

COMPLEMENTATION IN EARLY IRISH:  
THE *VERBA DICENDI*\*

RUAIRÍ Ó hUIGINN

*Department of Modern Irish, National University of Ireland,  
Maynooth*

The formation and structure of subordinate clauses is a field of study that has frequently claimed the attention of linguists. One area of particular interest concerns the syntax of what are referred to in traditional grammars as 'noun clauses' or in a more modern terminology as 'complement clauses'. Noun or complement clauses may follow a wide range of main-clause expressions. They may be governed by finite verbal phrases, may stand in apposition to nouns or pronouns or may otherwise be dependent on adjectival or adverbial expressions. An alternative designation for these structures derives from conjunctions that are sometimes used to introduce them; hence the term 'that-clause' has a certain currency in English, while the same can be said of German 'daß-Satz', Swedish 'att-sats' etc.

Most Indo-European languages show a divide between finite and non-finite complementation. The latter is represented by participial or infinitival constructions, while the Celtic languages use the verbal noun. Finite complement clauses are realized as clauses marked by introductory conjunctions or other complementizers, by a shift of mood or person or by a combination of two or more of these features. They may otherwise appear in paratactic juxtaposition to the governing expression with no overt form of marking.

Since the earliest documentation, we find in Irish an opposition between finite noun clauses and non-finite verbal-noun phrases. The present participle, so prominent as a subordinating strategy in eastern dialects of Indo-European, is attested but vestigially and occurs only in some lexical items, e.g. *carae* 'friend' < \**karants* etc. We have no evidence for its use in a verbal function. The non-finite subordinating device used in the Celtic languages is the verbal noun. In the absence of infinitive verbal forms in Celtic, the use in these languages of the verbal noun is of considerable interest and has called for explanation. Some scholars hold that it represents an innovation within the Celtic languages,<sup>1</sup>

\* Most of the material for this paper has been taken from my doctoral dissertation 'The noun clause in Early Irish: a historical and comparative study' (QUB 1989). Earlier versions of the paper were read at the Ninth International Congress for Celtic Studies (Paris, 11 July 1991) and at a seminar at Gothenburg University (1 December 1997). I wish to express my gratitude to the editors of *Ériu* for helpful suggestions and corrections made in the course of preparing this article for publication. Any errors or omissions are my own responsibility.

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., R. Jeffers, *Ériu* 29 (1978), 1–12.

while the more traditional doctrine ordains that the verbal noun with its nominal syntax represents an inherited archaism.<sup>2</sup>

The origin, use and syntax of the verbal noun in noun clauses has been the subject of a number of studies ranging from that of Baudiš<sup>3</sup> in the earlier part of this century to more recent works by Gagnepain,<sup>4</sup> Disterheft,<sup>5</sup> Gippert<sup>6</sup> and Genee.<sup>7</sup> These have shed much light on the use of the verbal-noun phrase and on syntactic developments pertaining thereto. In dealing with complement clauses, the studies of Gagnepain and Genee classify the governing expressions according to their semantic status<sup>8</sup> and not only list the verbal-noun constructions that follow each but also deal with examples of other possible constructions. It emerges from both works that the use of the verbal-noun phrase has increased from the Old to the Modern Irish period. Genee's work examines furthermore the use of the subjunctive in dependent clauses, tracing its decline and the concomitant increase in the use of the verbal noun in certain clause types.

The present study focuses on the particular type of complementation found in dependent clauses that follow expressions of speaking. This type has been dealt with by Gagnepain and by Genee, but the collections here are taken from a somewhat different range of texts than those used in their studies and, while the present work may complement them in some respects, the interpretation of data, emphasis and conclusions arrived at differ in certain points. In dealing with this single but central area of complementation some comments will also be made on more general aspects of complementation in Irish, on the use of different constructions in dependent clauses and also on the possible origin of certain of the constructions used.

The range of clauses in Irish that can be considered as noun clauses is quite wide. We find not only object (or subject) clauses that are governed by a wide range of finite verbs but also clauses that are dependent on adjectival, nominal and pronominal expressions. Thus we have clauses that are dependent on expressions of saying, thinking, knowing, perceiving etc. Noun- or adjective-based phrases such as *is dóig*, *is follus*, *is fír* etc. are likewise followed by noun clauses, and Thurneysen (*GOI* §503) would also include clauses governed by certain conjunctions,

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., D. Disterheft, *The syntactic development of the infinitive in Indo-European* (Columbus, Ohio, 1980).

<sup>3</sup> J. Baudiš, 'Zum Gebrauch der Verbalnomen im Irischen', *ZCP* 9 (1913), 380–417.

<sup>4</sup> J. Gagnepain, *La syntaxe du nom verbal dans les langues celtiques* (Paris 1963).

<sup>5</sup> D. Disterheft, *Syntactic development*.

<sup>6</sup> J. Gippert, 'Ein keltischer Beitrag zur indogermanischen Morphosyntax: das altirische Verbalnomen', in E. Crespo and J. L. G. Ramón (eds), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy* (Wiesbaden 1997), 143–64.

<sup>7</sup> I. Z. Genee, *Sentential complementation in a functional grammar of Irish* (Amsterdam 1998).

<sup>8</sup> Genee categorizes the governing expressions, or 'complement taking predicates' (CTPs), according to a system developed by M. Noonan in his study of complementation: 'Complementation', in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 2 (Cambridge 1985), 42–139.

which themselves are probably nominal or pronominal forms in origin, e.g. *acht*, *arindí*, *isindí* etc.

Finite noun clauses in Irish can be introduced by a variety of syntactic devices. For the early period we have no wide-ranging conjunction such as English *that*, Latin *quod*, *quia* Greek *ὅτι* etc. The corresponding subordinator in Old Irish is the nasalizing relative clause, the use of which is illustrated by the following examples:

- [1] *arnaro chretea mbías ícc do hua dia* ‘that he may not believe that he shall have salvation from God’ Ml. 127a7,  
 [2] *as-biur-sa nád n-ingén fer* ‘I declare that I know not man’ *Blathm.* 613,  
 [3] *conicc domberthar forcell* ‘a testimony may be given’ Ml. 24d14,  
 [4] *rolomur nondatges* ‘I dare to entreat Thee’ Ml. 21b5,  
 [5] *dóig linn bed nacuit* ‘it seems to us that it is the acute’ Sg. 30a8,  
 [6] *foisitiu ata pecthaig* ‘the confession that they are sinners’ Ml. 132a2.  
 As well as the use of this construction, we find that unmarked parataxis is frequently employed. In this construction the verbal complex of the subordinate clause shows no additional mark of subordination other than the possibility of changing person, tense or mood, e.g.  
 [7] *is airi asbersom is dia rodlabrastar* ‘therefore he says that it was God that had spoken it’ Ml. 126c10,  
 [8] *ro-fetar ropu sét cáeim* ‘I knew it was a treasured diadem’ *Fraech* 296,  
 [9] *is básad do sudiu ní arrbir biuth praint* ‘it is such a one’s habit that he cannot eat a meal’ *Lambeth* 131,  
 [10] *Anda leu nicon airtsitis cli fri alaile* ‘they thought they would not find one house-post against another’ *BBrigte* 4,  
 [11] *is derb limm attá latsu* ‘I am sure that you have it’ Wb. 29d14,  
 [12] *asbera tectid cach cumachte* ‘he will say he possesses every power’ Wb. 26a6.

Subordinating conjunctions may also introduce such clauses in Old Irish, but they are by no means as common as the constructions illustrated by the examples given in [1]–[12].

Thurneysen (*GOI* §896, §898, §909) lists three of these conjunctions: *co/co n-*, *ara n-* and *cía/ce*. The last of these need not concern us here. Its use is restricted to subject clauses and it appears following certain nominal or adjectival phrases. Even within its restricted range of use, it is doubtful if it ever developed the meaning ‘that’. In almost every case where ‘that’ is a possible translation we find that the alternative translations of the conjunction will serve equally well if not better.<sup>9</sup>

The use of *ara n-* is also somewhat restricted. It mainly occurs introducing indirect commands or desires, as in the following:

- [13] *asrubart dia friusom ara celebartis a sollumnu 7 arindmoldais* ‘God had told them to honour His festivals and to praise Him’ Ml. 102d3,

<sup>9</sup> Cf. R. Ó hUiginn, ‘Early Irish *cía/ce* “that”’, *Ériu* 42 (1991), 45–53.

- [14] *insce inso asber ar féda Ísu fri cach n-óen din chenélu dóine are n-índarbe analchi óod* ‘this is the word which our Lord Jesus saith to every one of the race of men, that he banish from him his vices’ *Thes.* 2, 244.21,
- [15] *guidmini airndip maith a forcell doberam díbsi* ‘we pray that the testimony which we give you may be good’ *Wb.* 25d21.
- In some cases *ara n-* can be used without this final function:
- [16] *toimtin armbenn duine* ‘the thought that I could be a man’ *MI.* 130d4,
- [17] *acht dlegair donaib críchaib seo ... ara mbé fer úaidib occa n-imchomé*t ‘but it is required of these lands that there should be a man from them to guard them’ *Bechbretha* §23.

Commenting on the use of this conjunction in noun clauses, Cecile O’Rahilly remarks that it is generally found in clauses expressing doubt, or following a negative main-clause verb.<sup>10</sup> These conditions are certainly met in many of the examples we have of ‘explicative’ *ara n-*, but there are other examples, such as [17], in which they would not seem to obtain, even allowing for the rather broad interpretation O’Rahilly gives the concept of ‘doubt’.

Attestations of explicative *co n-* are more infrequent than those of *ara n-* in the earlier language and it is found following various different kinds of governing expression, e.g.

