Converbs in Welsh and Irish
A Note

The term ›converb‹ was coined, so far as I know, without definition, by the Finnish Altaicist G. Ramstedt as ›Converbum‹ or ›Converbium‹, in his 1902 monographic description of Khalkha, the most famous of Mongolian dialects, which is the basis of today’s standard Mongolian. The term is still widely used in Altai and Turkic linguistics, where it is considered by its users to be apt, referring to a notion ›not existing in Indo-European‹. Following Ramstedt, the term was used by

The general paragraphs which form the first part of this paper overlap and to a degree repeat the general introduction to a paper on converbs in Egyptian and Coptic by the present writer, presented in 2006 at the NACAL 35 conference in San Antonio, Texas (Shisha-Halevy forthcoming). Terms like ›adverbial participles‹ or ›gerund‹ are to my knowledge not currently used in Celtic linguistics for this notion (consider Irish gerind, gerieann, later Welsh gerwnd, gerwndin, all for the Latin inflecting verbal noun, but also the Lat. participles and -tum supine).

1 Historically a misnomer, for some reason especially widespread in English-language writing, more or less corresponding to the French gérondif (English ›gerund‹ must be a gallicism). See Goldenberg (1977: 489–99, 2002: 28–30). Lewis (1967: 174) explains his preference of ›gerund‹ over ›converb‹ by the ›merit of brevity‹ (!); see also his Chapter XI on ›deverbal adverbs‹.

2 Embedded/incorporated to the superordinate clause (HASELMATH 1995: 8) is no less question-begging.

3 Kortmann (1995: 196 ff.), on cases like ›Our children hate John singing folk-songs‹.

If the Celtic converbal systems seem less obscure, ›simpler‹ than the English ones, it is only because and in the sense that there is in Celtic less homonymy – diachronically, merging, since (for instance) the prepositional prefixes mark and distinguish individual, mutually opposed converbs; still, the systems are as complex and as sophisticated.

4 If the English ones, it is only because and in the sense that there is in Celtic less homonymy – diachronically, merging, since (for instance) the prepositional prefixes mark and distinguish individual, mutually opposed converbs; still, the systems are as complex and as sophisticated.

5 Ramstedt (1902: 55): ›Da sie (i.e. the Converbs) aber im Khalkhasischen eine wichtige Rolle spielen, habe ich die nichtsagenden und in viel engerer Bedeutung angewandten Namen Sapimum und Gerundium durch die hoffentlich deutlichere, geeigneteren Benennung ›Converbum‹ ersetzt.‹ See also pp. 44 ff., 61 ff., 104 ff. etc. Ramstedt, always historically and morphologically associating the Mongolian Converbs with verbal nouns, still uses here ›Gerundium‹ (e.g. 76 f.), despite his explicit rejection of this term as ›meaningless‹. In the poshmmous Russian version of Ramstedt’s Introduction to Altai Linguistics (Moscow 1957), the term used is gerundivo-priçaštavnaja forma (e.g. 111); deepriçastiya is, of course, the Russian correspondent of ›gerund‹.
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Slavonic, Japanese, Asian and European languages of point to the importance of converbal forms on Finnish, Ekkehard König, editing an anthology of studies that critically Valid Category by Martin Haspelmath and celebrated as a typologically important Cross-Linguis-
45, GOLDENBERG 1977: 491). In 1995, the converb was >adverbiality, refining our conception of this most dif-
First, we must contemplate the descriptive meaning of due to traditional conceptualization.) that would otherwise be invisible or hidden, or ignored by evoking concepts and conceptualization, subtly, in-
ous revisionist terminology may suggest (cor)relations sidiously guide our descriptive view and insight; felici-
distinct syntagmatic slotting), is too fragmented to be use-
ful even as an overall umbrella. Adjunctal; abnominal (especially instructive, for often opposed as adnexal to the attributive relative); adlexemic (valential and non-
valentia); ad-(verbal)-nexus; adclausal; rhematic; rhe-
matic (>predicative< complement: adnexual; focal; top-
tical-presetting, and many more.

