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**FRI DAY, MARCH 27TH  Chavez 405**

Session 1: _Phonology, Information Structure and Syntax_. Chair: Heidi Harley

1-1:45  
*Plenary talk:* Mélanie Jouitteau (LLF, CNRS, Paris 7), Inquiry at the syntax/PF interface: Evidence from Breton*

1:45-2:15  
Emily Elfner, (UMass), The Interaction of Linearization and Prosody: Pronoun Postposing in Irish and Scottish Gaelic

2:15-2:45  
Ann Mulkern, (Indep scholar), Irish Pronoun Postposing and Information Structure

2:45-3:00  
Coffee break

Session 2: _U of Arizona Colloquium Talk:_ Chairs: Natasha Warner and Andrew Carnie

3:00-4:30  
*Plenary Talk:* Jim McCloskey (UCSC) Irish Existentials.

_Dinner and Party at the Auld Dubliner Pub on University Avenue. Cash bar. Dinner can be purchased from a limited menu_
Saturday, March 28, 2009,  

**Session 3: Morphology; Chair: Mike Hammond**

9-9:45  **Plenary Talk:** Maggie Tallerman (Newcastle), Phrase structure vs. dependency: the analysis of Welsh syntactic soft mutation

9:45-10:15 Kenji Oda (Toronto) Preverbal Particles and dependent verbal forms in Modern Irish

10:15-10:45 Colin Gorrie (Arizona) Morphophonological features and the Gaelic Adjective

10:45-11 **Coffee Break**

**Session 4: Old Irish; Chair: Sheila Dooley**

11-11:30 Aaron Griffith (Vienna) pro in Old Irish

11:30-12 Elliot Lash (Cambridge) Old Irish Standard of Comparison Constructions

12-12:30 Jenny Graver (Oslo) The Old Irish passive, its realizations and development.

12:30-2 **Lunch break**

**Session 5: Phonology; Chair: Diana Archangeli**

2-2:45  **Plenary Talk:** Máire Ní Chiosáin (UCD), and Pauline Welby, (LPL, CNRS, Aix-en-Provence), An investigation of the syllabification of Irish.

2:45-3:30  **Plenary Talk:** SJ. Hannahs. (Newcastle), The interaction of sonority sequencing and foot structure in Welsh

3:30-4:15  **Plenary Talk:** Anna Bosch (UKy) Transcription: The Phonology Phonetics Interface

4:15-4:30 coffee break

**Session 6: Brythonic Syntax; Chair: Andy Barss**

4:30-5:15  **Plenary Talk:** Randall Hendrick (U S. Carolina), Some Breton Indefinites

5:15-6:00  **Plenary Talk:** Máire Noonan (McGill) Object clitics in Literary Welsh

7-11 Dinner, Party with Live Celtic Music & dancing by Round the House. Easy dances will be taught; A Buffet Dinner will be provided for all FACL participants free of charge.

Room 104, Vine Avenue Annex, 1125 Vine Street (1 block north of speedway, one block west of Cherry)
Session 7: Scottish Gaelic; Chair: Simin Karimi

10-10:45 Plenary Talk: David Adger (QMUL), The syntax of PP complements
10:45-11:15 Sylvia Reed (Arizona) The Semantics of Scottish Gaelic Tense and Aspect.
11:15-12:00 Plenary Talk: Gillian Ramchand (Tromsø) Experiencers Possessors and Locations

12-1:30 Lunch
1:30 Trip to Desert Museum or Desert Hike.
FAQs

WHERE'S THE FRIDAY DINNER?
The Auld Dubliner. On University Avenue on the south side, right near Euclid Avenue. We’re in the private room at the back. Limited Cash Bar and Dinner menu available (Vegetarian and Vegan options available).

WHERE'S SATURDAY'S DINNER & CEILÍ/CEILIDH

7-11 Buffet Dinner (Vegetarian and Vegan Options available), punch and iced tea.

1125 Vine Street. Room 104 (North of Speedway, west of Cherry. Can walk from the conference site, parking in Vine St. Garage)

LIVE MUSIC! Round the House, Tucson's Premier Irish Band Concert and Participatory Dance. All dances will be taught and will be easy enough that everyone can do them.

(Sorry no alcohol is allowed and smoking must happen outside, after the party people can go to Gentle Bens on University for beer and other liquor)

WHAT IS HAPPENING ON SUNDAY AFTERNOON?

If there is enough interest we will organize some cars to drive over to the Saguaro National Monument and the Sonora-Arizona Desert Museum. This is a beautiful park. Good walking shoes and a hat are recommended. Please sign up at the registration desk if you are interested.

Other things to do if you prefer:

• The Mission San Xavier Del Bac on the Tohono Odham reservation, (about 15 minutes south of town on I19. The oldest working mission in Arizona, dates from the 16th Cent. Note: services are held on Sundays, so access is limited
• Sabino Canyon: A pleasant walk up a Canyon in the Santa Catalina mountains north of town. $10 entrance fee.
• Catalina State Park. Another nice desert park in the Catalinas, entrance is about 18 miles north of town.
• Tohono Chul Gardens and Tearoom. A beautiful desert botanical garden and tea room. Oracle and McGee Road. (10 miles from city center).
WHERE CAN I CHECK MY EMAIL?

The easiest place to check your mail is at the public terminals that lie in the underground cluster that between the main library and the integrated learning center ("the big hole in the ground") Just south of the Modern Languages Building. We will also make COMM114F available for email/computer work.

WHERE CAN I MAKE PHOTOCOPIES OF MY HANDOUT?

Please give your handout to Andrew or one of the student organizers AS SOON AS POSSIBLE and we'll get photocopies made for you. Alternately there is a "fast copy" in the Student Union.

WHERE CAN I GET A COFFEE?

- Café Luché: Independently owned, freshly roasted coffee, exotic teas. Park Avenue North of University
- Wilko Good coffee, excellent tea, small grocery section, as well as minor gifts and cosmetics. University and Park
- Expresso Art Café University Avenue
- Starbucks: University Ave, near Euclid
- Starbucks: Inside the bookstore in the Student Union
- Café Paraiso: University Ave, near Euclid
- Breugger's Bagels: Campbell Ave, just south of Speedway

WHERE CAN I GRAB A QUICK LUNCH?