- [18] *ci asberthar combad béim foris in dligid remeperthi* ‘though it is said that it is a recapitulation of the dictum aforesaid’ *Wb.* 10a12,
- [19] *huare as necen condib oinson tintá in son nebraide* ‘because it is necessary that one word should translate the Hebrew word’ *MI.* 37a10,
- [20] *ar cia beth con té in boct úanni* ‘for though it be that the poor man goes away from us’ *Lambeth* 196.

The use of these subordinating conjunctions *co n-* and *ara n-* as markers of the noun clause is probably late. *Ara n-* is otherwise found as a final conjunction, while *co n-* has a wide range of functions. Their use as markers of the noun clause has developed from these other well-established uses.

With *ara n-* the development took place through clauses such as [13]–[15], where the conjunction is used in its final function in an indirect command or wish. The command is uttered in order that what is contained in the subordinate clause may or may not be carried out. We note that such clauses formally belong to the prepositional relative construction, as *ara n-* is derived from the preposition *ar* and the relative particle (*s*)*a n-* (*GOI* §492). The development from preposition + relative

<sup>10</sup> C. O’Rahilly, ‘Three notes on syntax: 2. *Ara*“explicative conjunction’, *Celtica* 8 (1968), 160–2. The types of governing expression mentioned by O’Rahilly are those that would normally require a following subjunctive. It may be that the requirement of a subjunctive clause following these expressions attracted *ara n-*, the use of which is associated with this mood.

particle to conjunction can be explained in terms of the action (order, wish) being carried out in the first part of the sentence for which (*ara n-*, i.e. 'in order that') the outcome desired in the second part of the clause be realized. The surface similarity between this type of clause and others in which the verb of speaking did not impart a command or wish provided the semantic bridge that allowed *ara n-* to be used in a wider role.

As with *ara n-*, the final function of *co n-* would also have contributed to its development as a noun-clause conjunction. A probable starting-point here would have been the use of final *co n-* following verbs of entreating, such as *guidid* (which may also be followed by *ara n-*), e.g. [21] *rogaid ho dia conidnderoimed* 'he prayed of God that He should rescue him' *Ml.* 55d4.

In this case the clause following the verbal form *rogaid* could be taken as a final clause, if we accept that David prayed in order that God would rescue him, or it could be interpreted as a noun clause in that praying implies an act of thought or speech. The consecutive function of *co n-* would also have contributed to its development as a wide-ranging complementizer. The use of *co n-* following verbs of making or causing would have provided another starting-point, e.g.

[22] *cid fo-roar conid iudicium tar ési nduinoircne* 'what has caused it to be iudicium for murder' *Lambeth* 386.

*Co n-* can also be used in Old Irish in the so-called proleptic subject construction, in which the subject of the subordinate clause is treated as though it were subject or object of the governing expression,<sup>11</sup> e.g.

[23] *Oichonncatar Osseirge in mboin deirg arna marbad corbo coland duine* 'when the Ossraige saw that the cow that had been killed was the body of a man' *Ériu* 3, 141.200 (Expulsion of the Déssi),

[24] *o du ruidhmiset amne / Ísu combo thorise* 'when they thought thus that Jesus could be approached' *Blathm.* 217,

[25] *is áil in coicsed spirtálde conroib linn* 'it is desirable that we should have spiritual compassion' *Lambeth* 241.

This development of a noun-clause conjunction from an earlier final or consecutive function is not unique. The semantic overlap is one that is found in a number of languages. A parallel is found in Late Latin where the conjunction *ut*, originally having consecutive or final meaning, is sometimes found following declarative expressions of speaking where no final shade of meaning attaches to the clause. That *ut* did not develop fully in this function is probably due to the fact that other conjunctions, e.g. *quia*, *quod/quid*, were already at hand, and these in turn developed into the wide-ranging subordinating conjunctions *que*, *che* etc. of the Romance languages.

Regarding the position of the noun clause in Irish, we note that it must

<sup>11</sup> On this construction see M. A. O'Brien, 'Two passages on *Serglige Con Culaind*', *Celtica* 2 (1954), 348-9; C. O'Rahilly, 'Three notes on syntax', 162-6.

follow its governing expression (*GOI* §912) unlike many other types of subordinate clause, which may precede the principal clause and be brought forward in periphrasis with the copula. Where the content of the noun clause is to be emphasized, the device used in Old Irish for effecting this is extraposition involving the use of a neuter pronoun. In such cases, the neuter pronoun *ed*, in periphrasis with the copula, precedes the governing expression and anticipates the dependent clause, e.g.

[26] *is ed immurgu as-biur-sa frib-si arna raib lib cid a adbar inna duinoircne* 'this, then, is what I say to you, that you should not even have grounds for murder' *Lambeth* 331,

[27] *is ed asberat ind heretic as laigiu deacht maicc* 'this, then, is what the heretics say, that the Godhead of the Son is less' *MI*. 17c7.

The 3sg. neuter infixed and suffixed pronouns may also be used with governing verbs in anticipation of a following noun clause (*GOI* §421), e.g.

[28] *rafetarsa as peccad comaccobor* 'I know it, that concupiscence is sin' (lit. 'It know it, that ...') *Wb*. 3c22,

[29] *damunetarsom is fo sodin rogabad* 'they think it is of that that it was uttered' (lit. 'they think it, that ...') *MI*. 35b10.

Given the Middle Irish development in which infixed pronouns come to be petrified ever-present elements in most preverbal particles, it is possible that such examples as occur in earlier material are nothing more than early instances of what becomes a widespread feature in the later language. Such prolepsis, however, is not confined to verbal expressions as we also have instances of proleptic possessive adjectives accompanying governing verbal nouns, this being the nominal counterpart of the proleptic pronoun with verb, e.g.

[30] *tobertar desmrechta foilsí dia relad 7 dia demnigud as ndu christ rocét de* 'clear examples are given to manifest it and to confirm that it was sung of Christ' *MI*. 25b6.

In Middle and Modern Irish the use of such a proleptic possessive is extremely common, especially with the verbal noun *rádh(a)*, and in some cases seems to be practically obligatory.<sup>12</sup> It is difficult to establish if subordinate clauses anticipated by a pronominal element differ, or originally differed, in their semantics from those that are not so marked. We may note, however, that such a development apparently underlies the Germanic conjunctions *that*, *daß*, *att* etc., which likewise were originally pronominal elements used in anticipation of a following clause.

Our two main constructions, the nasalizing relative and parataxis, may alternate with each other, and I have no evidence that the use of one rather than the other is indicative of a semantic difference in the clause. Some governing expressions, however, show a preference for one over the other. When the nouns *bés* or *bésad* 'a custom', for instance, are followed

<sup>12</sup> See M. Ó Siadhail, *Modern Irish: grammatical structure and dialectal variation* (Cambridge 1989), 259.

by subordinate clauses it would appear that parataxis is by far the preferred finite construction in Old Irish,<sup>13</sup> e.g.

[31] *is bésad inna flatho doem et dofich* ‘it is the usage of the prince that he protects and he punishes’ Wb. 9d2 (see also [9]).

The expression *anda ia/inda la/da la/dar la* etc. ‘it seems to’ also shows a marked preference for this construction in the early period (see [10]), a preference that has been maintained until comparatively recent times.<sup>14</sup> Separation of the noun clause from its governing expression by intervening elements such as a second clause can also be conducive to the use of parataxis, e.g.

[32] *ar rofetarsa, co tísat na doíni atbathatar ó thossuch domuin, ní thic assin magin in rolád* ‘for I know until those who have died since the beginning of time return, it will not come from where it has been placed’ *Fraech* 275,

[33] *arna érbarthar o chrestit nin tá airli ar mban* ‘lest it should be said, since they have believed, we have not the management (?) of our wives’ Wb. 31c7.

The well-known oath formulae *tongu do dia toinges mo thuath* and *tongu a toinges mo thuath*, together with their many variants, belong to this category in that the primary governing verb, *tongu*, is separated from its subordinate clause by the remainder of the formula. In an overwhelming majority of the instances I have collected from Old Irish texts, the following clause is in parataxis, e.g.

[34] *tongu do dia toingthe hUlaid ... notninus amail negar forcor hi lunggu* ‘I swear by the god by whom the Ulstermen swear ... that I shall drub you as flax-heads are beaten in a pool’ *TBC Rec.* 1 4099.

Not infrequently, one or more further subordinate clauses may intervene between the governing *tongu* and the noun clause, e.g.

[35] *Tongu do dia toingear mo thúath mád meso a bláth lat indiu oldás a llaithi dondmbiurt-sa duit isin letir i crích nUlad, cia no beidis fir hÉrind ocot anocol airim-sa, nítansitis* ‘I swear the oath of my people that, if its condition be worse with you today than on the day I gave it to you on the hillside in the territory of Ulster, even though the men of Ireland were protecting you against me, they would not save you.’ *TBC Rec.* 1 4018.

Where a sequence of parallel noun clauses occurs, it sometimes happens that only the first of these is marked. The second (and subsequent) clause(s) may appear in parataxis (*GOI* §505). Occasionally, however, the first clause may not show any formal sign of grammatical subordination, while second or subsequent clauses may be marked (see [39]).

<sup>13</sup> See further Wb. 4d15, 14c21, 24d11; Ml. 40c15, 90d12, 98a4; *Lambeth* 131; *Thes.* 2, 245.33 (Cambrai Homily). See also Ó hUiginn, ‘Noun clause’, 314. The related noun *bésgne* ‘custom’, on the other hand, takes a following nasalizing relative clause at Wb. 14c12.

<sup>14</sup> See R. Ó hUiginn, ‘*Dar la*’, in A. Ahlqvist and V. Čapkova (eds), *Dán do oide: essays in memory of Conn R. Ó Cléirigh 1927–1995* (Dublin 1997), 545–58.