Moreover, there exist (in Celtic as in other lan-
guages) formal statuses in which adverbiality cannot be 
recognized and resolved as such, or seems irrelevant; for instance, as formally differentiated from substan-
tivity or nominality (preeminently in topic or rhyme status). The immediate or conventional adjunct associ-
ation of adverbiality (e.g. in NEDIALKOV 1995: 98; I quote, an adverbial in a simple sentence<), does not 
connect ohne weiteres with the other two alleged con-
 verbal roles (ibid.), namely >secondary or coordinate predicate< and >predicate of a subordinate clause<.

The converb’s formal characteristics I

Is the converb in essence and by definition a non-finite or a finite verb form, or either? Is this essentially mor-
phological distinction at all important, especially since the infinitive, and indeed the converb, may be finitized 
by various constructional devices. Moreover, the infini-
tive or participle constituents of a Nominal-Sentence type nexal pattern, are >finite< in construction and inter-
dependence with their theme or subject. The typology 
of actor-expression of convertbs as compared with infini-
tives in very instructive.9

Adverbiality

First, we must contemplate the descriptive meaning of >adverbiality<, refining our conception of this most diff-
cult, and perhaps most dubious of word-classes (the

word-class aspect is, structurally speaking, more impor-
tant than any other). Where and what is the adverb? Can >adjunctality< represent this category at all? And is this 
quality, thus conceived, of any importance for under-
standing the converb, when we consider such an over-
ruling set of parameters as syntactical slotting? Adver-
biality, if we stay rigorously analytical (a >word-class< distinct, in distinct paradigmatic commutation, in dis-


56f.); 7 HASPELMATH & KÖNIG (1995: 542 n. 52): >Thus, Amharic, which is not genetically related to Turkic, and has had no close contacts with it, exhibits a very similar constituent order and correspon-
ding patterns of converb subordination< POLOTSKY (1951) is not quoted; nor is POLOTSKY (1965), typologically comparing Amharic and Turkish syntax.

9 In verbal >Secondary Predication< syntax, convertbs play a strik-
ing role: see HIMMELMANN & SCHULZETZ-BERNDY (2005).

8 In verbal >Secondary Predication< syntax, convertbs play a striking role: see HIMMELMANN & SCHULZETZ-BERNDY (2005).

7 HASPELMATH & KÖNIG (1995: 542 n. 52): >Thus, Amharic, which is not genetically related to Turkic, and has had no close contacts with it, exhibits a very similar constituent order and correspon-
ding patterns of converb subordination< POLOTSKY (1951) is not quoted; nor is POLOTSKY (1965), typologically comparing Amharic and Turkish syntax.

An essentially junctural set of parameters concerns the converb as a unit, continuous or discontinuous. Analyticity and syntheticity are observable as both diachronic and synchronic qualities of converbal forms. Almost a curiosity in this context is the question of unity, which is largely psychological, namely a bias against viewing the [prefix+preposition+noun] syntagm — so in Celtic — as a single converbal unity, which is clearly a grammaticalized morphologized pattern; apparently, there’s no such difficulty with postpositions and case endings. Another formal question is one of external juncture: converbs, especially non-finite ones, are often induceable for verb categories such as tense, mode, person or negation. The scale of this induction is a significant factor of linkage and delimitation about the converb.

Formal characteristics II

›Syntaxic‹ features: ›Ordination‹. A question recurring in general and specific accounts of Altai and Turkic converbs: what is the ›main‹ and what the ›subordinate‹ verb, or action, or predication, in cases corresponding to ›he fell slipping‹, and especially to ›he started crying‹, ›he goes on crying‹ — descriptive or auxiliary or modal verbs, typical of Altai and Turkic languages but important elsewhere. The semantic query may perhaps be dismissed as subjective and non-illuminating, and it often appears to be trivial, leading to such problematic distinctions such as ›logical‹ as against ›grammatical‹ ›main-ness‹. Ramstedt himself, trying to make sense of the elusive ›Haupthandlung‹ and ›Nebenhandlung‹ (not Hauptsatz and Nebensatz) hierarchy, has recourse to the not really helpful ›psychologisches Hauptwort‹ (as against ›grammatical‹ or ›syntactical‹?), for the converb itself.

