenthetical lenition; lenition as address marker; lenition as adverbial/rhematic status marker:

(99) MG 146 *Un tro gyfeillion roedd y tir yma yn ffrwythlon* "Once, friends, this land was fertile"

(100) MG 118 *Rhamantydd ydw i welwch chi* "I'm a romantic, you see"

(101) MG 122' *Dydw i ddim yn Gymraes go iawn wyddoch chi* (cf. the allocutive particles Welsh *iti*, Greek *toi*, English *y'know*) "I'm not a real Welshwoman, you know".

<sup>10</sup> However, *doe* "yesterday" may be lenited (as an adverbial delimitation) also in other statuses: TB 321 *Ddaw ddoe byth yn ôl* "Yesterday will never come back".

(102) TB 108 *Yr oedd bob amser yn well mewn cwmni o ddau neu ddwy, nag mewn cwmni o dri debygai hi* "She was always better in a company of two men or two women, than in a company of three, it seemed to her."

Contrasted with zero lenition in

(103) TB 287 *Gwyrth fyddai iddo wella yn awr meddyliai* "It would be a miracle for him to get better now, she thought".

(104) HD 35 *meddwl am fy ngardd gartref...* "thinking of my garden at home..."

(105) TB 111 *Byddai'n mynd i weld Richard wedyn ddydd Sadwrn* "She was going to see Richard again Saturday".

(106) TB 262 *Ddoe gallasai wynebu Jane Devis* "Yesterday, she had been able to face Jane Devis"

(107) TB 135 ...*ar ben ych hun y ceuch chi hunnw* orau "on your own you'll get this best".

(2) Lenition of an initial finite verb marks nexal-interrogative (i. e. yes/no interrogative) status (i. e. delimits):

(108) TB 43 *Ddoi di wir Nani?* "Will you really go, Nani?"

While zero lenition in a corresponding placement marks the verb form as responsive (or, in the locutive persons, as performative), hence links it to the foregoing allocution:

(109) TB 267 *"Mi fasa'n braf petai'r rhyfel yn dwad i ben cyn imi fynd yn ôl"* - "*Basa.*" "It would be nice if the war came to an end before I went back". - "(Yes) it would".

### 5. Zero in juncture signalling

The zero linguistic elements, definable paradigmatically as "(meaningful) absence of any specifiable element privileged to occur in the prevailing environment", that is, in-paradigm, as a paradigmatic notion and by paradigmatic criteria, must be kept strictly apart from "*nil*".<sup>11</sup> Juncturally, zero is, like lenition, formally neutral.

(1) Zero elements in narrative are often, perhaps usually, *exponents of cohesion*. So for instance in actantial zeroing vs. non-zeroing of theme-actor exponence. Zero here signifies thematic-

<sup>11</sup> As - for a case of zero vs. *nil* article - in the case of word-formation including composition: in *y gemwaith* "the jewellery", *y*- structurally determinates *gwaith*, the nucleus, while the expansion *gem* is *nil*-determined; or in *yr ordeiniad*, "the ordination", the nucleus *-iad* is definite, *ordein-* is *nil*-determined; on the other hand, in *yn caru*, the infinitive is zero-determined, by token of the occurrence of *yn ei garu*.

agential cohesion. In transitive- (double-) valency verb lexemes, zero actor actant signifies actant-theme continuity; a non-zero nominal/pronominal element, if not an index of theme-switching, would then indicate the object (*patiens*) slot.

(110) HF 26 *Penderfynodd Mari mai dechrau gartref oedd orau. Golchodd y car yn lân a rhoes sglein ar y tresi. ... Sgwriodd Cwlin. ...* "Mary decided that beginning at home was best. (She) washed the trap clean and put a shine on the traces. (She) scoured Colin. ..."

*Non-zero* indicates the delimitation that is associated with a thematic switch or thematic (re)assertion:

(111) TB 302 *Daeth i ben ei llythyr. Stopiai'r trên, âi pobl gan glepian y drysau. Deuai rhai eraill i mewn a sefyll yn y cyntedd ac edrych drwy'r ffenestr. ... Deuai sŵn siarad. ...* "She came to her letter's end. The train stopped, people went slamming the doors. Others came in and stood in the hall and looked through the window. ... There came a sound of talking. ..."

It is instructive to compare in this context the Modern Irish delocutive narrative forms and the exponence of their pronominal (delocutive) theme-agents, *sé* vs. zero agents, in a primarily junctural (exx. from Seán Mac Mathúna's *An Seamlas*):

VERB + *sé*: individual narrative event

(112) *D'imigh sé* "He went"

(113) *Shuigh sé sa chathaoir* "He sat down in the chair".