On the other hand, there are cases where the nasalizing relative is clearly the preferred construction. The verb *do-adbat* 'shows' and its verbal noun *taidbsiu*, for instance, are followed by a nasalizing relative noun clause in 20 of the 21 examples I have collected from the Old Irish Glosses.<sup>15</sup> The phrase *ní nad/nach* 'it is not that ...' is also of common occurrence, and the use of the dependent negative particle is seemingly obligatory therein, e.g.

[36] *ní nach thised a gním* 'not that his work has not come' Wb. 26a12. Likewise, the use of the dependent negative is required in the phrase *becc na(d)*, *becc nach* 'almost', which has noun-clause syntax, e.g.

[37] *bec nád mýchtha doíne impu* 'people were almost stifled around them' *Fraech* 246.

I have observed no clear tendency in other cases where the sample is sufficiently large to allow any conclusions to be drawn, but the overall trend seems to be that parataxis is at its most extended in early texts, losing ground thereafter to the nasalizing relative. This would be in keeping with the development of the nasalizing relative in other clause types where a certain expansion in its use is to be noted in Early Irish texts. Thus, to take the Old Irish Glosses, for example, we find that parataxis is used in *c.* 44% of the noun clauses (132 examples) in the Würzburg Glosses,<sup>16</sup> the nasalizing relative accounts for *c.* 38%, while the remaining 18% of the clauses are introduced by conjunctions—*ara n-* (7%) or *co n-* (7%)—or are ambiguous (4%) as to the construction used. In Milan (187 examples), on the other hand, parataxis appears in only *c.* 15% of the examples, while the nasalizing relative is in *c.* 70%. The statistics for St Gall (60 examples) are again *c.* 70% of the examples with nasalizing relative, 15% with parataxis.

Apart from this overall trend, and the preference of some governing expressions for certain constructions, we should note two further important features, both of which concern the morphology of the verb in the subordinate clause. Firstly, we find that parataxis is more likely to occur in subordinate copula clauses, a feature that is also associated with the use of parataxis in the other clause types in which the nasalizing relative may be used. In the Würzburg Glosses 37 of the 58 paratactic clauses I have collected contain the copula, while of the 29 paratactic

<sup>15</sup> Wb. 6d6, 7a13, 12a6 (*ostenditur*), 12a11, 12d20, 19b14, 23a13, 27d13; Ml. 20a21, 30b2, 30b11, 46b28, 51c11 (*duadbat 7 relaid*), 56c11, 94c10, 145c8; Sg. 140a4, 200b3, 207b9, 209b30. Parataxis occurs at Ml. 47a17, where the dependent clause contains the copula. In *doadbadar as chomsuidigthe* 'it is shown to be a compound' (Sg. 207b9), lenition following the relative copula *as* is irregular in a clause of this nature. The editors' emendation to *comsuidigthe* is probably correct.

<sup>16</sup> This evidence is drawn from the collections in Ó hUiginn, 'Noun clause', 167–221. The figures cover noun clauses that are governed by main-clause verbal, nominal, pronominal or adjectival expressions and include only subordinate clauses that have a governing expression in the Irish text. Clauses governed by conjunctions such as *acht* 'save that', *issindi* 'in that' etc. are not included here. Glosses dependent on expressions in the Latin text have been ignored for present purposes, as have clauses that are introduced by *cia/ce*.

noun clauses collected from Milan no fewer than 23 contain the copula. In the St Gall corpus ten of the twelve paratactic clauses have the copula as their verb.<sup>17</sup>

Conversely, we find that the presence of the negative in the noun clause is quite conducive to the use of the nasalizing relative. Over half of the nasalizing relative noun clauses in the Würzburg Glosses are negative and, while the total of nasalizing relative noun clauses in Wb. stands at c. 38%, the figure for its use in negative clauses is of the order of 64%. In Milan, where the total figure stands at 70%, the figure for its use in negative clauses rises to an extraordinary 96%.

There is, however, a category in which the independent negative *ní* is frequently retained in a noun clause. This is where the dependent clause contains a jussive subjunctive verb, e.g.

[38] *is mebir lib-si cissi fírinne ro-boí la suidiu .i. ní accobritis duinorcín* 'you remember what kinds of justice they had, that is, that they should not commit murder' *Lambeth* 329,

[39] *ba coscc carat limm dí a gentlidi níptha labar et nípad ro(mór) nothocctha et armtha tairismech in hiris* 'it were a friend's advice for you, O Gentile, you should not be talkative, and you should not boast overmuch, and you should be constant in faith' Wb. 5b32,

[40] *apair fris, ní húasligethar nach mbrithemoin* 'tell him, let him not exalt any judge' *AM* §23,

[41] *abbair fris, ní rannaire ríamnae góe* 'sag ihm, er soll kein Austeiler geschminkter Lüge sein' *ZCP* 11, 83 §30 (*AM*),<sup>18</sup>

[42] *as-bert friu ní remtiastais in rí* 'he told them that they should not go before the king' *BDD*<sup>1</sup> 302.<sup>19</sup>

The syntax of such clauses is complex. The jussive subjunctive is distinguished from the imperative in that immediate compliance with the command is not contemplated (*GOI* §516). In dependent clauses, however, the subjunctive with *ara n-* can be used for both types, and it is not always easy to establish which corresponding main-clause mood, imperative or jussive subjunctive, is intended. Retention of the main-clause structure without any governing conjunction, as in our examples here, was apparently one way of distinguishing them.<sup>20</sup>

In affirmative jussive clauses, on the other hand, the use of *ara n-* is usual, and its negative form *arna* may also appear. In this respect, example [39] is of interest for, while independent *ní* appears in the first and second of three parallel clauses, the conjunction *ara n-* appears in the third clause, which is affirmative.

<sup>17</sup> While the use of parataxis is pronounced in copula clauses, the nasalizing relative is nevertheless the dominant construction in these clauses in Ml. (62 examples v. 23 of parataxis) and Sg. (29 examples v. 8 of parataxis). Parataxis, however, dominates in Wb. (37 examples v. 33 of nasalizing relative).

<sup>18</sup> Note the variant reading *Apair fris, naba rannaire romna góa* (*ibid.*).

<sup>19</sup> Note the variant reading from LU: *asbert friu nád remthiastais in rig* (6788).

<sup>20</sup> The fact that paratactic jussive subjunctive clauses are so prominent in the early text *Audacht Moráimn* suggests that this is an old syntactic feature.

There is a certain ambiguity attached to dependent jussive subjunctive clauses. They can be interpreted as object clauses in that they are governed by verbs that normally take a direct object (or object noun clause), or they can be seen as final clauses in that the command is issued in order that an action be realized. Evidence of this ambiguity can be adduced from sporadic instances of indirect injunctions being treated as ordinary noun clauses and employing the (nasalizing) relative markers, e.g.

[43] *ci asidrubartha nad tintaesiu a llatin do gregaib* ‘though I have said thou shouldst not translate it out of Latin for Greeks’ *MI*. 3a15, and note the variant readings of [41] and [42], which likewise show dependent syntax.

In this context the *Cín Dromma Snechtai* version of *BDD* provides an interesting example in which different negative constructions are used in stylistic alternation with each other in a series of parallel jussive subjunctive clauses:

[44] *asbert Ninión druí bátar n-é airchoilte a flatha arná hechtrad a Temraig cach nómaid aidche 7 ní fuinmilsed gata ina flaith 7 na gabtha díberg 7 ní dírsed augra in dá tuathmaíl tuath Maugnae 7 ná foíed hi taig asmbad ecna soilse iar fuiniud gréne* ‘Ninion the druid said that these were the prohibitions of his reign, that he should not go out of Tara every ninth night, and that he should not allow thefts in his reign, and that plunder should not be taken, and that he should not settle the quarrel of the two tribal slaves of North Maugnae, and that he should not sleep in a house from which after sunset light would be visible’ *LU* 8019.

Despite the prominence of parataxis here and in the other categories mentioned above, dependent construction is best established in Old Irish with the negative. In some cases this is to the total exclusion of parataxis, the phrases *ní nad/nach* (see [36]) and *becc nad/nach* (see [37]) being cases in point.

By the end of the Old Irish period the nasalizing relative construction was established as the dominant construction in most types of noun clause. The use of parataxis and, to a lesser extent, the conjunctions *co n-* and *ara n-* was also possible but on the evidence of the Milan and St Gall glosses these are very much less favoured. Developments in the verbal system of Middle Irish, however, were to lead to the total collapse of the nasalizing relative, and by the tenth century it is all but moribund.<sup>21</sup> A bipartite system then emerges in which affirmative noun clauses are marked by *co n-*, while negative noun clauses are marked by *na(ch)* or, less frequently, *cona(ch)*.

This system evolved during the course of the Middle Irish period. As in Old Irish, marking is most prominent and best established in negative

<sup>21</sup> For this development see R. Ó hUiginn, ‘The Old Irish nasalizing relative clause’, *Ériu* 37 (1986), 33–87: 69–75.

clauses, where the markers *nach* and *nad* are reflexes of the Old Irish relative negations as used in the nasalizing relative clause. Paratactic negative clauses are still found, but the majority of the examples occur in the categories in which parataxis would have been prominent in Old Irish, i.e. following *inda la*, oath formulae, separation of the clause from its governing expression etc., and even in most of these categories formal marking is gradually established. The retention of parataxis in negative jussive subjunctive clauses is also instanced, e.g.