Formal characteristics III

Grammaticalization: Grammaticalization and analyzability are kindred, correlated properties, both a matter of gradience, and a function of diachrony — the earlier occurring, the less sharply analyzable a syntagm. Moreover, as noted above, cases of preposition governing infinitives, preeminent candidates for converb-hood, are, I suggest, not synchronically analyzable as prepositional phrases but grammaticalized as converbs. Infinitives ›alone‹, too, as narrative carriers — whether as tightly-linked verb-serialization forms, or (for instance) as dialogue response-forms — are arguably adverbial and thus converbal. Note too the fact that the focalized converb in ModW, the converb as Cleft Sentence focus, is homonymous with the infinitive: Canu yr oeddwn ›It was singing that I was‹; another case of converb/infinitive homonymy is, I believe, in narrative-carrier slot (see below).

As an aspect of juncture and a symptom of advanced grammaticalization,10 the synchronic absence in Celtic (sometimes irregularity) of infinitive mutation inside some converbs is striking (Irish ag-, Welsh yn-, wedi-; this is only superficially paradoxical, for this feature indicates reduced analyzability (conditioned mutations, beside marking recension and rectum status, promote analyzability).

Structural identity

The converb’s structural identity, as defined by commutation, compatibilities, relationships (synchronic or diachronic), distribution and affinities with verbal nouns (notably infinitives), not merely morphologically (the Altai Converbs are synchronic or diachronic case-forms of verbal nouns), but systemically, in the sense of the implicative significance of their respective performance (Leistung) and their mutual trade-off, homonymy (where applicable) and/or complementary distribution.11

Syntactical-relation scanning

Once again, we face the theoretical conundrum of the epistemology and phenomenology of ›ordination‹, or ›inordination‹ (HAMP 1973: Einordnung): the relation, and indeed the macrosyntactic patterning of one predicative nexus adjoining another, that is neither sub-ordination, nor coordination (cf. KAZENIN & TESTELETS 2004): the adnereal expansion of one nexus by another, and of a noun syntagm or pronoun by a nexus (the latter opposed in-paradigm to attributive expansion). ›Subordination‹, which is a basic component of prevailing verb description, is, I believe, a faulted concept in syntactic analysis, and at the very least is question-begging, and not merely in ›esoteric‹ languages (including Celtic).

Syntactic versatility and environmental sensitivity of the converb: privilege of occurrence as adjunctual expansion ( ›She turned to me dancing‹), adnereal expansion ( ›The girl dancing was too lovely for words‹), adnereal expansion ( ›I found her dancing‹), rhyme ( ›She

10 For paradigmatic-junctural correlates of grammaticalization, see SHISHA-HALEVY (2003b, 2004): the prefixes of Irish and Welsh ›infinitival converbs‹ are, arguably, not synchronic prepositions at all, also by token of their paradigms.

was dancing when I first saw her), focalizability (It was dancing that I first saw her), topicalizability (Dancing, the girl looked at me), and others, e.g. exclamative status (Dancing!).

Textemics

Textemic significance and properties of converbs, especially narrative concatenation by converb sequencing, often discussed in HASPELMATH & KÖNIG (1995).

Function I

Adverbiality yet again: what does this actually mean, functionally speaking, in an analytical view of language, one that rejects the Part of Speech model as aprioristic and logic-based? As a structurally conceived word-class, the adverb is not a category at all, but a synthetic and synthesizing cluster of numerous paradigms. See above.

Function II

The converb an adnexal satellite (expansion-form). As brilliantly pointed out by Johannes LÖHMANN (1965: 295, see SHISHA-HALEVY 2009), the converb has striking affinities with the original and historically correct conception of the participle – μετοχή, not partaking of the nature of verb and noun or similar, but predicative-sharing or in predicative union (other more or less descriptive appellations, by Lohmann and others, are durchkonstruierter Satz, adsentenziale Subordination). The intriguing status and slot that has been variably called halb-prädikativ (Behagel), degradiertes Prädikat (Hermann Paul), Prädikative Apposition (Sommer), predicative (HASPELMATH 1995: 17ff., of participles nearest to Lohmann’s predicative sharing); second or secondary predicate (HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2005), all of which I prefer to call, following Otto Jespersen, adnexal (SHISHA-HALEVY 2007: 695 s.v.). The relationship of converbility with rhematicity, as a special sector of the clause-linkage spectrum, is here at issue.12 On a yet higher general plane, I would pose the question of the affinity of adverbiality to predicativity or rhematicity, an affinity manifested by formal similarities – consider the Arabic accusative, Welsh lision, or Coptic n-marking.