VERB + zero: responsive subconstituent of dialogue

(114) # *Thosaigh sí ag gol* – # *Níor dhein, a dhiabhl!* – *Ó, dhein*. "She began crying" – "The devil (she) did! (lit. 'she didn't, by the devil!') – "Oh yes she did".

[VERB + *sé*] + is + [VERB + zero]: hyper-eventing, zeroed second pronoun

(115) *Thóg Tadhg cnámh den talamh is chaith leis an bhfalla é*

"Tadhg raised a bone from the ground and threw it at the wall".

[VERB + VERB] + *sé* – close juncture, bracketing pronoun:

(116) *Ní thiocfadh is ní imeodh sé* "It would neither come nor go".

All this immediately raises a question concerning the connection and relationship between cohesivity/cohesion signalling and valency; the valency matrix, i.e. the junctural frame of verb lexeme with its actants – governed or conditioned – and, so to speak in orbit, its circumstants – constitute a neat and striking instance of junctural scope as well as domain frame; This too is a case of helpful insight gained by the junctural perspective.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> In Modern Irish, the pronominal object actant is a striking valency-matrix-final boundary signal: *Cluinim ag eascaine agus ag achtrann ó am go am iad* (Pádraic Ó Conaire) "I hear them cursing and quarelling from time to time".



Note in this connection also the Preterite + *-a*+INFINITIVE construction, already referred on several occasions, as opposed to a coordinated Preterite, a paradigm already referred to several times. I find this an especially interesting kind of zeroing cohesion (or cohesive *zero*), for here it is the entire *person-category* exponent that is zero (and not morphologically at that).

(2) Cases of valential object-actantial *zero* are, generally speaking, rare in Welsh. Typically, these are cases of cohesive anaphoric *zero* across deep boundaries (often with the pro-verb *gwneud*), thus across dialogic or narrative delimitations:

(117) TB 119 Mi fedri fwyta... # Medra "You'll be able to eat..." – "I will".

(118) HF 13f. Rwan cod y cwd papur yna # Na wna "Now pick up that paper-bag" – "I won't".

(119) Ar y stesiwn yr oedd arno eisiau gafael yn ei llaw, ond ni wnaeth "In the station, he felt the need to hold his hand, but he didn't".

(3) The case of *zero* morph, typically cataphoric to the infinitive (or the *i-cum-infinitivo* nexal substantivation pattern) in the thematic slot of the statal-existential nexus pattern, is well known:

(120) TB 139 Bu'n rhaid iddi gael nerth mawr... "It was necessary for her to get a great strength..."

(121) TB 103 O, mae'n dda gen i ych bod chi'n fy nallt i "Oh, I'm glad you understand me".

while the seemingly feminine delocutive *hi* a homonym of the 3rd sgl. fem. pronoun is an inert (i. e. non-referent, non-cohesive) "dummy" formal replacement or object-actant slot filler that is *functionally zero*: see further below.

(For lenition/absence of lenition or *zero* lenition, see above).

## 6. Pronominal juncture, referential juncture, phoricity, vectors of reference

This is perhaps the most familiar – in a way, the most banalized – of cohesive devices; and yet, it is very complicated, and still not entirely clear or well-mapped. Here are only a few observations on some salient cases.

(a) The personal pronouns in Kate Roberts's writing constitute a very complex morphosyntactic issue. First, of course, the basic distinction of *delocutives* – phoric – vs. *interlocutives* –

non-phoric or pragmatically phoric (the allocutive repertory is especially complex: *chi/chdi/ti*).<sup>13</sup> For the singular masculine delocutive pronoun, *o*, *efo*, *ef*, *fe*, *fô* are junctural, morphosyntactic and textemic alternants.

(b) The inert *hi*, non-phoric, non-textual, non-pragmatic – not feminine – a formal valency slot-filler, a valency-satisfying ‘dummy’ element. In this case, *hi* has no linking effect:

(122) MG 115 *Yn sicr mi fydden ni wedi’u hanwybyddu nhw’n llwyr a’i guneud hi am lecyn arall* “Surely, we would have ignored them entirely and made (lit. ‘made it’) for another spot”

(123) MG 142 *Cyn bo hir roedd y pedwar ohonom ni wedi’i throï hi am ein gwllâu* “Before long, the four of us had turned (lit. ‘turned it’) to our beds”

(124) MG 142 *Aeth hi’n flêr yn y rihyrsals eto?* “Did it go badly in the rehearsals again?”