- [45] ‘*iss ed atderim-sea rit ám*’, *bar Fingin fáthlaig*, ‘*nír ármea do bú móra bar dartib*’ ‘what I say to you’, said Fingin, the seer-physician, ‘is that you should not exchange your great cows for yearlings’ *TBC-LL* 3760.<sup>22</sup>

Marking of affirmative clauses seems to have been much slower. It will be recalled that, although explicative *co n-* is already found in Old Irish, attestations are not very numerous. Its development in the function of a wide-ranging explicative conjunction belongs to the Middle Irish period, and it does not seem to have been fully established in this role until the twelfth century.<sup>23</sup>

We may note that dependent construction with *co n-* or *nach/na* extends in Middle Irish, not only to clauses in which the nasalizing relative is found in Old Irish but also to certain types of clause that would have allowed only of parataxis (or of the verbal-noun phrase) in the earlier language, e.g. following the noun *bés*, *bésad* and the phrase *inda la*, e.g.

- [46] *is bes coitcenn fon doman conidh misgaisiu lasna tuathaib na tigerna clechtait forru* ‘it is a common custom throughout the world that the people hate the rulers with whom they are acquainted’ *CCath* 5106,

[47] *indar let co tuitfedh* ‘you would think that it would fall’ *CCath* 341. Separation of the dependent clause from its governing expression no longer inhibits the marking of the clause. Contrast, for instance, the following example from the late Stowe version of *Táin Bó Cuailnge* with the same passage from the earlier first recension ([35]):

- [48] *Do-berim-si brethir ris madh measa a blat[h] no a lesugadh let aníú no in lá do-radius-[s]a duit é isin letir i Cruachain Aí, da mbetdis fir Erenn ’cut hanacal orm, nach aineocdais thú* ‘I pledge my word on it that if its preservation and condition be worse with you today than on the day when I gave it to you on the hillside at Cruachain Aí, even if the men of Ireland and of Alba were protecting you against me today, they would not save you’ *TBC St* 4822.

<sup>22</sup> See also LL 31717, *Immrama*, 29, line 130.

<sup>23</sup> Parataxis is dominant in the affirmative noun clauses following *as-beir/ráidid* in *TBC Rec. 1*, *Trip*<sup>2</sup>, and markedly so in *TTr.* (see Appendix). The numbers of paratactic affirmative clauses and affirmative clauses introduced by *co n-* are roughly equal in *TBC-LL* and in *TTebe*. Only in *TBC St* and in the texts from the Modern Irish period is *co n-* clearly dominant. While these figures refer solely to clauses following *as-beir/ráidid*, my collections of other noun clauses show a roughly similar picture (see my study of the development, ‘Noun clause’, chapter 6).

By the Early Modern Irish period parataxis is at best a rarity, though still attested following the expression *dar la* and in some other instances.<sup>24</sup> In the present-day language the formal marking of noun clauses through *go* or *nach(ar)/na* is all but obligatory.

That *co n-* rather than *ara n-* assumed this dominant role may have been aided by the fact that explicative *co n-* could be followed by the indicative as well as the subjunctive mood and thus did not have the restrictions attached to it that pertained to *ara n-*, which always required the subjunctive. While the use of *ara n-* persists throughout the Middle Irish period in indirect commands etc., we have evidence of it losing ground to *co n-* from an early stage, e.g.

[49] *Rí roraíde friu cen lén ... co nderndtais doib eclais nglain* ‘the King ordered them without sorrow to build a pure church for themselves’ SR 4185.

Already in *Saltair na Rann* instances of *co n-* are more frequent than those of *ara n-* in this function.<sup>25</sup> A hybrid conjunction, *arco*, appears in later Middle Irish, e.g.

[50] *rádis Fergus fri Fiachu mac Fir Aba ar co ndigsed do acallaim Con Culaind* ‘Fergus told Fiachu mac Fir Aba to go and speak with Cú Chulainn’ TBC-LL 1718,

but does not survive.

Side by side with these developments in finite clauses we also find that a non-finite verbal-noun phrase can more or less discharge the same function as a clause. Unlike finite clauses, the verbal noun is not marked for person, tense or mood, such features being supplied where possible by the addition of prepositions or adverbials, or by the general context in which it is used. The verbal noun can be used following not only expressions that require the nasalizing relative but also those that allow only of parataxis in finite clauses.

The verbal-noun constructions that we encounter are basically of two types. In the first type the verbal noun stands as direct complement to an expression (verbal, nominal, adjectival etc.) in the main clause. Its object is expressed genitively (or by a possessive adjective) and its subject introduced by the preposition *do*, or may otherwise be expressed in a genitival relationship:

[51] *tecmaing dano buith briathar huadaibsem* ‘it happens then that verbs are (derived) from them’ Sg. 156a2,

<sup>24</sup> Parataxis is not uncommon in texts written in this period that are based on earlier works (e.g. The Stowe version of *Táin Bó Cuailnge*) or in texts written in an archaizing style (e.g. *BARuaidh*). It is also found occasionally in poetry. The Early Modern Irish examples that occur in our collection (i.e. in *St. Erc.* and *BARuaidh*) very often involve the use of the copula form *ba* in the dependent clause. With regard to the expression *dar la*, note that marking of the following subordinate clause by *co n-/nach* etc. is attested from at least as early as the twelfth century (see Ó hUiginn, ‘*Dar la*,’ 556).

<sup>25</sup> The use of *co n-* is attested at 1795, 1813, 4185, 5621, 5641, 5642. *Ara n-* is attested at 1989, 4481, 6742.

- [52] *co n-epert fris-som tódúscad na mbó* ‘she told him to bring the cattle back to life’ *Trip*<sup>2</sup> 156,
- [53] *ba ferr limm immurgu buith di in ógi* ‘I had rather, however, that she were in virginity’ *Wb.* 10b24.
- In the second type the object precedes its verbal noun, to which it is connected by means of the preposition *do*, e.g.
- [54] *inda leis Cothraige do thiachtain isteach i roibhe* ‘he thought he saw C. coming into the house in which he was’ *Trip*<sup>2</sup> 221,
- [55] *ni guid digail du thabairt foraib* ‘he prays not that punishment should be inflicted on them’ *Ml.* 42a4,
- [56] *is bes tra isind libursa briathra na salm anall do erlabrai ánd* ‘it is customary then in this book to say the words of the psalms’ *Ml.* 26c6.

This division between finite clauses and non-finite verbal-noun phrases is found elsewhere in the system and is still a feature of the modern language, even though certain of the syntactic features associated with the verbal noun in the examples given above are no longer used. A verbal-noun phrase can do duty for a subordinate clause in very many instances, with the two constructions being apparently interchangeable. Yet the exact conditions under which one construction may replace the other are not at all clear. Thurneysen, in discussing the use of the nasalizing relative in noun clauses, remarks that this construction can be used ‘generally in all contexts where the complement of the principal clause can be more conveniently expressed by a second clause than by a noun’ (*GOI* §503). The criterion of convenience, however, is not explained and is far from clear.

So also in Modern Irish we find that the two constructions may alternate with each other to a certain degree. The standard grammar of the modern language, that of the Christian Brothers, remarks that a verbal-noun phrase may sometimes be used for a clause but also points out that there are many cases in which this cannot happen.<sup>26</sup> Some governing expressions require a finite following clause, while others allow only of a verbal-noun phrase. Similar, though not identical, restrictions evidently obtained in the earlier language.

It is clear that in the early as well as in the modern language an element of choice obtains with both constructions. In Modern Irish we find a degree of dialectal variation, with the verbal-noun phrase being favoured by the Northern dialects in certain types of clause, while the finite clause introduced by *go* or *nach* is preferred elsewhere.<sup>27</sup> This is not to say that the distribution and use of the different constructions has remained constant since the Old Irish period. As we know, the verbal-noun phrase plays a far greater role in Modern Irish in certain types of clause than it did in the earlier language. In some cases the verbal-noun phrase has

<sup>26</sup> *Graiméar Gaeilge na mBráithre Criostaí* (Dublin 1960), §692.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ó Siadhail, *Modern Irish*, 255–6.

established itself to the total exclusion of the finite clause. In Old Irish, for instance, expressions of potentiality or ability may be followed by a finite clause very often with a co-referent subject, e.g.

[57] *ní cumcat sídī beta ndobriathra* ‘these cannot be adverbs’ Sg. 220a7,

[58] *cuin as túalaing duine rob teist for anmannuib ala n-aile* ‘when is a person competent to answer for the souls of others’ *Apg. Ch.* 90.

See also [3]. These would be quite impossible in the modern language where a verbal-noun phrase with equi-noun phrase deletion would be required following expressions of potentiality.<sup>28</sup>

A well-known and particularly interesting exploitation of different verbal-noun constructions for semantic purposes is evident in the syntax of one clause type, to which we will now turn our attention. These are clauses that are governed by *verba dicendi* or expressions of speaking, in particular the verb *as-beir* and the Middle and Modern Irish *ráidid*. Our discussion is based mainly on the evidence of the collections I have made from a number of texts ranging from the Old Irish to the post-classical Modern Irish periods (see Appendix). In dealing with this material I include not only examples of finite verbal forms governing noun clauses but also examples of clauses governed by non-finite forms of the verbs as well as those governed by pronominal elements used with the verbs (e.g. proleptic pronouns).

Two types of complementation occur with *as-beir/ráidid*. In the first type we have to do with a simple declarative use of the verb. In the second type we have to do with indirect commands, where the verb imparts an injunction. We shall look at each in turn.

#### TYPE A

The following subordinate clause is a simple statement. In such cases it can be followed by all possible constructions, parataxis, nasalizing relative, conjunctions *co n-* and *ara n-*, and the verbal noun:

[59] *ci asberat doaidbdeatar físi doib* ‘though they say that visions are shown to them’ Wb. 27a27,

[60] *asrubartsom rongaid dia* ‘he said that he had prayed to God’ Ml. 53b26,

[61] *dicunt alii combad celebrad trátha* ‘others say that it is celebration of the canonical hour’ Wb. 25c23,

[62] *na epred a menme armbad ferr són* ‘let not his mind say that that would be better’ Wb. 10a16,

[63] *ba bec mad asberad a derschugud do doinib* ‘it were little if he said that He excelled men’ Ml. 129b12.