In the latter part of this paper, I shall suggest and illustrate13 Irish and Welsh candidates for converbhood, as well as syntags or elements of relevance to the study of converbs, in a brief commented typology. (Note that all converbs are emphasized; converbs are written as a continuous junctural unit.) In brief, Welsh and Irish converbs are formed by prefixing preposition-homonyms to the infinitives, or are infinitive-homonymous; in both cases, converbs may be finitized.

Adjunct converb I

In Welsh, this is a richer paradigm (category) of infinitive-base converbs than the schematic one, with their precise individual semantics still unclear.14

(1) Tawodd, gan-wlychu’i wefusau. He fell silent, moistening his lips.<br/>
(2) Bwytai’n araf dan-edrych o’i chwmpas. She ate slowly, looking around her.<br/>
(3) Cododd yntau dan-grynu. He arose, trembling.<br/>
(4) Ni ddywedodd yntau ddim wedi ei-ddarllen … He did not say anything after reading it.<br/>
(5) Oedd, mi roedd o yno, yn-siarad ac yn-lolian efo thair o enethod … Indeed, he was there, talking and fooling around with three girls.<br/>
(6) Gweld ei fam yn-gorfod gweithio’n galed ag yntau ‘n-ennil dim … Seeing his mother having to work hard and he earning nothing …<br/>12 The current concept of participant orientation (e.g. in HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2005) is germane here. This is essentially a complicated junctural feature, of the two predications inter-merging in looser linkage with common actants.
13 Examples are quoted from fiction by (ModW) Kate Roberts, Saunders Lewis, Islwyn Ffowc Elis, T. Rowland Hughes; (ModIr.) Myles na gCopaleen, Pádraic Breathnach, Pádraic Ó Conaire, Liam Ó Flaithearta. The examples are selective and representative.
14 The present writer is engaged in a special study of the construction and meaning of converbs in narrative, as part of a comprehensive study of Kate Roberts’s narrative syntax.
(11) D’airigh sé go raibh sí amuigh ag-damhsa.
›He noticed she was outside dancing‹.

Adjunct converb II

The converb completing a descriptive action-phase-marking finite verb: In information-structure terms, the converb is here a rhematic (predicative) complement.

(12) … gweld defaid a gwartheg yn-pori’n hapus a hamddenol … ›… seeing sheep and cattle grazing happily and leisurely.‹

(13) Stop an stócach óg ag-caint. ›The youth stopped speaking‹.

(14) Tosnaigh sé ag-rith. ›He started running‹.

(15) D’éiríos i-mo-sheasamh. ›I rose up (lit. arose standing)‹.

(16) ›­Tá mé tinn tuirseach ag-breathnú ort is ag-éisteacht leat! is chuir sí ina-sheasamh amuigh le balla sa gcúinne é. ›»I’m sick and tired watching you and listening to you!« and she made him stand (lit. put him standing) outside against the wall in the corner.‹

(17) Dhearnbaigh sé dhí, lom díreach, go raibh sé ag-dul ag-pósadh go luath. ›He declared to her, straight out, that he was going to get (lit. getting) married soon‹.

Rhematic converb, predicated in the existential-statal nexus pattern

(adverbial-rheme nexus)

The converb supplying periphrastic durative-statal and perfectal components of the verb-system.

(a) Observe in Welsh the typical interlocutive environment of the rhematic wedi-converb.

(b) The ›future‹ converbs in Welsh: deontic i-, ›tempus instans‹ am-: none expresses a purely temporal future (if there is such a thing).

(c) The embracing nexal negation of this pattern in Welsh, by means of ni-… (ddim) must be kept distinct from the negation of the constitutinal converb itself (for which see below).

(d) Observe in Irish the almost full resemblance of the intransitive converb to the incidental noun predication (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 193 ff., 201): Bhí Feardanand ina sheanduine críonna. ›F. was a wise old man‹.