- University Ave: A wide Variety of Restaurants, some fast, some not (We recommend University Avenue for Lunch!)
  - Chipotle Anglicized Mexican food. (Delicious!). Most meals are a flat $5.95, and the portions are quite generous.
  - The Pita Pit Pita wraps and salad. Prices range from 4.75 – 6.50.
  - Which Wich Toasted sandwiches. Approx. $6.50 each
  - Jimmy Johns Non-toasted sandwiches Avg. price: $4.50
  - Pei Wei Diner Anglicized Pan-Asian food. Dishes range from $6.50 – 10.50
  - Vila Thai The best (only) Thai food within walking distance of campus. $6.50-10.50, Lunch specials with a drink and side from 11a-1p
  - The Fat Greek Gyros, Pitas, Greek food. Prices from $5.00-8.50
  - The Cereal Boxx (behind Which wich) many types of Cereal and other breakfasts, served all day (including Belgian waffles)
  - The Paradise Bakery (actually on Park) Cold sandwiches, excellent breads.
  - Fuku Sushi The only sushi within walking distance. Also has Teppanyaki
- **No Anchovies!** Freshly baked pizza slices. Prices range from $3.50-$5.50 per large slice. Selection of pies changes daily.
- **Kababeque** Indian food, good lunch specials. (Try the Mango Lassi!)
- **Auld Dubliner.** Irish Themed pub and restaurant. (Friday night party local)
- **Gentle Bens:** Brew Pub and Burgers
- **Frog and Firkin:** Brew Pub and Burgers
- **Joels Bistro:** Not quick, but very yummy French food.
- **Johnny Rockets:** 50s themed Soda Fountain and Burgers
- **Saigon Pho** (behind Which Wich): Vietnamese, Ok quality
- **Sultan’s Palace** (Behind Which Wich): Afghan, variable quality (sometimes very good, sometimes not.)
- **La Salsa:** Mexican
- **Sinbad’s:** Middle Eastern, good but can be slow.

- The Student Union (located near both the Comm and Chavez buildings):
  - **3 Cheeses & a Noodle** gourmet Italian food
  - **Boost** energy drinks, power bars and groceries
  - **Burger King** burgers and fries
  - **Cactus Grill** homemade breakfasts, hot lunches, and dinners, grilled sandwiches, frozen yogurt, desserts, and salad bar
  - **Cafe Sonora** homemade, specialized Mexican food and salsa bar
  - **Canyon Cafe & Bistro** coffee & espresso bar
  - **CORE** Core is designed to offer healthy, tasty and unique food options that meet your needs.
  - **Cellar Bistro** Gourmet and environmentally sound salmon, shrimp, tuna, chicken, burgers, sandwiches and more. (Warning: Service is SLOW!!)
  - **Chik-fil-A** Serving classic Chick-fil-A combos, fresh squeezed lemonade and desserts.
  - **Fro-Yo** frozen yogurt, breakfast yogurt and custom trail mix
  - **IQ** Fresh wraps, salads and smoothies
  - **On Deck Deli** gourmet custom sandwiches, gourmet bagels
  - **Panda Express** (icky) Chinese food
  - **Papa John’s Pizza** Pizza and salads
  - **Redington Restaurant** all-you-can-eat buffet with carved item, full salad bar, variety of entrees, vegetables and sides.
  - **U-Mart Convenience Store** groceries, grab-n-go sandwiches, drinks, and eegee’s frozen drinks
OTHER RESTAURANTS

$ = fast food
$$= Entrées between $6-10
$$$ = Entrées between $10-15
$$$$ = Entrées $15 and over

University Avenue – between Park and Euclid
- See list above under lunch

4th Ave Arts District -- Between University Ave and 8th Street – a short walk from Campus and Bed and Breakfasts
- La Indita, 662 N. 4th Ave. East side of street, between University Ave and 6th St. Tohono O’odham and Mexican Food $$
- Bee Line 4th Ave, between 5th and 6th, Good Salads $$
- Athens Greek food, 4th Ave & 6th Street $$-$$$ 
- Magpies Pizza, West side of the street, 4th Ave, north of 6th $ 
- Brooklin Pizza, East side of street south of University Ave Ave $ 
- IBTs, Gay Bar, no food but dancing! West side of street, between University and 6th St. $    
- (There are several other restaurants on this street not listed here)

Downtown (short cab ride) 
- Barrio, Adam’s Favorite! Mexican, 6th Ave & 12 Street $$$
- Café Poca Cosa, Excellent Oaxacan Style Mexican food. Andrew’s Favorite! Reservations recommended (520) 622-6400, $$$$ 
- El Minuto, Mexican, south of convention center, 354 S. Main Ave $$-$$$ 
- El Charro, The oldest Mexican Restaurant in town. They invented the Chimichanga. $$-$$$ 

Other Restaurants: $10 cab ride from University Area
- Guilin, Chinese including vegetarian menu. Tom recommends $$
- Pastiche, Relaxed Nouvelle American, Campbell South of Prince $$$$ 
- Sushi Cho, Considered by many to be the best Sushi in town, Broadway and Campbell $$-$-$$$$ 
- Sushi Garden, All you can eat Sushi for $20, Alvernon, just north of Broadway. $$$$ 
- Janos, in the Westen La Paloma Resort (Skyline Avenue). Widely regarded as the best, and certainly the most expensive, restaurant in town. Upscale dress please. $$$$$$ (J-Bar, the down-market next door neighbor specializes in less fance meals. Also excellent $$) 
- Café Terra Cota, SW style food, 3500 Sunrise Ave (East of Campbell). $$$$$ 
- P.F. Changs, River and Campbell, good Chinese $$-$$$
• India Oven, Campbell between Grant and Glenn $$-$$$  
• El Corral, Steak and Prime Rib, a Tucson Classic. 2201 E. River Road $$$  
• Kingfisher, Seafood, 2564 E. Grant Road $$$$  
• Seri Melaka, Malaysian, 6133 E. Broadway $$$$  
• Chars Thai Restaurant, 5039 E. 5th Street $$-$$-$   
• Pho 88, Vietnamese, 2744 N. Campbell $$
The syntax of PP complements

The theoretical question addressed in this talk is how PP complements to Ns are syntactically licensed. The classical view, given the UTAH, is that they are sisters to N, and so the N takes the PP as an argument. However, there is a rather stiff problem for this view in Celtic, where PP complements to N come at the right of the NP after adjectives and possessors:

(i) Det N AP* Possessors PP

At first blush this is problematic for the classical view, and I'll argue that this remains true at the nth blush too.

A solution involving head movement (Rouveret, Roberts) gets the constituency wrong. A solution which denies the complementhood of the PPs gets the selectional facts wrong (Sadler). An obligatory PP extraposition story (Willis) does no more than describe the structure. A Kaynian Prepositions as Probes story (Kayne/Cinque) gets the simple constituency and binding facts right. However, it predicts for more complex cases that two PP complements (or a possessor and a PP) will be in constituency, and this turns out to be false. Moreover, without extra stipulation, one would expect the ECM style PrepProbe structure for complement PPs to behave just like PrepProbe structures elsewhere in the language, and this is also false.

I offer an alternative which takes the selectional relation between the N and the PP to be mediated by an abstract functional head (in fact a class of these with different semantics). The head (call it F) projects above the NP/QP/DP, essentially s-selecting the nominal rather than the other way around, and it has a K(ase)P in its spec. There is a syntactic agreement relation between F and K, so that K is pronounced as the relevant preposition. This means that PP=KP is a constituent outside the main projection line, allowing it to be extracted, clefted etc.