<sup>28</sup> The verbal-noun construction following *con-icc* is already found in Old Irish (see Genee, *Sentential complementation*, 226–8, and Gagnepain, *La syntaxe du nom verbal*, 85). For expressions of potentiality in the modern language see Ó Siadhail, *Modern Irish*, 292–3.

Instances of the verbal noun in both the declarative and the jussive clauses are somewhat problematic. Firstly, the verbal noun can act as a concrete noun without any verbal content being implied. In some of our examples it is not easy to establish whether the function of the verbal noun in the dependent phrase is verbal or nominal. Secondly, given that the verbal noun is unmarked for tense or mood, it is not easy to establish whether the underlying clause is imperative, jussive subjunctive, or declarative. This can sometimes be adduced from the context, but it is not always possible to do so. A similar problem attends clauses that are introduced by *ara n-*, in that it cannot always be ascertained whether the subordinate clause is imperative or jussive subjunctive. In categorizing the clauses, I have included all examples where the content appears to be jussive (subjunctive or imperative) under type B. The distribution of these constructions for type A in the Old Irish Glosses is as follows:

	Nasal rel.	Parataxis	<i>co n-</i>	<i>ara n-</i>	Verbal noun	Ambiguous
Wb.	5 (19%)	15 (56%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
MI.	37 (56%)	15 (23%)	1 (1%)	0	8 (12%)	5 (8%)
Sg.	4 (25%)	9 (57%)	0	0	3 (18%)	0

#### TYPE B

In this type the choice is between a conjunctive finite clause introduced by *ara n-* or by the verbal-noun phrase. Neither the nasalizing relative, the conjunction *co n-*, nor parataxis are employed in the Old Irish Glosses.<sup>29</sup> In Middle Irish the conjunction *co n-* or the hybrid *arco n-* often appear for *ara n-* (see [49] and [50]).

[64] *is hed asbeirsom híc ara tartar airmitiu féid donaib preceptorib* 'it is this he says híc, that honour be given to the teachers' Wb. 15a19,

[65] *co n-erbairt fris techt do procéupt do Goidelaib* 'and he told him to go to preach to the Irish' *Trip*<sup>2</sup> 281.

To gain a picture of how the two types develop over a longer period of time I have excerpted the relevant examples from a range of texts extending from the Old Irish period down to the later part of the Early Modern Irish period. In making this collection I have ignored samples occurring in verse sections of prose texts. For statistical purposes I have counted examples of parallel noun clauses governed by the same expression as one example, and they are classified according to the construction used in the first clause. The findings are presented in the following statistical table; references to the examples are in the Appendix.

<sup>29</sup> I have ignored examples of the construction in which the imperative mood is retained in an indirect command but hope to deal with them in another paper.

	Type A ( <i>declarative</i> )		Type B ( <i>jussive</i> )	
	Clause	Verbal noun	Clause	Verbal noun
Wb.	24 (93 %)	2 (7 %)	2 (40 %)	3 (60 %)
Ml.	58 (88 %)	8 (12 %)	5 (56 %)	4 (44 %)
Sg.	13 (87 %)	2 (13 %)	0	0
<i>TBC Rec.</i> 1	32 (97 %)	1 (3 %)	6 (67 %)	3 (33 %)
<i>Trip</i> <sup>2</sup>	45 (96 %)	2 (4 %)	3 (43 %)	4 (57 %)
<i>TBC-LL</i>	28 (97 %)	1 (3 %)	10 (45 %)	12 (55 %)
<i>TTr.</i>	32 (100 %)	0	0	4 (100 %)
<i>TTebe</i>	14 (82 %)	3 (18 %)	0	14 (100 %)
<i>TBC St</i>	44 (100 %)	0	6 (27 %)	16 (73 %)
<i>St. Erc.</i>	63 (100 %)	0	0	13 (100 %)
<i>BARuaidh</i>	34 (100 %)	0	1 (33 %)	2 (67 %)
<i>TDGr.</i>	27 (100 %)	0	0	15 (100 %)
<i>TGGr.</i>	9 (100 %)	0	0	7 (100 %)

The picture that emerges from the table is relatively clear. Although both clause and verbal-noun phrase are found in the two types of complementation in Old Irish, the evidence of the examples we have collected shows the finite clause to have been the more common construction in both in the earlier period. The verbal-noun phrase is clearly the less popular alternative but is more prominent in indirect commands (B) than in declarative sentences (A), and indeed in Würzburg occurs in slightly more examples than does the finite clause.

Gradually a bipartite system evolves in which the verbal-noun phrase comes to dominate in type B, that is, in indirect commands, to the apparent exclusion of the clause. Correspondingly, we find that in type A the reverse takes place and the finite clause comes to be the sole construction, with the use of the verbal noun receding totally. The picture presented by *TTr.*, *TDGr.* and *TGGr.* etc. is more or less what we find in Modern Irish. Although the verbal-noun construction is poorly attested in type A in this text, the progression in type B can be clearly seen in the statistics for the three versions of *TBC*. Thus in some cases where *TBC-LL* uses a jussive subjunctive clause, the Stowe version of the text has a verbal-noun phrase, e.g.

[66] *Rádis fria araid ar co ragbad in n-echrad 7 ar co n-indled in carpat*  
 'he told his charioteer to harness the horses and yoke the chariot'  
*TBC-LL* 528

(= *Raidhis ier sin frisan araidh an eachraidh do ghabail 7 an carpat d'innell TBC St* 544),

[67] *Rádis Medb fria muntir ara tiastais i comruc 7 i comlund fri Coin Culaind*  
 'Medb ordered her people to go and fight and do combat with Cú Chulainn'  
*TBC-LL* 1362

(= *Raidhis Medb and sin fria muintir nec[h] eigin aca do dul ar cend Con Culainn do comrac TBC St 1397*).<sup>30</sup>

Likewise, in the declarative type the use of *co n-* replacing parataxis from Rec. 1 through the LL version of the text to Stowe can be clearly observed, e.g.<sup>31</sup>

[68] *Rádis Redg no bérad ainech Con Culaind* ‘Redg said that he would deprive Cú Chulainn of his honour’ *TBC-LL 1809*

(= *Raidis Redg co mberad oinech Con Culainn TBC St 1842*).

The retention in Stowe of some jussive subjunctive clauses in type B and of parataxis in type A can evidently be ascribed to the influence of the older text on which it is based.

A somewhat similar argument can be invoked to account for the occurrence of the jussive subjunctive in the early seventeenth-century *Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill*:

[69] *atbert frisan ffoirinn ro ordaigh i rémthus na conaire co ndianascnaitis remhibh* ‘he told the party whom he had ordered to take the van to march forward rapidly’ *BARuaidh 226.37*.

It will be noted from the table above that the number of examples of type B is rather small for what is a lengthy text. This is explained by the fact that the verb *for-congair* is used in preference to *as-beir* or *ráidid* in a further nine examples of indirect injunctions, while *ordaigid*, *erbaid*, *smachtaid* and *eráilid* all occur in one instance each, performing much the same function. Examination of these reveals that the usual construction is the verbal-noun phrase, but that [68] is not isolated is shown by the fact that in two examples the verb *for-congair* is followed by a conjunctive clause, e.g.

[70] *ro fhorchongair forsan dala rann...go rémthiegtais gusan slógh nechtrond* ‘... ordered the second division to advance towards the foreign army’ *BARuaidh 226.20*.

These aberrations from the trend, however, can be explained in terms of the text, which is written in a highly archaizing style. Not only was the author fully familiar with and competent to use inflected predicative adjectives, verbal forms that were long obsolete by his time, infixed pronouns and a number of other features, but he also seems to have had an understanding of earlier syntactic structures, such as parataxis, the nasalizing relative and the conjunction *ara n-*, and used them to effect. The use of conjunctive finite indirect commands is another such feature.

In Modern Irish the two types of complementation are distinguished in that the use of the verbal noun is reserved for indirect orders, while the declarative use of the verb requires a finite clause. From the evidence of our collections, this system had not fully evolved until the late Middle

<sup>30</sup> See also LL 1357 = Stowe 1391; LL 1388 = Stowe 1423; LL 1730 = Stowe 1773.

<sup>31</sup> In fact the two examples of declarative *as-beir* + *co n-* that occur in Rec. 1 are found in the later *Aided Fir Diad* section of the text. There are, however, several instances of other governing expressions followed by *co n-*clauses in that text.

Irish period, and even thereafter, as we have seen, the use of the jussive subjunctive clause following *as-beir/ráidid* remained a possibility, although for the later period it is probably to be considered an archaism.

The evidence of our Old Irish sources suggests that a different system may once have prevailed in which jussive clauses appeared in the subjunctive (with or without a conjunction), while the declarative use of *as-beir* required a finite clause (with or without the nasalizing relative). The general extension in the use of the verbal noun saw it being used in both types of clause, but only in the jussive type did it take root, owing to the desirability of making a clearer distinction between the two meanings of *as-beir/ráidid*.

Regarding the use of the verbal noun following declarative *as-beir/ráidid*, this is usual where the governing verb is embedded in certain types of relative clause, e.g.

[71] *ind aimser in eperr cetal ind sailm* ‘the time at which the psalm is said to have been sung’ Ml. 24d14,

[72] *in foscad báis autem a n-apar a mbith* ‘the shadow of death in which it is said they were dwelling’ *Trip*<sup>2</sup> 45,

[73] *is suaichnid sund tra as rect maid asmbeir do airiuc túas* ‘it is obvious here, then, that it is a good law which he says above he has found’ Wb. 3d10.