(c) The same pronoun, homonymous with the feminine delocutive, occurs in a fuzzy linking role to information given in preceding text, anaphorically; or (typically in dialogue) to an *obtaining situation* (i.e. exophorically to the pragmatic condition, not to a fact), less usually cataphorically to subsequent text. An alternative and more unified view would consider *hi* in all these roles a formal thematic slot-filler (see [b]):

(125) MG 145 *Mater o amser yw hi* “It’s a matter of time”.

(126) MG 19 *Roedd hi’n anodd credu ei fod o am werthu Bryn Derwen* “It was difficult to believe he was going to sell Bryn Derwen”.

(127) TB 99 *Mae hi’n tipyn o broblem* “It’s a bit of a problem”.

(128) HF 10 *Mae’n rhaid i bod hi’n oer yn y stabal* “It must be cold in the stable”.

(129) TB 239 *Yr ym yn ffôl iawn yn aros mewn lle ddi-awyr fel hyn, a hithau mor braf allan* “We’re quite foolish to stay in an airless place like this, when it’s so nice outside”.

(130) TB 284 *Yn y nos mae hi waetha* “It’s worst at night”.

And consider especially

(131) TB 284 *Mi awm ni am de at yr hen wraig cyn iddi nosi* “We’ll go to the old woman for tea before night (lit. ‘before it nights’)”.

(d) The masculine (*o*) too occurs in the cataphoric referent slot, but (or so it seems) with clearer factive situational cohesion (reference to something that actually occurred):

(132) TB 288 *Mae o’n ormod i neb ceisio ‘i drin a’i drafod* “It’s too much for anyone to treat and discuss it”.

<sup>13</sup> Consider “Teulu Mari” in HF: Ledi Miew (the cat) addressed as *chi* and *ti*, differently in the changing interpersonal environments by different allocutors, corroborating the dynamic view of text-enfolding presented above.

(e) The formal theme in the Nominal Sentence (SHISHA-  
HALEVY 1998: Chapter Three). The endophoric reference (*ibid.*  
121 ff.) is a non-deictic, formal *scope-delimiting* one:

(133) HF 27 *Mari ydi hi* "It's Mary".

(134) *Nos Nadolig yw (hi)* "It's Christmas Eve".

(135) *Stori dditectif yw hi...* "It's a detective story".

Contrasted with the deictic theme (not formal, albeit equally closing the pattern)  
in

(136) MG 35 *Dim ond bore dydd Mercher oedd hwn* "This was nothing but  
Wednesday morning".

Observe again that in Modern Irish, the formal theme is a definite pattern-final-boundary signal, whereas in Modern Welsh it has colon-enclitic (colon-second) tendencies:

(137) *Is cosúil le'seanleon a bheadh gonta nó iolar na haille a chaillfeadh lúd na sciathán mé* "I'm like a wounded old lion or an eagle of the cliffs that lost the agility of his wings" (Pádraic Ó Conaire). The initial copula [or rheme-marker], theme and rheme are not in italics).

(f) *Zero* reference, usually cataphoric, was illustrated above:

(138) MG 19 *Mae'n wir fod y plastr wedi dechrau disgyn* "It's true the plaster has begun to come down".

(139) MG 19 *Mae'n anodd imi fod yn ddeddfol* "It's hard for me to be legalistic".

(140) TB 267 ...*mae'n gwestiwn a wyddai* Rolant hynny "It's a question whether Rolant knew that".

(g) The *zero* thematic reference in the closer links of narrative event concatenation has already been referred to above. The interplay of *zero* (non-phoric, ana- or cata-phoric), feminine (exophoric, ana- or cata-phoric) and masculine (fuzzy anaphora) referents is among the most interesting issues of Welsh juncture:

(141) TB 319 "*Mae'n ddrwg gen i Richard*" "...*mae'n rhaid i ddiwrnod ddwad...pan fydd yn rhaid inni adael teuluoedd, a phan fydd yn rhaid inni benderfynu a ydy'n cariad ni yn ddigon i'n dal ni wrth ein gilydd ac anghofio pawb arall. Mae'o yn beth creulon i'w ddweud.*" "Ydi, y mae o" "I'm sorry, Richard." "A day must come (lit. 'it will be necessary for a day to come')...when we shall have to leave families ('it will be necessary for us to leave'), and we shall have to decide ('it will be necessary for us to decide') whether our love is enough to keep us together and forget everyone else. It's a cruel thing to say" "Yes, it is."

(142) TB 321 *Yr oedd yn Nadolig eto ac Ann gartref* "It was Christmas once again, and Ann at home".

(143) TB 320 "*Ydach chi'n teimlo'n well rian?*" "*Ydw, a mae hi mor braf cael bod efo'n gilydd*" "Are you feeling better now?" Yes, and it's so nice to be able to be together".