The class of Fs includes heads encoding depiction, direction, etc, as well as different types of possession. They are also plausibly implicated in theta-role assignment of agent and experiencer PPs (as suggested by Adger and Ramchand for Gaelic psychological nominals). The system keeps the advantages of a PrepProbe story while allowing the PPs to behave like PPs, rather than like chunks of clausal structure.
It’s a given in our discipline that phonologists work from transcriptions. In a very real sense, then, our raw material isn’t in fact the spoken word, it’s the written word—written, one hopes, by fieldworkers with extensive ear-training, for the perception of relevant details, and training in the transliteration or transcription of those perceived distinctions into written form. Our phonology can only be as good as our transcribed text. As H.J. Uldall memorably put it, “when we write a phonetic or a phonemic transcription, we substitute ink for air” (1944, reprinted 1966:148)—however, he continues, “the substance of ink has not received the same attention on the part of linguists that they have so lavishly bestowed on the substance of air.” Although the linguistic description of Scottish Gaelic dialects dates back more than 100 years, the representation of the prosodic phenomena of intervocalic hiatus and svarabhakti have posed a challenge to every descriptive study and phonological analysis. In this paper I examine transcription practices employed in the description of Scottish Gaelic, beginning with John Forbes’ *Principles of Gaelic Grammar*, published in 1848, up to the detailed word-lists of the *Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland* (Ó Dochartaigh, ed., 1994–97), with a particular focus on interpreting the representation of hiatus and svarabhakti.


Emily Elfner

The Interaction of Linearization and Prosody: Pronoun Postposing in Irish and Scottish Gaelic

**Problem:** Weak pronominal objects in Modern Irish (MI) and Scottish Gaelic (SG) occupy different positions in the sentence as compared to full DP or strong pronominal objects (Chung & McCloskey 1987; Duffield 1995; Adger 1997, 2007; Doyle 1998; McCloskey 1999). For example, full DPs and strong pronouns precede an adverbal or complement phrase (1a) while weak pronouns follow, either medially (1b) or sentence-finally (1c) (data from MI):

(1) a. Léigh Liam *leabhar/seisean/é* ar an traen ar éir.
   read Liam book/it-EMPH/it-NONEMPH on the train last-night

b. Léigh Liam *leabhar/*seisean/é ar éir.
   read Liam on the train book/it-EMPH/it-NONEMPH last-night

c. Léigh Liam *leabhar/*seisean/é ar éir.
   read Liam on the train last-night book/it-EMPH/it-NONEMPH

‘Liam read a book/TT/it on the train last night.’

It has been assumed that the position of the weak pronoun is defined by phonological rather than syntactic or discourse factors, since there appears to be no difference in interpretation between (1a) and (1b-c) (Adger 1997, 2007; Doyle 1998; McCloskey 1999). However, the best-developed accounts (Adger 1997) posit a syntactic movement operation that has access to phonological information, running counter to the assumptions of the Y-model of the grammar. If the motivation for (1) is truly phonological, in the context of phase theory (Chomsky 2000) it should be derivable based on constraints operative at Spell-Out, without look-ahead in the syntax.

**Proposal:** This paper argues in favour of a prosodic account of weak object pronoun postposing in MI and SG (but one that differs from Chung & McCloskey 1987; Adger 1997; Doyle 1998; McCloskey 1999). I propose that the linear position of the weak pronoun is determined by the interaction of constraints at phonological Spell-Out, rather than in the syntax. Assuming phasal Multiple Spell-Out, where syntactic structure is spelled-out in “chunks”, potential candidates for surface linearized form would be evaluated at each phase, as under an Optimality Theoretic framework (OT, Prince & Smolensky 1993/2004). If constraints on linearization (as defined by the LCA, Kayne 1994) are in direct competition with constraints on prosodic structure, constraint ranking will determine which constraint will be violated in case of a conflict. I propose that pronoun postposing in MI and SG alters “normal” word order by violating the LCA in order to satisfy a prosodic constraint referring to domain-initial position.

**Analysis:** Under the Multiple Spell-Out hypothesis, syntactic structure is spelled-out in chunks corresponding to phrases. I assume that vP is a phase, and that the complement of v constitutes a Spell-Out domain (Chomsky 2000). At Spell-Out, this domain corresponds to a prosodic phonological phrase (q) (Adger 2006, Ishihara 2007), and its content is subject to prosodic well-formedness constraints. Objects are assumed to be syntactically initial in the Spell-Out domain of vP at the point of Spell-Out in MI and SG (owing to the movement of V out of VP to sentence-initial position), and unpostposed pronouns, like full DP objects, would be initial in the corresponding q. Finally, I assume that, prosodically speaking, weak pronouns in Irish lack the status of prosodic word (Selkirk 1995). My solution to the postposing problem has two essential parts. First is the idea that the displacement of the weak pronoun away from the left edge of the q corresponding to the Spell-Out domain of vP is driven by a prosodic markedness constraint ParseEdge-L(q,ω), which calls for the left edge of a q to coincide with the edge of a prosodic word (ω), the next category level down in the prosodic hierarchy. This type of prosodic constraint is attested independently: ParseEdge-R(q,ω) is responsible for promotion of phrase-final weak nonpronominal function words to ω status in English, explaining their strong, stressed, form in final position. ParseEdge-L(ω,Ft) is responsible for the lefthand foot in
Tàtamagóuchi in English, the so-called Garawa-effect (Hayes 1995), and ParseEdge-R(1,q) is arguably responsible for promotion of any final verb to q status in Bengali (Hayes and Lahiri 1991). In Irish, rather than promote weak pronoun to ω status (with consequent word stress), ParseEdge-L(q,ω) is satisfied by rightward displacement away from the edge. (ω status for nonfocus weak pronouns in Irish would presumably be in conflict with morphological spell-out requirements for pronouns). The second part of the proposed solution concerns the “mechanism” of the rightward displacement. I propose that constraints on linearization (as defined by the LCA, Kayne 1994) are viable and are in direct competition with constraints on prosodic structure. The LCA (Kayne 1994:6) establishes precedence relationships between the non-terminal nodes in a syntactic tree based on asymmetrical c-command: if a syntactic node α asymmetrically c-commands a syntactic node β, then every terminal node contained within α should linearly precede the every terminal node in β. Crucially, the precedence relationships are established between non-terminal nodes rather than terminal nodes. Under minimal assumptions, the LCA is violated when there is a syntactic node α whose terminal nodes do not precede the terminal nodes dominated by a syntactic node that α c-commands. This makes two predictions, which correctly account for the data in (1). First, if precedence relations are determined by the c-command relationships between non-terminal syntactic nodes, alternative orderings will manipulate non-terminal rather than terminal nodes: we expect that the weak pronoun will follow the entire adverbal phrase rather than surface within it. For example, the weak pronoun will not surface inside a PP (*Léigh liam ω[ar] an traín) because ordering is determined based on non-terminal syntactic nodes <NP, PP> rather than terminal nodes <é, ar>. Second, if violations of the LCA are determined categorically based on whether or not the node α precedes the syntactic nodes that it asymmetrically c-commands, the LCA will be equally violated by (1b) and (1c): in other words, the distance from the pronoun’s base position will not increase the number of violations that the sentence incurs. This correctly predicts that the weak pronoun can surface following any of the adjuncts in a sentence with multiple adjuncts (Ó Siodhail 1989:209).