This use of the verbal noun is also frequent after other governing expressions, verbs and copula phrases that occur in similar syntactic environments.

Note in the following examples that the verbs *dorigensat* and *adopar* might be taken either as relatives or as noun-clause verbs dependent on the preceding expressions *asmbeir* and *as tech [dech] latsu*:

[74] *isí in miscuis clóin asmbeir dorigensat assir* ‘that is the iniquitous hatred of which he says that the Assyrians were guilty’, or ‘it is the iniquitous hatred that he mentions that the Assyrians had’ (lit. ‘did’) Ml. 46d10,

[75] *is ed insin as tech latsu adopar dait* ‘it is that which you deem best is offered to you’, or ‘it is that which you most like to be offered to you’ Ml. 73a10.

The possible ambiguity in such cases may be responsible for the choice of the verbal noun in examples such as [71]–[73]. This use of the verbal noun with declarative *as-beir/ráidid* in such relative sentences continued until well into the modern period but has been replaced by the so-called ‘double relative construction’, e.g.

[76] *an íodhbairt ghlan ... adubhairt an Tigearna do déantaoui do ofrálu-ghadh* ‘the pure sacrifice which the Lord said would be offered’ *Eochairsg.* 24.

Clauses such as [71]–[75] account for a minority of the verbal-noun constructions following declarative *as-beir* in our collection.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Instances of this construction in our material are: Wb. 3d10, 9b7; Ml. 24d14, 126c1; *Trip*<sup>2</sup> 42, 45; *TTebe* 1319. The rule that Genée (414) formulates to deal with such clauses,

Attestations of other *verba dicendi* in my material are not as numerous, but those that do occur have either a declarative or a jussive function. As the semantic division evident with *as-beir/ráidid* does not arise here, we find that verbal noun and clause can be used interchangeably. *Ad-fét* and the related *as-indet* occur five times with finite clauses in the Old Irish Glosses (Wb. 12d20, Ml. 14c19, 54a12, 84d8, 93d14) and three times with a verbal-noun clause (Ml. 104c5, 108b6, 128a15). The finite clause is preferred in *TBC* Rec. 1 (1380, 2740, 3380, 3397, verbal noun 4003), but only the verbal noun is found in the later LL version of the text (2515, 2784, 3945, 4598, 3983). The verbal noun is also preferred in the Stowe version (2809, 2812, 3846, 3910, 3945, clause 99, 150), and is the only construction found in *Bethu Phátraic* (980) and in *Togail Troí* (LL) (31023, 31070, 31357). A preference for the finite clause is again evident in *Togail na Tebe*, with seven examples (556, 786, 1288, 1295, 1573, 2995, 3344) against four of the verbal noun (1606, 2148, 2149, 2993). This preference is more marked in *Stair Ercuil*, with eight attestations of the finite clause (26, 89, 133, 224, 226, 1645, 1663, 2038) against one of the verbal-noun phrase (1229). *BARuaidh* shows three examples with a finite clause (70.27, 212.14, 260.9), while the verbal-noun phrase appears in a further five (32.24, 72.30, 130.26, 144.18, 276.35). *TDGr.* provides two examples, both of which are finite clauses (1205, 1661).<sup>33</sup>

With verbs of ordering, the verbal-noun phrase is clearly preferred. Apart from *as-beir/ráidid*, the main representative of this class in my material is the verb *for-congair*. This usually requires a following verbal-noun phrase, but, as we have observed above, *BARuaidh* provides two examples of finite jussive subjunctive clauses (112.24, 226.20). This, however, is probably to be taken as one of many archaisms in the text. Other verbs of ordering that occur in the collection, such as *erbaid*, *ordaigid* and *eráilid*, occur only with a verbal-noun phrase.

---

i.e. 'if the M[atrix]C[lause] is a relative clause express the complement as a non-finite prepositional C[omplement]C[lause] with the preposition *do*' (see [73]), is somewhat too general. Some of the clause types she would assign to this 'special syntax' (p. 138, n. 29) are not so restricted, as counterexamples with finite clauses are found, e.g. *is airi asbeirsom a eperit doib* 'therefore he says that they said it' Ml. 31b17; cf. *is airi asbertar ata cétmídi in chamthuisil* 'therefore the oblique cases are said to be primitive' Sg. 197a2 (see also 50a4, 143a1, 197a2, 208a1)

A number of the examples listed by Gagnepain and discussed by Genée do not belong here. In Sg. 40a11 the governing verb is not *as-beir* but *ar-beir*. In Ml. 26a8 we have an instance of the phrase *as-beir do* 'applies to', and the following verbal noun should be taken in its concrete rather than in its verbal sense. It may be that an element of 'contextual backgrounding' led to it being felt more convenient to use a verbal noun instead of a clause in some of the remaining examples, i.e. information available from the context can establish subject and tense of the verbal-noun phrase and thus make it, with its minimal requirements, more attractive than a finite clause. This in itself cannot explain the phenomenon, as many instances of finite clauses are likewise backgrounded. Rather than trying to explain away the small but significant number of instances of declarative *as-beir* + verbal noun, it seems better to accept them as instances of a marginal syntactic structure in declarative clauses that failed to take root.

<sup>33</sup> A similar picture emerges from Genée's (*Sentential complementation*, 145) discussion of this verb.

Turning now to a more general consideration of our findings, we can make some further observations about the distribution of the finite and non-finite constructions. Firstly, we find that the verbal-noun construction is very poorly attested in copula noun clauses. Although the verbal noun *buith* does duty for both substantive verb and copula, it does not appear in our collections as a copula.<sup>34</sup> All examples we have are of its function as verbal noun to the substantive verb. When the verb of the subordinate clause is the copula, then the clause apparently must be finite and will frequently be in parataxis. This restriction would explain the use of finite clauses following some expressions of potentiality, as the dependent verb in such clauses is very often the copula (see [57] and [58]). Only at a later stage, when the construction *attá + i + noun* is developed, does it become possible to use the verbal noun *buith* in clauses of this kind. Secondly, we find that negative verbal-noun constructions are very poorly attested in the earlier language. This probably reflects the fact that the language seems to have had some difficulty in negating the verbal noun. A number of different constructions are found. The verbal noun can be made negative by addition of the prefix *neph-*, e.g.

[77] *ní eperr nephmolad dé di* 'it is not said that it is not to praise God'  
 Ml. 145c3.

This, however, is abandoned and replaced by an analytical construction involving the use of the preposition *cen* (*can/gan*) 'without':

[78] *is ed adbert fris ... can tiachtain arís* 'he told him not to come again'  
 TTebe 23.

From my collections, negative noun clauses involving the use of the verbal noun are rather thin in the Old Irish material, and a look at the material assembled by Gagnepain, Baudiš and others shows a similar paucity of examples for the earlier language, even though this use of *cen* is attested at an early stage and develops greatly thereafter. The use and distribution of the different constructions suggest that unmarked parataxis is one of the oldest complement constructions in affirmative clauses. Its predominance in early texts and its later persistence in copula clauses are a strong indication thereof. The nasalizing relative, however, comes to play the dominant role in Old Irish and is probably at its most extended in the Milan Glosses. This use of a relative marker to introduce noun clauses is of course paralleled elsewhere. Latin *quia/quod*, Greek *ὅτι*, English *that* etc. are all relative pronouns or markers that develop to be subordinating conjunctions. The Irish nasalizing relative is different in that it is an enclitic, subject to the workings of Wackernagel's Law, and thus unable to develop as an independent conjunction. This restriction undoubtedly contributed to its ultimate demise.

Apart from its use in the noun clause, the nasalizing relative is employed as a marker of subordination in a wide variety of dative or adverbial clause types and is thus found following antecedents of time,

<sup>34</sup> This verbal noun is infrequently attested as a copula form elsewhere, see *DIL* s.v. *buith*.

manner, cause etc. Its origin is a matter of debate, and theories range from its being the reflex of a pronoun or particle to its being a relatively late and analogical development based on the more central leniting relative clause.<sup>35</sup> It is, moreover, a feature of the early language and becomes moribund in the early Middle Irish period. Its use in the noun clause, however, shows marked differences to its use as a relative marker in temporal, manner and causal adverbial clauses. In a study of these latter categories I have attempted to show that the degree to which it may alternate with parataxis is not nearly as wide as Thurneysen's *Grammar* might lead us to believe.<sup>36</sup> The frequent use of unmarked parataxis in these clauses is encountered only where the clause contains the copula or, less commonly, an infixed pronoun. In other cases the use of the nasalizing relative is all but obligatory and parataxis is at best a rarity. The freedom to use parataxis in place of the nasalizing relative in these clauses, therefore, is more or less determined by the morphology of the verbal complex in the clause.

The noun clause, however, presents us with an entirely different picture. Here, the use of parataxis is unrestricted by considerations of morphology and it may occur in most types of clause regardless of the verb therein. This marks a clear division between the nature of the nasalizing relative in this type of clause and its use in the other categories, where it can be argued it has a truly relative function. Our observation that there is a fundamental and underlying division between the use of the nasalizing relative in the noun clause and in other types of subordinate clause is further supported by developments in Middle Irish. As is known, the use of the nasalizing relative gives way in the Middle Irish period to that of the leniting relative in most categories that would have used the former construction in Old Irish. Thus antecedents of time, manner etc. generally take the leniting relative construction in Middle Irish.<sup>37</sup> The noun clause does not share this development but instead, in the course of time, adopts the bipartite system of *co n-* and *na(ch)-* that we have discussed above.

The fact that the nasalizing relative is not nearly as firmly established in noun clauses as it is in other categories suggests that its use here is secondary and that it was introduced as a marker of subordination from oblique relative clauses. This would have been a comparatively late development in the prehistory of Irish.