(144) TB 322 *Ydi, mae'n anodd dallt* "Yes, it is hard to understand".

(h) The textually marked pronoun paradigm member – the scope of conjunct pronouns and the *augens* (this must be further studied in detail):

(145) HF 37 *'Does ar Mari ddim o eisio'ch gweld chi / - 'Does arna innau ddim o eisio i gweld hithau 'chwaith* "Mary doesn't feel like seeing you" – "I don't feel like seeing her either".

(146) MG 157 *Ni soniai Arwyn am gyfeillion yn ei waith, ac nid oedd fawr awydd arni hithau i wneud ffrindiau newydd...* "Arwyn did not mention friends in his work, and she too had little need to make new friends...".

### 7. *Junctural Bracketing. Cohesive Immediate Constituents*

The junctural characterization of syntagms and constituents provides us with a relatively simple analytic model of syntagmatic hierarchy, often correlative with the old familiar Immediate Constituents (but considerably more sophisticated), which may also correlate to the inner cohesion of complex units. It even gains in importance when we apply the distinction of *actual syntagmatic sequence* vs. *structural sequence*, a distinction absolutely necessary in study of sequencing ('word-order'); moreover, it coincides with the notion of juncture contouring as presented above.

(a) Consider, for instance, the case of the syntax of *gan-*:

(147) MG 158 *O leiaf yr oedd Arwyn ganddi* "At least she had Arwyn"

(148) HD 32 *Llawer o gagen:au ganddi i mi...* "Many cakes she had for me"

– cases of an existant *possessionum* and *gan-* adverbial rheme, with the possessive verboid, such as

(149) HD 30 *Yr oedd ganddi wyneb rhadlon* "She had a kind face".

(150) TB 287 *Teimlai Ann fod ganddi le mawr i ddiolch* "Ann felt she had much to be thankful for".

(151) HD 33 *Nid oes gennyf ddim diddordeb* "I have no interest".

The *differentia specifica* here is not so much word-order, not even constituent ordering, but the distinctive juncture of two constructions, a usual statal-existential one predicating *gan-* as rheme, and a specialized possessive verboid *mae gan-* with its object actant.

(b) The important associative *noun + noun* construct-chain syntagms provides another striking instance. The closer-junc-

ture syntagm, leniting the attributive expansion for feminine nuclei, is not bracketed by the determinators, which affect the nucleus alone; thus, for the nucleus itself determination is fully pertinent. (Note the typical compounding in English):

(152) *y-Swyddfa Ryfel / y-baw ci / y-polau piniwn / y-meistr tir, y-cwmni drama, ei-phen glin* "the War Office", "the dogshit", "the opinion poles", "the land-owner", "the drama company", "her kneecap".

(153) *y-Siop-Lyfrau Deithiol* "the mobile book-shop"

(154) *y-cwd-papur yna* "that paper-bag"

The expansion itself may be complex:

(155) *gwyneb [hen ddyn]* "an old-man's face"

For more than two nouns, *o* expands the main nucleus:

(156) *llif o rwd haearn* "a current of iron rust".

This is contrasted with the looser-juncture syntagm, determining the expansion only (unless a Proper Name) – with the nucleus incompatible with determinators (hence of fuzzy determination?):

(157) *drws y festri, cyfarch y dynion* "the vestry door, the men's greeting"

The case of a Proper-Name expansion is interesting, for here the two constituents are incompatible with the definite article, the nucleus structurally and syntagmatically by the distinctive property of the construction, the expansion deictically and paradigmatically (the latter is incompatible only with the anaphoric definite article):<sup>14</sup>

(158) *safbwynt Harri* "Harri's standpoint".

Two definite articles, determining respectively the nucleus and the expansion, mark the latter as compound (and typically properized<sup>15</sup>), thus are cohesive:

(159) *y dant-y-llew* "the dandelion"

A different, prepositional construction marks the nucleus as indefinite:

(160) *brodyr i ffrindiau* "brothers of friends"

<sup>14</sup> Cf. THOMAS 1996: 183 f.

<sup>15</sup> For 'properization' and 'deproperization' cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1989.