**Consequences:** The assumption that Spell-Out is phasal accounts for syntactic restrictions on pronoun postposing, including predictions of conditioning and blocking environments. For example, this analysis correctly predicts that weak pronoun subjects will not postpose:

   read she book read book she
   ‘She read a book.’
   ‘She read a book.’

Because subjects are syntactically situated in a position higher than the complement of vP (Spec,vP or Spec,TP; McCloskey 1996), they will not be spelled-out in the vP phase and will not be initial within a higher q, as are object pronouns. Since they do not violate ParseEdge-L(q,ω) there is no motivation to violate the LCA by postposing the subject. This theory also predicts that weak pronouns in the vP phase can be postposed, even if they occupy a syntactic role distinct from direct object. This prediction is borne out: the weak pronominal subjects of small clauses and progressives can be optionally postposed:

   heard I him at singing heard I at singing him
   ‘I heard him singing.’ (Duffield 1995)

These data are unexpected under a syntactic account, because the syntactic configuration of the weak pronoun is different in (3) as compared to (1). Under a prosodic account, postposing can be accounted for with reference to ParseEdge-L(q,ω) as in (1).
Colin Gorrie

Morphophonological features and the Gaelic adjective

The notion that there exist linguistic features— theoretical primitives that act as intermediaries between two components of the grammar— has gained widespread currency in theories of syntax (Chomsky 1995), morphology (Anderson 1992, Halle and Marantz 1993), and phonology (Jakobson and Halle 1956, Chomsky and Halle 1968). Under frameworks such as these, there exist two types of features: morphosyntactic and phonological. I argue here that we have need of a third class of features: morphophonological features, which mediate between the morphological and phonological component. I show that such features are necessary to explain the morphological properties of the adjective agreement paradigm of Scottish Gaelic (henceforth Gaelic).

One of the most salient aspects of Gaelic morphology is the presence of the phenomenon of lenition (a type of initial mutation; Massam 1983, Tallerman 1987, Pyatt 1997, among others), in which certain word-initial sounds are systematically replaced by other sounds in certain grammatical environments:

(1) a. Unlenited: seann /ʃ/ ‘old…’
   Lenited: mo sheann /h/ ‘my old…’

b. Unlenited duine /ʤ/ ‘person’
   Lenited droch dhuine /ɣ/ ‘bad person’

I follow Pyatt (1997) in representing lenition as the phonological realization of a prephonological feature (Pyatt’s diacritic), and extend this analysis to the mutation of slenderization (phonologically palatalization, with concomitant vowel changes).

(2) Basic Slenderized
   a. am balach /əm bəlax/ na balaich /nə bələʃ/ ‘the boy’ ‘the boys’

   Evidence for an analysis of mutations as reflexes of morphophonological features comes from the inflectional paradigm of the Gaelic adjective. For example, adjectives in the plural are affected by lenition only if the modified noun has been inflected by means of slenderization. If this were exclusively a phonological sensitivity, it would be triggered by nouns with word-final palatalized consonants. (3b) shows that this is not the case.

(3) a. fir mhòr-a /fɪr/ VO:R-ə/ man.PL big-PL
   ‘big men’

b. a fhear-aibh mòr-a /ə ʃə-rəv/ VOC man.PL big-PL
   ‘O big men’

   (lenited segment bold; slenderized segment **bold and underlined**)
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The Old Irish ‘passive’ verb, its realisations and development

The topic of this paper is the Early Irish so-called passive morphology. I will show that this morphology expresses two types of passive clauses; canonical (with subject promotion) in the third person, and impersonal (without subject promotion) in the first and second person. Phenomena to be discussed include the agentive by-phrase, case-marking and subject agreement in number. Furthermore I will sketch the development from canonical to impersonal passive in the later stages of the language, after which the entire paradigm ends up as impersonal passive in the Early Modern Irish period.

The clause types in question are defined at the intersection between thematic roles (argument structure) and grammatical functions (functional structure), in terms of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG). The two passive clause types are illustrated for a transitive predicate in (1-2), where x and y represent thematic roles that are higher and lower on the thematic hierarchy, respectively. \( \emptyset \) denotes the ‘mapping to zero’ of the higher role; this I take to be defining of the passive (cf. Bresnan 2001: 310, ignoring the problem of the agent phrase).

1. Canonical passive:

\[
\begin{align*}
&< x \quad y > \\
&| \quad | \\
&\emptyset \quad \text{SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Impersonal passive:

\[
\begin{align*}
&< x \quad y > \\
&| \quad | \\
&\emptyset \quad \text{OBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

The Old Irish examples in (3) (from Thurneysen 1998: 260, 349) illustrate that when the lower role of a passive verb is a first or second person pronoun, it is realised as an infixed pronoun (glossed with the relevant person/number in the paradigm). This is similar to how pronominal objects are expressed in the active (4). In the third person, the lower role is expressed by the verbal morphology, parallel to pronominal subjects in the active.

3. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no-m-charthar</th>
<th>no-t-charthar</th>
<th>carthair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICLE-1SG-love.PASS</td>
<td>PARTICLE-2SG-love.PASS</td>
<td>love.PASS.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am loved’</td>
<td>‘you are loved’</td>
<td>‘s/he is loved’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ní-m-charat-sa

NEG-1SG-love.3PL-EMPHATIC
‘they do not love me’
The subsequent development towards impersonal passive across the paradigm is illustrated in (5) and (6). These examples are taken from two different versions of the same story. In both of the examples, the predicate is the passive verb *ructha*, a third person plural passive form meaning ‘were brought’. In the older example (5), I will argue that the third person lower role is expressed by the morphology of this form. In the younger version (6), the lower role is expressed by the object pronoun *iáit* – ‘them’.

5. Third person canonical passive (Chadwick 1927: 9 (1))

```plaintext
ructha chuici-sium isin m-bruidin
```

`bring.PERF.PASS.3PL to.3SG.M-EMPH in.DEF hall`

‘they were brought to him in the hall’

6. Third person impersonal passive (Meyer 1894: 51 (1))

```plaintext
ructha chuigi-sium isin m-bruidin iat
```

In sum, it will be shown in this paper that the paradigm of the Early Irish passive verb is split between canonical and impersonal passive, and that the canonical passive develops into impersonal passive in the later stages of the language. I will suggest that these data support the existence of a non-promotional (impersonal) passive; the Irish impersonal passive furthermore appears to be subjectless at both functional structure and constituent structure.
Aaron Griffith

pro in Old Irish

McCloskey and Hale (1984, hereafter “MH”) have shown that pro must occur in MnIr where it is linked with person and number morphology on a lexical category. McCloskey (1991), using data from coordination, has argued similarly for Old Irish. This paper extends the scope of his investigation to more OIr data and shows that the analysis of MH fits for Old Irish, though there are some indications that a set of OIr clitics, the notae augentes, rather than being clitic to pro, as in the MH analysis of MnIr, are instead pronouns in their own right.