Here as elsewhere, however, the case with negative clauses is clearly quite different. Our evidence suggests that marking through negative *na (d), nach* is quite old. The statistics have shown that subordination is more likely to be marked in a negative clause than in other types. Not

<sup>35</sup> See, e.g., Ó hUiginn, 'Nasalizing relative', 75–86, and P. Schrijver, *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles* (Maynooth 1997), 99–113, for a discussion of these theories.

<sup>36</sup> See Ó hUiginn, 'Nasalizing relative', 69.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 71–5.

only this, but the dependent negation is seemingly a prerequisite in certain fixed phrases that are in origin noun clauses (e.g. *bec nad, ní nad*).

The verbal-noun construction appears to have started off from a rather narrow base but clearly grew in importance in the course of time. The evidence we have adduced suggests that its use in negative noun clauses is poorly established in the early period and that the use of *na(d)/na(ch)*+finite verb was the earlier subordinating strategy here. Likewise the dominance of the finite construction in copula clauses to the almost total exclusion of the verbal-noun phrase suggests that the range of use of the verbal noun may have been quite restricted in the prehistoric period.

From the foregoing it is clear that in Irish the morphology of the verb in the dependent clause played an important role in determining which subordinating strategy would be used. An interesting parallel to this is offered by Welsh. Since the earliest documentation Welsh has shown a system of marking noun clauses by non-finite verbal-noun constructions, by what are historically paratactic clauses introduced by preverbal particles or by the negation *na(d)*. The context for using one or other of these constructions is conditioned entirely by the status of the verb in the subordinate clause. If the clause is affirmative, then either the verbal-noun construction or a finite clause may be used. If the clause is negative, a finite construction with *na(d)* is required. A number of different verbal-noun constructions occur:<sup>38</sup>

[79] *mi a wn dy hanuot om gvaet* 'I know that you are of my blood' *CO* 167,

[80] *ac un onadunt a dywawt gallel yslipanu cledyueu* 'and one of them said he could burnish swords' *CO* 782,

[81] *a chyt dywettit uot porthawr ar lys Arthur* 'and though it was said that Arthur's court had a doorkeeper' *Owein* 4,

[82] *ny thebygaf i y un o hyn uynet ar dy geuyn di* 'I do not think that one of them will go on your back' *PKM* 25.16.

As with Irish, the tense of the verbal noun can be inferred from the context, but dependent clauses in the past or pluperfect can be so marked by the extension of the verbal particle *ry* to the verbal noun, a feature not paralleled in Irish, e.g.

[83] *a gwedy clybot ry uarw brenhin Freinc* 'and after hearing that the King of France had died' *C.Ll.Ll.*<sup>2</sup> 16.

As well as the various verbal-noun constructions, a finite noun clause introduced by a preverbal particle, *y(dd)*, *yd* or *y(r)*, may be employed,<sup>39</sup> e.g.

[84] *ac adaw idaw ... yd aei y'r Ysphaen* 'and he promised him that he would go to Spain' *BBCS* v. 209.15,

<sup>38</sup> See M. Richards, 'Syntactical notes: the subject of the verb noun in Welsh', *Études Celtiques* 5 (1951), 51–79, 293–313.

<sup>39</sup> *GMW*, §187, §190.

- [85] *ef a dybygei ... yr ymordiwedei a hi* 'he thought he would overtake her' *PKM* 10.29,
- [86] *Lleuelis a dywawt y gwydyat ehun ystyr y dyuodyat y'r gwladod hynny* 'Lleuelis said that he himself knew the reason for its coming to those lands' *C.Ll.Ll.*<sup>2</sup> 68.
- As these particles also serve to introduce main clauses, their use in the noun clause represents nothing more than an original parataxis. Where the clause is negative, however, the dependent negative *na(t)* is required:<sup>40</sup>
- [87] *kyt tebyckych na bo hawd* 'though you might think that it is not easy' *CO* 576,
- [88] *dywedaf wrthyt ... na dywedeis ys blwydyn y gymmeint yn y kyfryw le a hwnn* 'I will tell you that I have not, for a year, said as much in such a place as this' *PKM* 7.14,
- [89] *ac gwedy dywedwyt o'r kennat nat oed namyn ef ac vn esweyn y gyt ac ef* 'and after the envoy had said that there were but he and one squire with him' *BrutBr.* 138,
- [90] *hynn hagen a kadarnhaaf, na bydy vyth vn anryded a'th chwyoryd* 'this, however, I do confirm that you will never be of the same rank as your sisters' *BrutBr.* 45.

Although the Welsh system differs in many respects from that of Irish, there are some points of convergence and some notable similarities. The use of parataxis in affirmative clauses is prominent in both languages, while negative clauses usually show formal marking. The requirement that negative clauses be marked is apparently absolute in Middle Welsh, while in Old Irish it is quite pronounced. This similarity may not be entirely coincidental for, while the markers used in these clauses, W. *na(t)* and Irish *na(d)*, are not exact cognates, they have in common the negative element *na*. This derives from the Indo-European negation *\*ne*, and its confinement to the secondary role of dependent or prohibitive negative arises from the fact that it was replaced in its primary function by new main-clause negatives in both branches of Celtic, OIr. *ní* (originally the copula *\*ne-est*) and W. *ny(t)*. That this development took place in both branches of Insular Celtic is testimony to the antiquity of dependent *na*. The dominance of W. *na(t)*, OIr. *na(d)/na(ch)* in noun clauses has resulted in the all but total exclusion of the verbal-noun construction from negative noun clauses in the earliest attested periods of both languages.<sup>41</sup>

The question of complementation in Irish and the conditions that govern the use of different constructions may be approached in a number of ways. The semantics of the clause can obviously have a bearing on the choice of construction, as we have seen above in the development of declarative *as-beir* and of jussive *as-beir*. There are many cases, however,

<sup>40</sup> *GMW*, §183(a). The alternative constructions listed in §183(b)–(d) are not relevant here.

<sup>41</sup> The somewhat limited use in Irish of main-clause *ní* in the noun clause may reflect further encroachment of this secondary negation on the territory of *\*ne*.

where constructions are interchangeable, and, for these, stylistic more than semantic considerations are probably the determining factors. Apart from considerations of semantics and style, this study has shown that another feature, namely the structure of the verb in the dependent clause, plays a central role in determining the choice of subordinating device to be used in the early period.

#### APPENDIX

Collection of dependent noun clauses and verbal-noun phrases  
 Copula clauses are marked (c) and negative clauses are marked (n)  
 where not included under a separate heading.

#### WÜRZBURG

##### *Type A*

nasalizing relative: 2c24 (c), 16b19, 17a12 (c), 17a13 (c), 18d1  
 parataxis: 4c23 (cn), 7d8(c), 10d13 (c), 15a12 (c), 17c6 (c), 22b23, 23d25 (c),  
 24a28 (c), 26a6, 27a26 (cn), 27a27, 29b12 (c), 30c12 (c), 31c7, 32a20  
*co n-*: 10a12 (c), 25c23 (c)  
*ara n-*: 10a16 (c), 17d11  
 verbal noun: 3d10, 9b7

In 26a1 *ci asberat dofeil laa mbrátha* 'though they say that Doomsday is at hand' the verbal form *dofeil* is ambiguous as to whether the nasalizing relative or parataxis has been used. It is clear, however, that neither *co n-*, *ara n-* nor the verbal noun is involved here. Such instances of ambiguity occur only in Old Irish texts, i.e. where the nasalizing relative is a possible construction. These clauses are counted as instances of parataxis in the Middle Irish material.

##### *Type B*

*ara n-*: 15a19, 21d11  
 verbal noun: 9b19, 10a4, 24c10

#### MILAN

##### *Type A*

nasalizing relative: 3a15 (n), 17c7 (c), 20b2 (n), 20c5 (n), 21c11 (c), 24d4 (cn),  
 24d23 (c), 24d25 (c), 24d29 (c), 25b5 (cn), 26c1 (c), 27d10 (n), 33c17 (n),  
 44b19 (cn), 50d1 (n), 50d2 (n), 51a19 (c), 53b26, 53d6 (cn), 54c23, 55d25 (n),  
 56b15 (n), 57c4, 59a18 (n), 63b12 (c), 65d13 (c), 76a5 (c), 90c9 (n), 97d4 (n),  
 97d5 (n), 122d7, 124d9 (n), 130a6 (c), 131c3 (c), 131c12 (c), 131c14 (c), 136b4  
 (cn)  
 parataxis: 16c10, 17b23, 30c3 (c), 35a8 (c), 37a14 (c), 37b19 (c), 44c9 (c), 44c19  
 (n), 45d8 (c), 56b33 (n), 67d8 (c), 93d14 (c), 94a6, 126c10 (c), 132a1 (c)  
 ambiguous: 30c3, 32c15, 95a5, 92c4, 106d3  
*co n-* : 34d6  
 verbal noun: 24d14, 31b17, 67c2, 76a6, 126c1, 128d14, 129b12, 145c3

*Type B*

*ara n-*: 46a12, 54c18, 102d3, 125c2, 145d4  
 verbal noun: 15a2, 72b3, 83a5, 145d4

## ST GALL

*Type A*

nasalizing relative: 40a15 (n), 197a2 (× 2c), 218a6 (cn)  
 parataxis: 5b6 (cn), 18a4 (c), 25b6 (c), 50a4 (c), 100a9 (c), 127b4 (c), 146a1,  
 161a2 (n), 208a1 (c)  
 verbal noun: 58b1, 59a5, 187b5