- Celtic)" in: *Word Order: Stability and Change Over Time*, edd. R. SORNICOLA *et al.*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin, 71–100.
- SHISHA-HALEVY Ariel, Forthcoming, *Topics in Bohairic Coptic Syntax*, Leuven: Peeters.
- TALLERMANN, Maggie, 1998a, "Word Order in Celtic", in: *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe* (ed. A. SIWIERSKA), Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter = Empirical Approaches to Language Typology/EUROTYP 20-1), 21–45.
- TALLERMANN, Maggie, 1998b Tallerman 1998a "Celtic Word Order: Some Theoretical Issues", in: *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe* (ed. A. SIWIERSKA), Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter = Empirical Approaches to Language Typology/EUROTYP 20-1), 599–647.
- THOMAS, Peter Wynn, 1996, *Gramadeg y Gymraeg*, Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| CAREY, J.: <i>A single ray of the sun: religious speculations in early Ireland: three essays</i> (J. P. MACKEY) . . . . .  | 299 |
| LAYZER, V.: <i>Signs of weakness: Juxtaposing Irish tales and the Bible</i> (P. Ó FIANNACHTA) . . . . .  | 302 |
| NÍ URDAIL, M.: <i>The scribe in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ireland: motivations and milieu</i> (P. Ó FIANNACHTA) . . . . .   | 304 |
| BRODERICK, G.: <i>Placenames of the Isle of Man</i> , vols. 4; 5 (P. LE BESCO) . . . . .   | 306 |
| DAVIES, W.; GRAHAM-CAMPBELL, J.; HANDLEY, M.; KERSHAW, P.; KOCH, J. T.; LE DUC, G.; LOCKYEAR, K.: <i>The inscriptions of early medieval Brittany / Les inscriptions de la Bretagne du Haut Moyen Âge</i> (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . . | 310 |
| GREEN, M.; HOWELL, R.: <i>A pocket guide: Celtic Wales</i> (B. MAIER) . . . . .  | 313 |
| HEINECKE, J.: <i>Temporal deixis in Welsh and Breton</i> (T. A. WATKINS) . . . . .   | 315 |
| SCHULZE-THULIN, B.: <i>Studien zu den urindogermanischen o-stufigen Kasusativa / Iterativa und Nasalpräsentien im Kymrischen</i> (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .   | 317 |
| HUWS, D.: <i>Medieval Welsh manuscripts</i> (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .  | 322 |
| PADEL, O.: <i>Arthur in the Medieval Welsh literature</i> (A. T. E. MATONIS) . . . . .   | 324 |
| DAVIES, C.: <i>Adfeilion Babel: agweddau ar syniadaeth ieithyddol y ddeunawfed ganrif</i> (P. RUSSELL) . . . . .   | 326 |
| CORNILLET, G.: <i>Geriadur brezhoneg-alamaneg hag alamaneg-brezhoneg / Bretonisch-deutsches und deutsch-bretonisches Wörterbuch</i> (CH. BATKE) . . . . .  | 328 |
| LÖFFLER, M.: <i>'A book of mad Celts': John Wicken and the Celtic Congress of Caernarfon 1904 / John Wicken a Chyngres Geltaidd Caernarfon 1904</i> (ST. ZIMMER) . . . . .   | 330 |
| TRISTRAM, H. L. C.: <i>How Celtic is Standard English?</i> (M. GÖRLACH) . . . . .  | 331 |
| TRISTRAM, H. L. C.: <i>The Celtic Englishes II</i> (M. GÖRLACH) . . . . .  | 332 |
| DESFAYES, M.: <i>A thesaurus of bird names: etymology of European lexis through paradigms</i> (R. KÖDDERITZSCH) . . . . .  | 335 |
| PSTRUSINSKA, J.: <i>Old Celtic cultures from the Hindukush perspective</i> (A. PI-SOWICZ) . . . . .  | 341 |
| HONKO, L.: <i>Textualising the Siri epic</i>   |     |
| HONKO, L., in collaboration with GOWDA, CH.; HONKO, A.; RAI, V.: <i>The Siri epic as performed by Gopala Naika</i> (D. EDEL) . . . . .   | 348 |
| <i>Studia Celtica: Bwletin y Burdd Gwybodau Celtaidd = The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies</i> 29 (1995), 30 (1996), 31 (1997), 32 (1998), 33 (1999), 34 (2000) (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .                                  | 353 |
| <i>Veleia: Revista de Prehistoria, Historia antigua, Arqueología y Filología clásicas</i> 13 (1996), 14 (1997), 15 (1998), 16 (1999) (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .   | 359 |
| <i>Scottish Gaelic Studies</i> 19 (1999) (F. Ó BÉARRA) . . . . .   | 365 |
| <i>Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru / The National Library of Wales Journal</i> 31, 1–2 (1999) (G. R. ISAAC) . . . . .  | 367 |
| Liste weiterer eingegangener Schriften (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .   | 370 |
| Liste weiterer eingegangener Zeitschriften (K. H. SCHMIDT) . . . . .   | 378 |