Two sets of clitics play a very important role in the argumentation. The first set, called the notae augentes, has person and number forms but no case, while the second set, referred to here as the deictic clitic set, is 3rd person only and inflects for case and number (see GOI 252-3, 302-3). Both sets of clitics may be used as follows:

- after a noun, agreeing with a preceding possessive pronoun
- after a personal pronoun
- after a copula + noun / adjective sequence, serving as the subject
- after a conjugated preposition ¹
- after a verb, agreeing with either the subject or the infixed / suffixed object

Though their appearance is always optional, these clitic sets are found only in those positions where pronouns or pronominal affixes are already present, i.e. they follow pronouns and the pro argued for by MH.

A couple restrictions on the appearance of these clitics serve to reinforce the contention that they are associated with pro: they may not appear when a full NP is present, and they may not appear with a wh-trace (Griffith 2008a: 67):

(1) ad-cú(*-som) in-fer in-mnáí “the man sees the woman”
(2) is in-fer ad-chú(*-som) in-mnáí “it is the man who sees the woman”

Furthermore, in verbs with an infixed pronoun, two clitics may follow the verbal complex:

(3) Sg 16⁸⁸ ni- sn- arróetmar- ni- sidi “we have not accepted it”
    NEG-3pl-accept.perf.1pl -1pl-3pl

In all such cases with two clitics, the first must be a nota augens agreeing with the argument that is higher on the scale 1st > 2nd > 3rd human > 3rd non-human (Griffith 2008a), while the second clitic must agree with the object and be from the deictic clitic set.

Finally, in phrases with a pronominal possessor, the nota augens appears in the same position as a non-pronominal possessor, i.e. after adjectives (as in MnIr, see MH: 515):

(4) MI 23³¹⁵ a- gnímai sainemlai-som “his wonderful works”
    3sg -works.nom.pl wonderful.nom.pl-3sg

That -som follows the adjective is expected if it is clitic to a pro (or is a pronoun).

¹ This is the one case where the deictic set differs slightly. As the object of a preposition it is generally stressed: for suidi “on it”. Like the notae augentes, however, it can also appear after a conjugated preposition: fuiri-sidi “on it”.
This whole line of argumentation assumes that infixed and suffixed pronouns, as well as pronominal possessors, are not true arguments (Eska, forthcoming; Griffith 2008b). Since infixed and suffixed pronouns in OIr can be doubled by full NPs, it is quite reasonable to analyze them as non-referential (in the spirit of Bresnan and Mchombo 1987). Clitic doubling is not found with prepositions, but it is assumed here that the conjugated pronouns are also non-referring, parallel to the verbal subject, infixed verbal object, and pronominal possessors. This assumption allows Old Irish to be classified as a split head-marking language: with pronominal arguments it is head-marking, and with full NPs it is dependent- (or double-) marking.

The proposal of MH of course has the added benefit of accounting straightforwardly for the distribution of stressed pronouns (mè, tú, etc.) in OIr. Since all inflection in OIr is synthetic, never analytic, there is no chance for stressed pronouns to appear with prepositions, as subjects or objects of finite verbs or as possessors. Stressed pronouns may only appear as predicate nominatives after the copula or as subjects in either verbless sentences or after bare interrogatives (GOI 254).

The contention that pro and the notae augentes are in complementary distribution is difficult to prove. Unlike in MnIr, the notae do not have the function of making pro(nouns) strong: the presence of a nota is irrelevant for the fact that OIr pro may not head a relative clause but may be coordinated, and that stressed pronouns may do both. Without this syntactic function, the notae augentes are arguably in complementary distribution with pro. That the notae are pronouns is supported by their usage, with is neither primarily emphatic nor contrastive but often correlated with the topic (Griffith 2008b). Though much of the case for the notae augentes being pronouns is circumstantial, the evidence is compatible with this contention.

This paper argues that the notae augentes are pronouns in OIr and that they are the phonologically realized counterparts of the pro posited by MH and McCloskey 1991 for MnIr and OIr. While the argument here is not entirely new, the paper brings new data to bear on the proposal and makes a novel claim about the syntactic status of the notae augentes in Old Irish.
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The interaction of sonority sequencing and foot structure in Welsh

S.J. Hannahs, Newcastle University

ABSTRACT

It has long been observed that certain final consonant clusters in Welsh may provoke vowel epenthesis (svarabhakti), deletion of one member of the cluster, or metathesis (cf. Morris Jones 1913:17-18). These clusters consist of a consonant followed by [r], [l] or [n]; other sorts of final clusters are permitted, e.g. [päs] Päs ‘Easter’, [bäl] bälch ‘proud’.

1. Epenthesis /ɔɣy/ → [ɔɣɔɾ] ‘side’ ochr
/bɪstɬ/ → [bɪstɬ] ‘gall’ bustɬ
/kʌbl/ → [kʌbɬ] ‘whole’ cwbl
/bɪdɬ/ → [bɪdɬ] ‘dirty’ budɬ

2. Deletion /ɬənastr/ → [ɬənst] ‘mess’ llanastr
/pəsɪbl/ → [posɪb] ‘possible’ posɪbl
/ʃɪnəstr/ → [ʃɪnst] ‘window’ ffɪnəstr

/diːəθɬ/ → [diːəθɬ] ‘strange’ dieɪθɬ

Despite the long-standing observations, traditional accounts (Morris Jones 1913, Pedersen 1909, Lewis & Pedersen 1937, Jackson 1953) fail to connect the phonological operations with either the sonority of the clusters involved or with prosodic considerations.

As I show here, the occurrence of epenthesis, deletion or metathesis depends not only on the type of cluster involved, but also on the prosodic size of the citation form. I argue that these three processes - epenthesis, deletion and metathesis - are all intimately connected. All arise in order to avoid a sonority sequencing violation: an obstruent followed by a sonorant in a final cluster, as in words of this type, represents illicit rising sonority in a coda. Moreover, these processes also create or maintain binary feet.