*Type B*

no examples

## TBC REC. 1

*Type A*

nasalizing relative: 147 (c)  
*co n-*: 2571 (c), 2896 (c)  
*na(ch)/nad*: 545 (c), 704 (c), 719, 3152, 3194 (c), 4004 (c)  
 parataxis: 189 (c), 562, 613, 905, 1272, 1373 (n), 1516, 1767 (cn), 1899, 2051,  
 2492, 2586 (c), 2609 (cn), 3178, 3342 (n), 3349 (c), 3377 (c)  
 ambiguous: 1266, 1430, 1754, 1882, 2316, 3445  
 verbal noun: 4091

*Type B*

*ara n-*: 137, 689, 1001, 3082, 3927  
*co n-*: 2470  
 verbal noun: 1662, 1751, 1761

BETHU PHÁTRAIC (*Trip*<sup>2</sup>)*Type A*

nasalizing relative: 828 (c), 2209 (n), 2283 (n), 2293 (n), 2362 (n), 2655 (n),  
 2802 (c)  
*co-*: 63 (c), 64 (c), 1175 (c), 1392, 2343 (c), 2713 (c)  
*na(d)/nach*: 629, 1087, 1477, 1712, 1715 (c), 1813, 2200, 2205, 2244, 2267, 2357,  
 2397, 2398 (c), 2455 (c)  
 parataxis: 282 (c), 584 (c), 789 (c), 869, 1165, 1576 (c), 1672 (c), 1731 (c), 1736  
 (c), 1928 (cn), 2173, 2358 (c), 2372 (c), 2605 (c), 2786 (c), 2998  
 ambiguous: 1501, 1977  
 verbal noun: 42, 45

*Type B*

*co n-*: 2870  
*ara n-*: 1634, 2241 (c)  
 verbal noun: 156, 281, 2324, 2649

*TBC-LL**Type A*

*(ar)co n-*: 361 (c), 750, 826, 1817 (c), 2534 (c), 2541 (c), 2543 (c), 2609 (c), 3877 (c), 4861 (c)  
*na(ch)*: 1805 (c), 3775, 3822 (c), 3847 (c), 3973 (c)  
 parataxis: 113 (c), 135, 926 (c), 958 (c), 1095 (cn), 1664 (c), 1809, 1819 (c), 2007 (c), 2322, 2837 (c), 3673 (c), 3760  
 verbal noun: 1605

*Type B*

*arco n-*: 174, 528, 1352, 1357, 1388, 1718, 1730  
*ara n-*: 824, 1335, 1362  
 verbal noun: 124, 125, 394, 1341, 1915, 1922, 1973, 1975, 2461, 3640, 3660, 3997

*TOGAIL TROÍ (LL)**Type A*

*co n-*: 31908, 31136  
*na(ch)*: 30876, 30975, 31148, 31295, 31625, 31630, 31695  
 parataxis: 30907 (c), 30924 (c), 30970 (c), 31056 (c), 31073 (c), 31107 (c), 31124, 31129, 31158 (cn), 31296, 31604 (n), 31611 (n), 31619 (c), 31632 (c), 31647 (c), 31674 (c), 31679, 31713, 31717 (cn), 32027 (c), 32608 (c), 32687 (c), 32842 (c)

*Type B*

verbal noun: 31030, 32041, 32689, 32731

*TOGAIL NA TEBE**Type A*

*co n-*: 163 (c), 340 (c), 2115 (c), 2179, 2683 (c), 3306  
*cona*: 224 (c)  
*na(ch)*: 818, 4134 (c)  
 parataxis: 816, 831, 1629 (c), 1631 (c), 3847  
 verbal noun: 119, 1319, 1690

*Type B*

verbal noun: 23 (n), 34 (n), 67, 124 (n), 415 (n), 475, 477, 1507, 2579, 2599, 3850 (n), 3918, 3925, 4660

*TBC STOWE**Type A*

*co n-*: 33 (c), 34 (c), 38 (c), 39 (c), 373 (c), 554, 777, 992, 1439 (c), 1704 (c), 1739 (c), 1842, 1851 (c), 1853 (c), 1908, 2531 (c), 2538 (c), 2540 (c), 2606 (c), 2684 (c), 2837 (c), 3597 (c), 3820 (c), 4910 (c), 5016 (c).  
*na (ch)*: 856, 1130 (c), 1590, 2728 (c), 2759 (c), 3553 (c), 3776 (c), 3796 (c), 3915, 3936  
 parataxis: 133, 143, 1761 (c), 1766 (c), 1767 (c), 2045 (c), 2359, 2437, 2955 (c)

*Type B**ara n-*: 1371, 1760, 2823, 2839*(ar)co n-*: 185, 1387

verbal noun: 127, 408, 544, 854, 1320, 1377, 1391, 1397, 1423, 1442, 1773, 1950, 1958, 2010, 2453, 4884

*STAIR ERCUIL OCUS A BÁS**Type A**co n-*: 229, 258, 272 (c), 274 (c), 286 (c), 439, 447, 486 (c), 673, 703, 706, 707, 843, 982, 990 (c), 1133 (c), 1138, 1140, 1152, 1184, 1262, 1364, 1621 (c), 1649, 1667, 1843, 1957 (c), 1978 (c), 2008, 2018 (c), 2031 (c), 2048, 2059, 2068, 2070, 2084 (c), 2088, 2144, 2222 (c), 2292, 2365 (c), 2366, 2423, 2439, 2486*na(ch)*: 206 (c), 229, 366, 534, 581 (c), 707, 887, 1165, 1838, 1842, 1850 (c), 1860, 2324, 2364, 2558, 2587

parataxis: 2038, 2142

*Type B*

verbal noun: 710, 794, 816, 976, 1173, 1207, 1656, 1677, 1807, 2062, 2152, 2325, 2357

*TÓRUIGHEACHT DHIARMADA AGUS GHRÁINNE**Type A**co n-*: 216, 359, 582 (c), 769, 827 (c), 865 (c), 1294 (c), 1306, 1322, 1323, 1330, 1393 (c), 1425, 1462*na(ch)*: 278, 965 (c), 1068, 1108, 1355, 1390, 1438 (c), 1447, 1471 (c), 1504, 1506, 1702, 1752*Type B*

verbal noun: 125, 207, 212, 221, 629, 653, 722, 1067, 1087, 1404, 1421 (n), 1491, 1536, 1588, 1776

*BEATHA AODHA RUAIDH UÍ DHOMHNAILL**Type A**co n-*: 4.7 (c), 48.26, 116.20 (c), 116.22 (c), 120.26 (c), 128.1 (c), 128.26 (c), 172.19 (c), 178.12 (c), 178.30, 184.15 (c), 208.26 (c), 220.21 (c), 220.22 (c), 222.27, 270.15 (c), 274.18 (c), 276.14 (c), 276.22 (c), 328.32 (c)*na(ch)*: 8.10, 50.14 (c), 124.7, 184.20 (c), 208.19 (c), 314.10 (c), 338.19

parataxis: 130.17 (c), 172.3 (c), 172.20 (c), 220.14 (c), 328.35 (c), 338.10 (c), 338.15 (c), 338.18

*Type B**co n-*: 226.37

verbal noun: 36.1, 228.35

## TÓRUIGHEACHT GRUAIDHE GRIANSHOLUS

## Type A

co n-: 22.15 (c), 24.26 (c), 86.17 (c), 92.9 (c), 96.12 (c), 132.17 (c)  
 na(ch): 88.22 (c), 90.6 (c), 104.13 (c)

## Type B

verbal noun: 88.26, 88.28 (n), 100.28, 108.13 (n), 114.7, 132.8, 132.20

## ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in this study are those employed in the Royal Irish Academy's *Dictionary of the Irish language (DIL)* with the addition of the following:

<i>AM</i>	F. Kelly (ed.), <i>Audacht Morainn</i> (Dublin 1976).
<i>Apg. Ch.</i>	V. Hull (ed.), 'Apgitir Chrábaid', <i>Celtica</i> 8 (1968), 44–89.
<i>BARuaidh</i>	P. Walsh (ed.), 'Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill', <i>ITS</i> 42, (London 1948).
<i>BBCS</i>	<i>The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies</i> (Cardiff, 1921–93).
<i>BBrigte</i>	D. Ó hAodha (ed.), <i>Bethu Brigte</i> (Dublin 1977).
<i>BrutBr.</i>	B. Roberts (ed.), <i>Brut y Brenhinedd</i> (Dublin 1971).
<i>C.Ll.Ll.</i> <sup>2</sup>	Brynley F. Roberts (ed.), <i>Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys</i> (Dublin 1975).
<i>CO</i>	R. Bromwich and D. Simon Evans (eds), <i>Culhwch ac Olwen</i> (Cardiff 1988).
<i>GMW</i>	D. Simon Evans, <i>A grammar of Middle Welsh</i> (Dublin 1964).
<i>GOI</i>	R. Thurneysen, <i>A grammar of Old Irish</i> (Dublin 1946).
<i>Lambeth</i>	J. Carney and L. Bieler (eds), 'The Lambeth Commentary', <i>Ériu</i> 23 (1972), 1–55.
<i>Owein</i>	R. L. Thomson (ed.), <i>Owein (Chwedyl Iarlles y Ffynnawn)</i> (Dublin 1968).
<i>PKM</i>	I. Williams (ed.), <i>Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi</i> (Cardiff 1930).
<i>TBC-LL</i>	C. O'Rahilly (ed.), <i>Táin Bó Cuailnge from the Book of Leinster</i> (Dublin 1967).
<i>TBC Rec. 1</i>	C. O'Rahilly (ed.), <i>Táin Bó Cuailnge: Recension 1</i> (Dublin 1976).
<i>TDGr.</i>	N. Ní Shéaghda (ed.), 'Tóruigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne', <i>ITS</i> 48 (Dublin 1967).
<i>TGGr.</i>	C. O'Rahilly (ed.), 'Tóruigheacht Gruaidhe Grian-sholus', <i>ITS</i> 24 (London 1924).