(e) In the same rhematic slot in this predicative pattern we find in Irish also -ppp-type (-ta/te) participles, which are here considered and illustrated as converbs. However, adjectives that share this slot (tá sí óg ›she is young‹), while still adverbial in the paradigmatic sense, cannot be converbal (except in the sense of rhematic adverbials; non-verbal converbs is a contradiction in terms; SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 202 ff.).

(18) Yr ydych wedi-gorffen nofel, meddwch. ›You have finished a novel, you say‹.

(19) Nid wyf wedi-prynu llyfrau Cymraeg ers tro. ›I haven’t bought Welsh books for a while.‹

(20) Mae M. yn-ei-ddarllen rwân; ac yr wyf wedi-ei-dyngedu nad wy i-siarad efo mi. ›M. is reading it now; and I have condemned him not to speak to me.‹

(21) Ydach chi wir-yr am-brynu car? ›Are you really going to buy a cart?‹

(22) Caswell wy’ti i-fod i-ddweud. ›It’s »cage« you should call it‹.

(23) Dydach chi ddim am i-adael o … yn nag ydach, Mari? ›You are not going to leave him … are you, Mary?‹

(24) Pwy sy’n-dweud fy mod i am-dynnu’r drol? ›Who says I’m going to pull the cart?‹

(25) Tá sosarnach na bheithidi ar-siúl fós. ›The insects’ humming is still going on‹.

(26) Bhí a dhá suil ar-lasadh. ›His two eyes were ablaze‹.

(27) Tá tú le-pósadh! ›You are about to get married!‹

(28) Bhíos i-mo-shuí sa doras, ag-cur caoi ar lìonta ronnach. ›I was sitting at the door, repairing mackerel fishing-nets‹.

(29) Tá si báite. ›She has/is drowned‹.

(30) Tá sé réitte go … ‘It is said that…‹

(31) Cad a bhí déanta agam? ›What had I done?‹

(32) Ní raibh an tae ólta agam … ›I had not (yet) drunk the tea…‹

Adnominal converb

Only for non-specific substantival nucleus?

(33) … swn cath yn-erdded ar garped. … the sound of a cat walking on a carpet.

(34) … fel carcharor wedi’i-ddefrydu i far-wolaeth. ›like a prisoner condemned to death‹.

Focal converb (in cfeint sentence)

In Modern Welsh, the yn-converb in focal status is homonymous with the infinitive, but different in the topical construction of the Cleft Sentence: y-conversion, not a-. The converb may be part of ›Envelope Focussing‹ (SHISHA-HALEVY 1998: 28, 31).

(35) Clywed yr oeddech chi, gweld oedden ni. ›You were hearing; we were seeing‹.

(36) Nid gwarafun plieser i’w thad yr oed, ond gwarafun caethwed ar ei threfniaid ei hun. ›She was not refusing pleasure to her father, but refusing enslavement of her own arrangements.‹
(37) Gweiddi ormod yr ydan ni. ›We’re shouting excessively.‹
(38) Trio osgoi’r cwestiwn yr ydach chi, yntê? ›You’re trying to evade the question, aren’t you?‹
(39) Ina-sheasamh agus a dhá lámh ina phócaí aige ag breathnú ar bhád beag fúithí ar an duiirling a bhí F. Mac F. Lá Feile Sin Seáin … ›Standing on the beach with his two hands in his pockets, looking at a small boat with an opening in her bottom, was F. Mac F. on St. John’s Day.‹
(40) Ag-magadh fum a bhi sé, ag-magadh faoin amadán a chaith a chuid leis. ›He was mocking me, mocking the fool who spent his substance on him.‹
(41) Níd ag-éisteacht leis atáim, ach go bhfuil sé ag-dul tríom. ›I’m not listening to him: he is rather going through me.‹

Topicalized ›preset‹ converb
(42) Wrth-weled y cymylau duon a grogai fel bwganod dros y môr troes ei wyneb at Cwm Dugoed eilwaith. ›Seeing the dark clouds which were hanging like bogeys over the sea, he turned his face towards Cwm Dugoed once again.‹
(43) Wrth-edrych ar y llawr, yr oedd yno llanast anghyffredin. ›Looking at the floor, there was an uncommon mess there.‹
(44) Wedi-gadael y Bont a gadael llawer o bobl ar ôl yno, lleoddod y gorwelion … ›After leaving the Bridge and leaving many people back there, the horizons widened …‹
(45) Ach ag-iarraidh dul suas an cnoc dhó, chuala sé caoineadh caol crua … ›But, attempting (lit. he-attempting) to climb up the hill, he heard shrill, hard crying …‹