To account for the data at hand, the analysis will rely on the interaction between the constraints DEP-IO (militating against epenthesis), MAX-IO (militating against deletion) and LINEARITY (working against metathesis), to capture the effects of epenthesis, deletion and metathesis in avoiding a violation of the undominated SONSEQ constraint. In addition, the prosodic structure constraint FrBN will be shown to play a role in deciding between epenthesis (which occurs in the case of a monosyllabic citation form), and deletion or metathesis (which occurs when the citation form is bisyllabic). Finally, account will also be given for the fact that the epenthetic vowel is a copy of the stem vowel (rather than simply a ‘default’ vowel such as schwa) by means of a correspondence relation between the epenthetic vowel and the underlying stem vowel.
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Some Breton Indefinites  
RANDALL HENDRICK  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

This paper has two goals, one descriptive and one more theoretical. Descriptively it aims to advance our understanding of how Breton nominal expressions traditionally identified as indefinite behave with respect to a range of major syntactic constructions. This portion of the paper will highlight negative polarity items, how they are licensed, and how they combine with other expressions of quantity. It will correct the impression in the literature that the (Brythonic) Celtic languages are of one cloth in this domain. The second goal of the paper is to contribute to our theoretical understanding of how syntactic structures are chunked (or split) by their interaction with phonological and semantic interpretation. I will argue that the distribution of indefinites is especially sensitive to the VP and TP boundaries: no more than one quantity expressing argument occurs per phase. This limitation allows us to explain apparent violations of what appear otherwise to be plausible economy and licensing requirements. The also offers some insight into asymmetries between simple clause on the one hand and periphrastic clauses and embedded clauses on the other. The indefinite limitation, it is speculated, may have a functional reflex in optimizing computational efficiency.
Inquiry at the syntax/PF interface: Evidence from Breton

Breton has a Celtic well-behaved VSO derivation, but it has the amazing property that an extra step is needed to meet grammaticality: the tensed verb cannot stand first in the sentence and has to appear in the second position. The language shows a full range of last-resort strategies to ensure that the final word order is 'at least V2', satisfying a Late Expletive Insertion Trigger. This trigger is a mystery in itself, but in this presentation I won't focus on it. I will only be using its paradigm to conduct an inquiry on the syntax/PF interface in the T model. Among the Breton last resort strategies obtaining (linear) V2, we find expletive insertion, but also verb-doubling, or a very local movement that seems to violate the Head Movement Constraint (Verb-fronting or Long Head Movement).

Examining these cases as well as rannig alternation and auxiliary selection, I discuss where the V2 rule applies, and the encapsulation of modules in the grammar.
Elliot Lash

**Old Irish standard-of-comparison constructions**

This paper discusses the development of Irish standard-of-comparison constructions from the earliest attested examples (8th century) to the end of the Middle Irish period (12th century). The background for this paper is found in an argument-adjunct distinction found in operator-constructions, due to the fact that Old Irish standard-of-comparison constructions behave like adjunct-operator constructions. The distinction between arguments and adjuncts in these constructions is manifested by phonological ‘mutations’ that are characteristic of Celtic languages. In Irish, the mutations are called _lenition_, which changes a stop to a fricative and _nasalization_, which voices an unvoiced sound and changes voiced stops to nasals.

Operator-variable chains representing arguments exhibit lenition in two cases: if the argument is a subject or if the argument is an object of neuter gender, with non-neuter objects, nasalization is found. Chains representing adjuncts only exhibit nasalization. Such mutations can be viewed as PF-reflexes of Spec-Head agreement between the operator and the head X introducing the subordinate clause. The verb linearly adjacent to X undergoes the specified mutation. The following examples show these distinctions:

1) **Subject:**
   - Ind _hul-i_ doin-i _ro-chreit-s-et_
   - the.PL all-PL men-PL PRF-(LENITION)believe-PST-3P
   - ‘All the men who believed…’ (ML. 60b16) (lenition c > ch)

2) **Object (neuter):**
   - An _ad-chi-am_
   - the.one PV-(LENITION)see-1P
   - ‘The one that we see…’ (ML. 112b13) (lenition c > ch)

3) **Object (feminine):**
   - Chech _irrigde_ do-nginx-id
   - Each prayer PV-(NASALIZATION)do.SBJ-2P
   - ‘each prayer that you may make…’ (Wb. 5c20) (nasalization g > ng)

4) **Adjunct:**
   - In tindacuil sin du-n-éommach-t Día inni
   - the deliverance that PV-NAS-PRF.deliver-PST.3S God that.one
   - ‘That deliverance by which God delivered that one.’ (ML. 55c1)

In this paper, I argue that standard-of-comparison constructions were adjunct-operator constructions, because they exhibit nasalization of the verb. They are characterized by the elements _ol daas_ where _ol_ is a former preposition “beyond” and _daas_ a nasalized relative verb “which is” (non-nasalized: _taas_). The translation indicates the adjunct-operator status of this construction with the words ‘the way that’.

5) **is**
   - Doch-u _indala_ n-áí _ol da-as_ anaill.
   - COP likely-COMP one 3P.GEN beyond (NAS)be-REL.3S other
   - ‘One of them is more likely than the way that the other is.’ (Wb. 4b24)

Where the predicate of a standard-of-comparison construction differed from the main predicate, the adjunct-operator construction was followed by a complement clause – also marked with nasalization in OI (although it is not the PF-reflex of Spec-Head agreement,
as complement clauses lack an operator in SpecX). This two clause analysis is indicated in the example by the words [the way it is [that …]].

6) ol da-as a-ta¹ ndiglaid-i…
    beyond (NAS)be-REL COP.PRS-3P.REL (NAS)vengeful-PL
    ‘…than the way it is that they are vengeful…’ (Ml. 111c8)

During the Old Irish period, several related changes affected the constructions shown in examples (5) and (6). These changes were driven by the ambiguity of the nasalized complement clause following *ol daas*, which could either be a complement clause or an adjunct-operator construction introduced by a complementiser *oldaas*. Because of this ambiguity, [[C ol] … [V-T daas] …] was reanalyzed as a complementiser [C *oldaas*].

This reanalysis was also helped by the fact that *daas* was no longer found in other operator constructions (such as relative clauses), where forms such as *ro-ngab* (+nasalizing operator) and *fil[e]* (+leniting operator) had become common. The second reanalysis was that the complement clause became an adjunct-operator construction. Essentially, these changes result in clause collapsing, from the original construction (7) to the new (8):

7)   [CP [C ol] [XP OP [X’ [X] [TP [V-T daas] […]]]]]
8)   [CP [C *oldaas*] [XP OP [X [TP verb/predicate…]]]]

These two reanalyses were followed by a number of extensions, in which the underlying syntactic analysis of these constructions became clear through a series of phonological and morphological realignments. With the reanalysis of *ol daas* to a complementiser, the verbal characteristics of *daas* were lost: it eventually no longer manifested person/number/tense distinctions and it underwent subsequent phonetic change to Modern Irish *ná*. Furthermore, its use in sentences in which the main clause predicate and the standard-of-comparison predicate were the same (example 5) could now be viewed as a complementiser with an elided predicate, stranding the subject in its (normal for Irish) post predicate position. Finally, the reanalysis of a complement clause as an adjunct-operator construction in sentences having different predicates (example 6) was later manifested by the introduction of the overt-operator *mar* “how/like/as”, which appears to be common in the 12th century (although likely introduced earlier). An example of this new construction is found in the Modern Irish:

9) Labhraíonn sé níos fearr ná mar a scriobh-ann sé.
   speak-3S.PRS he  COMP better than how that write-3S.PRS he

This paper will contribute to the general knowledge about argument-adjunct distinctions by providing data from a previously under-studied language (O1). Additionally, it will show that the history of Irish standard-of-comparison constructions can be explained with reference to a theory of reanalysis, extension and syntax-driven grammaticalisation.

¹ Note that in Irish, the copula is likely part of the C-system. According to this analysis, is is in C/X and thus introduces the nasalization found in operator or complement constructions.
At the initial level this paper seeks to establish some of the analysis of existential constructions in Irish and by so doing to contribute to the comparative typology of existential constructions.

At a second and slightly more ambitious level, it tries to use those initial results to engage some of the issues (semantic and syntactic) that have shaped the attempt to understand existential constructions more generally. Understanding how existential constructions work involves peeling apart a complicated knot of interactions among syntactic, semantic, lexical and pragmatic factors. Looking at languages in which the relevant syntactic structures are apparently rather different from those of well-studied languages can help us peel apart the contributions of these various factors. In particular, we can ask the following question: as a given aspect of the morphosyntax of an existential structure is varied, which aspects of the semantics and pragmatics co-vary, and which aspects remain constant? Running this kind of natural experiment should help us make some useful deductions about how the various pieces of the existential puzzle fit together and how those pieces interact.

Lurking at the back of all this is the question of whether or not there is actually such a thing as the 'existential construction,' or if the observed properties of the various sentence-types called existential in various languages can be understood as emerging from the interplay between lexical properties and general principles of syntactic and semantic composition. The conclusion of the present paper is that there is, for Irish at least, no reason to believe that there is such a construction and every reason to believe that the various properties of sentences called 'existential' derive from the properties of a lexical item (the existential predicate) in interaction with general principles of composition.
Ann Mulkern

Irish Pronoun Postposing and Information Structure

In finite clauses of Irish, the canonical constituent order is VSOX, where X is any other constituent, such as a prepositional phrase or an adverbial. A general characteristic of Irish, however, is that unstressed object pronouns and inflected prepositions (and some small clause subjects) are typically found at or near the right periphery of the clause, following one or more additional X constituents. This phenomenon has traditionally been referred to as ‘pronoun postposing’ (see for example, Ó Siadhail 1989, Stenson 1981, Chung and McCloskey 1987). The sentence pairs in (1a-c) illustrate the relevant facts, showing the differences in positions available for full NP and pronominal objects. (examples from Ó Siadhail 1989, pp. 207-208).

(1) a. Léigh sé an leabhar go cúramach.  [(6)]
read.PA he the book carefully
'He read the book carefully.'

b. *Léigh sé go cúramach an leabhar.

c. Léigh sé go cúramach é. /Léigh sé é go cúramach.  [(7)]
read.PA he carefully it
'He read it carefully.'

While the pronoun or inflected preposition typically occurs in sentence-final position, and this has been claimed to be the preferred position, all positions of the pronominal shown in (2) are acceptable (from Ó Siadhail 1989, figure 9.2, p. 209).

(2) Fághadh é ina luí ar an talamh taoibh thiar den scioból aréir.
left.AUT it in-its lying on the ground side back-of-the barn last-night
'It was left lying on the ground behind the barn last night.'

or

Fághadh ina luí é ar an talamh taoibh thiar den scioból aréir.
Fághadh ina luí ar an talamh é taoibh thiar den scioból aréir.
Fághadh ina luí ar an talamh taoibh thiar den scioból é aréir.
Fághadh ina luí ar an talamh taoibh thiar den scioból é aréir.

The phenomenon has been the subject of particular interest in recent years because of the problems it presents for a formal theoretical framework (such as Kayne 1994) in which rightward adjunction and rightward syntactic movement are excluded. Duffield (1995) gives an analysis in which the unstressed object pronoun moves leftward to the head of a clause-initial functional projection, with the rest of the clause moving into the specifier of this phrase. Doyle (1998) and McCloskey (1999) find Duffield’s analysis of Pronoun Postposing problematic, but also conclude that Kayne’s syntactic framework is not without merit, because for phenomena that seem to involve syntactically motivated feature-checking movement in Irish (e.g., movement of the verb resulting in VSO order of finite clauses, movement of the object resulting in SOV order of non-finite clauses) such movement is leftward. Pronoun postposing, is different since there are no grammatical consequences associated with movement or non-movement of the pronoun. Suggesting that postposing is a discourse-related phenomenon, Doyle (1998) proposes the right-adjunction analysis of Chung and McCloskey (1987), but with the rightward movement rendered “invisible” to the syntax, though he provides no principled way of realizing this. McCloskey (1999) also suggests an analysis that involves making the movement invisible to LF, arguing that
the phenomenon is phonologically motivated, occurring in a part of the derivation (PF) which interpretive mechanisms could not access. Adger (1997, 2007), using evidence from Scots Gaelic, also argues that the motivation for postposing occurs at PF. Under McCloskey’s analysis, an unstressed pronominal can attach to the end of any Phonological Phrase. The optionality of pronoun postposing, and the landing site, is thus determined by prosodic structure, as there are different ways of building prosodic structure out of the same syntactic base. But this account seems incomplete: given that there are different ways of building prosodic structure, what motivates the choice between different prosodic structures? And if it is possible to leave the object in canonical position, why would it ever (indeed, quite often) be located anywhere else?

In this paper, I argue that an additional relevant aspect of the interpretation is the Information Structure, such as described in Lambrecht (1994). Building on ideas introduced in Mulkern (2003), I present examples from a variety of naturally occurring sources showing that the clausal position of the object pronoun marks the boundary between two parts of the Information Structure of the sentence: the assertion, which comprises information the speaker presents as new; and the presupposition, information which the speaker assumes has already been introduced into the discourse or is mutually manifest to all discourse participants. The pronominal object is located on the right periphery of the assertion, and therefore follows the informationally (and prosodically) prominent part of the sentence. The topic (pronoun) and anything to the right of the topic is automatically construed as the presupposition. Thus, the various orders of the sentence shown in (2) distinguish the speaker’s choices in structuring the information to achieve different semantic and pragmatic effects.

It follows from this that an adequate account of pronoun postposing is one in which the information structure of the sentence is appealed to as part of the interpretation. Thus, I suggest that an adequate theoretical framework must posit the existence of information structure as a component of grammar representing the relevant sentence-level discourse considerations, and formulating pronoun postposing with respect to this.
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An investigation of syllabification in Irish

Máire Ní Chiosáin (University College Dublin)
Pauline Welby (Laboratoire Parole et Langage, CNRS, Aix-en-Provence)

There is disagreement in the literature (predominantly traditional dialect descriptions) about syllabification in Irish. For example, in disyllabic monomorphemic words like buile 'bilə 'anger' and creideamh 'krədələ 'belief', the consonant between a stressed vowel and a short unstressed vowel is represented as the coda of the first syllable by some authors, e.g. 'bilə, 'krədələ (de Bhaldraithe 1945:60); see also Ó Cuív (1944) for West Muskerry Irish, de Búrca (1958) for Tourmakeady Irish, and Mhac an Fhailigh (1968) for Erris Irish. Others, including Sjoestedt (1931) on West Kerry Irish and Breathnach (1947) on Ring Irish, represent the intervocalic consonant as the onset of the second syllable. However, as noted by Green (1997), de Bhaldraithe appears to suggest ambisyllabicity: 'when a single consonant occurs between vowels it is difficult to define the exact point of syllable division. The point of least prominence can be somewhere in the consonant itself' (p.60). Breathnach makes a similar observation but adopts a convention that assigns the consonant to the onset of the second syllable. An intervocalic consonant followed by a stressed vowel, on the other hand, is consistently represented as an onset.