Converb in presented nexus (narrative/diologue)16
(46) Wedyn, dyma gyrchwyn i’r eae … ›Afterwards, they set out (lit. approx. here is setting-out) to the field …‹
(47) Dyna hi wedi-dwad. Approx. ›Here she is (having) come.‹ (’la voilà venue)
(48) Sin ’e anois é ag-damhsa agus ag-ceolteoiriacht. Approx. ›Here he is now, dancing and singing.‹

Converb in narrative nexus I
Dynamic tableau:
(49) Wedyn Wmffra’n-codi, ac yn-mynd i’r efn am y ddwy fûred. ›Then W. arising, and going to the back for the two ferrets.‹
(50) Ann yn-gwylltio ac yn-gweiddi digon i bobl y draws nesaf ei chlywed … ›Ann flying into a passion and screaming enough for the people next door to hear her …‹

Converb as narrative carrier I (Welsh)
The difference and interplay between the two converb forms is subtle and not easy to describe. In autobiographical diary-style or logbook-style narrative, yn-converbs are used for locutive (1st-person) pivotal events, and/or for durative action (SHISHA-HALEVY 1997).

(51) Gweiddi ar Merîri eneth hynaf i’r ty wedyn, iðdi redeg ar neges i’r siop … ›Shouting for M. the oldest daughter to the house, for her to run to the shop on an errand …‹
(52) Cychwyn dan-chwibanu ’n hapus … ›Setting out, whistling happily …‹
(53) Diwrnod golchi. W edi-rhoi fy nghas ar y peiriant golchi … ›Washing day. Put (lit. having-put) my pillow-case on the washing machine …‹
(54) Wedi-diffodd i gyd yr un dwaetha, codi fy ngolygon at y Mona Lisa, dim-yn-hoffi ei golwg o gwbl. ›Put (lit. having-put) out all the lights but the last, raising my eyes to the Mona Lisa, not liking her looks at all.‹
(55) Y gath yn-neidio ar fy nglin; yn-ei-hel i lawr. Penderfynu peidio â mynd i’r capel yfory. ›The cat jumping onto my knee; chasing her down. Deciding not to go to Chapel tomorrow.‹

Converb as narrative carrier II (Welsh)
a+ + infinitive to complete a hyper-event (SHISHA-HALEVY 1997):
(56) Diolchodd Harri a-chusanu Gr eta. ›Harri thanked and kissed Greta.‹
(57) Cododd Catrin a-mynd i eistedd. ›Catrin rose and went to sit down.‹
(58) Aeth allan a’i-gadael. ›He went out and left her.‹
Converbs in Welsh and Irish

Converbs in narrative nexus II

Logbook Style:
(59) Meddwl am ddoe, a dechrâu poeni ... Margiad yn-galw. Dweud yr hanes wrthi ...Thinking of yesterday, and starting to worry ... M. calling. Telling her the story ...<
(60) Poli wedi-gyrru Meg ym walgof yn y gegin. >Poli drove (lit. having-driven) Meg crazy in the kitchen.<

Converb with explicitly marked actants

Probably most challenging for the converbal interpretation of verbal forms, as well as instructive for the agglutinative typology of Irish and Welsh, is the specific morphological marking of a substantive or pronoun as the theme-agents constituent of a finite converb, or of a pronominal object actant of the converb’s lexicem rheme-constituent. Welsh object and agents actants are infixed, the former by homonyms of the possessive article or pronominal object actant of the converb’s lexemic theme-constituent. The question of Celtic converbs negatived is difficult. Welsh heb-, elsewhere without, inflects like any preposition. It appears to negative the converb as adverb, neutralizing yn-, wrth-, gan- and wedi- converbs (non-adverbial infinitives are negatived by peidio [r-]). Dim- is used to negate narrative converbs (see ex. 54).

Irish gan is highly grammaticalized, non-inflecting (gan tú, gan é), and by that token not properly prepositional; it seems to include a ›non-existence‹ semantic component. The precise details of the negation of the Irish converb are still obscure, but it does not seem that gan- alone is the negativizer in this case; may agus gan- be the negating exponent (agus adverbializing converber)?

Converbs with infixed lexicem modification

(Welsh)

A striking, difficult construction: lenition (if any) of the lexem is a signal of its relation with the ›prepositional‹ prefix, not governed by the prelexemic modifier, which appears in a ›phantom slot‹ in the syntagm.

(73) Yr oedd Rhys yn-hanner-cysgu wrth-gau ei ddillad. >Rh. was half-asleep upon buttoning his clothes.<
(74) Yr oedd wedi-dirgel-gredu yr edifarasai Aels am yr hyn a wnaeth. >He secretly believed Aels would repent for what she did.<
(75) Wedi-flawn-ddefro ysweddolodd i’w lawenydd mai dyma’r dadmer. >After fully waking-up, he realized, to his joy, that that was the thaw.<

Converbs negatived

The question of Celtic converbs negatived is difficult. Welsh heb-, elsewhere without, inflects like any preposition. It appears to negative the converb as adverb, neutralizing yn-, wrth-, gan- and wedi- converbs (non-adverbial infinitives are negatived by peidio [r-]). Dim- is used to negate narrative converbs (see ex. 54).

Irish gan is highly grammaticalized, non-inflecting (gan tú, gan é), and by that token not properly prepositional; it seems to include a ›non-existence‹ semantic component. The precise details of the negation of the Irish converb are still obscure, but it does not seem that gan- alone is the negativizer in this case; may agus gan- be the negating exponent (agus adverbializing converter)?

(76) Yr oedd yn lle digon hawdd loetran o’i gwmpas heb-i-nеб-eich-gwel. >It was a place easy enough to loiter around without anyone seeing you.<
(77) Ymddiheurfyr am yr holl oeddi yma heb-anfon i-ddiolch am y llyfrau. >I apologize for that whole delay in (lit. not) sending to thank you for the books.<
(78) ... nó gur thit mé siar ar mo thóin ... gan cois fáigtha agam le cur fám. ... until I fell back on my backside ... without a leg left to me to put under me.<
(79) ... toise gan Mairé a-bheith I mo theannnta. ... because of M. not being with me.<
(80) ... agus d’oibr sé seacht mbliana déag i Nua Eabhrach gan scribh aniarth go hÉirinn ca rabh a bheo nó a mharbh. ... and he worked seventeen years in New York without ever writing to Ireland to say whether he was alive or dead.<
In Kate Robert’s fiction, *typographical focussing* by segmental italicization (SHISHA-HALEVY 1995: §3.1.1) is consistently applied to the *yn/-wedi-* prefix – nucleus of the rhematic converbal syntagm, thus representative – of the whole nexus, for nexus focussing).

(82) *Rydw i yn-dibynnu arnoch chi.* I do rely on you.

(83) *Mi fasa’n haws gin Ann gredu ’mod i wedi-marw taswn i yn-sgwennu.* It would have been easier for Ann to believe I had written.

(84) *Rydych chi wedi-marw.* You have died.

Converbs in *adnexal nexus* (adverbal, adnominal to non-specific nuclei)

(85) *Yna, a’i gyfaill Emrys yn-eï-ddanfon, i fferddag ef.* Then, with his friend E. accompanying him on his way, he left (lit. away with him).

(86) *Agus a dhroim iompaithe liom, leag sé siar arís leath uachtarach a choirp.* With his back turned to me, he laid back again the upper half of his body.

(87) *Polláin agus-iad-lán le uisce.* small pools full of water.

Converbs in *rank-shifted nexus*

Exclamative nexus, nexus (or converb) as title, nexus as adjunct:

(88) *Ochón, a dúirt na daoine, fear bocht eile caillte!* Alas, said the people, another poor man lost!

(89) *Mé póxta íag seilg sna Rosae* »I married.«

[Hunting in the Woods.«]

(90) *Ni ar mo stól atáim anois an ar urlár … ise ina-suí le m’ais.* »It’s not on my stool that I am now but lying on the floor … she sitting at my side.«
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