Despite competing claims in the literature, to our knowledge, the question of syllabification in Irish has not been empirically tested and it is timely that it be addressed. There is a growing body of experimental research calling into question received notions about syllable structure in various languages (e.g. Treiman & Danis 1988, Gillis & de Schutter 1996, Content et al 2001, Goslin & Freuenfelder 2000). Moreover, beyond its importance on a basic, theoretical level, the question of syllabification in Irish also has important implications for other research questions. For example, basic questions of intonational structure depend crucially on assumptions about syllabification. Prominent models of intonation structure make reference to alignment of the fundamental frequency curve with respect to syllables and parts of the syllable (onsets, vowels, and codas) and differences in tonal alignment are used to support one model over another. Recent studies of Irish (Dalton & Ní Chasaide 2007, Dalton 2008), for example, assume that triplets like gob 'beak', goban 'tradesman', gobadán 'sandpiper' share the same first syllable /gob/. This, of course, rests on the assumption that there is a syllable break after the medial /b/. Assumptions about syllable structure are also important in studies of the phonetic correlates of stress (Ní Chiosáin 2007), and decisions about syllabification may also contribute (or detract from) the naturalness of text-to-speech synthesis systems, since much allophonic variation depends on syllable structure.

We will present the results of a perception experiment conducted to explore native speaker intuitions about the syllable structure of Irish, in particular the influence of various factors (vowel quantity, consonant manner etc). Initial results from one dialect (Connemara Irish) show that there is no clear cut division on the syllable affiliation of post-tonic intervocalic consonants: while there is a preference for syllables with onsets, about half the responses across all conditions point to ambisyllabicity. The Irish data also provide interesting points of comparison with results of similar experiments conducted on other languages.
Maire Noonan

Title: Object clitics in tensed VSO clauses in Literary Welsh

Person-number marking in Celtic poses a long standing analytical challenge. Past accounts have differed between analysing it as agreement (by government: Hale & McCloskey 1984, Sadler 1988; by movement to specifier: de Freitas & Noonan 1991, Koopman 1993, Rouvert 1991), pronoun incorporation (Hale 1990, Jouitteau 2005), or akin to clitics (Noonan 1995/1996, Roberts 2005). One of the challenges has been to account for the complementarity with non-pronominal DPs, which distinguishes it from ordinary subject agreement in other languages.

In this presentation I will revisit this problem. I first outline the advantages of analysing person-number marking as analogous to clitic heads in Romance languages. Then I will home in on one particular instance – object clitics in tensed VSO constructions in Literary Welsh. These so-called infix pronouns are subject to two constraints: they are restricted to sentences containing a presentential particle, and they may only occur if the tensed verb carries person-number marking (with the subject pro or echo pronoun); (see Sadler 1988). The latter constraint has, to my knowledge, so far escaped satisfactory analysis. I propose to derive this constraint from assuming that the infix pronoun heads a projection in the clausal architecture, and specifically that this head causes an intervention effect, preventing Agree between Fin and T. This intervention effect can be circumvented by the verb moving to the even higher subject person number head (pied piping the object clitic). In other words, I will argue that the verb, if inflected with person-number subject marking, is structurally higher than when it does not bear this marking. I will then attempt to forge a connection to Old Irish, where such an object clitic head in certain circumstances appears block movement of T to C, triggering insertion of a dummy element in Fin (cf. Carnie, Harley & Pyatt 2000, Newton 2006).
Kenji Oda

Preverbal Particles and Dependent Verbal Forms in Modern Irish

Kenji Oda, University of Toronto

This paper tries to account for a peculiar complementary distribution between the so-called dependent verbal form and a past tense preverbal particle exemplified in (1) within a framework of Distributed Morphology (DM) (Halle and Marantz, 1994). More precisely, this work claims that two tense specifications are available in the clausal architecture of Irish, and the dependent form subsumes the two tense specifications while the independent form subsumes only one. The ultimate goal of this analysis is to show that the dependent/independent alternation is dealt with thoroughly within the domain of morphology, and it has very little to do with syntax.

The Data: First let us consider preverbal particles and how they interact with dependent/independent forms. Just like other Celtic languages, Irish has a rich inventory of preverbal particles, which have a wide range of grammatical functions. Most, but not all, of these particles make a tense distinction between past and non-past. For example, the negation particle is realized as ní in the present or future environment, while níor appears in the past, as shown in (2a). The wh-extraction marker a₁, on the other hand, always stays the same regardless of the tense environment it is in, as in (2b). Now let us turn to the irregular verbs. Irish has a small set of irregular verbs, and a subset of them, such as bí ‘to be’, feic ‘to see’, and déan ‘to do’, have dependent forms, which emerge only when they are preceded by a tense-sensitive particle, such as ní. For instance, the verb bí preceded by the question particle an is realized as bhfuil, as in (3a), but the verb is otherwise realized as tá in the present tense. What is even more puzzling is that the availability of the dependent form in the past tense environment deprives the preverbal particle of the past tense marking. Thus, we observe the data in (1), where the past tense form of the negation particle níor is incompatible with the past dependent form dearna ‘did.DEP’ of déan (N.B., the past tense independent form is rimne, and also see (2a) for a grammatical instance of níor with a past tense verb). This puzzle is what we wish to address in this paper.

The Analysis: Following McCloskey (1996, 2001), I assume the following points: First, the preverbal particles occupy the C⁰ position (or some functional head(s) in the expanded CP-layer). Second, I assume that the morpho-syntactic content of C⁰ lowers and adjoins to the T⁰ after Spell-Out, creating the morphological structure [τ C [τ T+V ]]. Also, we argue that there may be up to two tense specifications available in a finite clause in Irish, and one of them, which I consider to be valued under an Agree relation with the tense on T⁰ (hereafter T-tense, for expository purposes), appears on C⁰. The availability of tense on C⁰ (hereafter C-tense) seems to be an accidental lexical property; hence the resumptive particle a₀ has it while the extraction particle a₁ lacks it, despite their functional similarities. The existence of non-dependent suppletive forms which can cooccur with a past tense particle, as in (4), evidences the double-tense model. Finally, we assume that the feature bundle on the T+V complex and the one on C⁰ are parsed concurrently, but a preference is given to maximize the content on the T+V complex when multiple ways to realize phonological forms are available.

Let us start with simpler cases: we first propose that the non-past morphology is a bona fide case of Underspecification, and only past particle Vocabulary Items (VIs) carry a tense
specification; hence we have VIs shown in (5) for negation. When a feature bundle of \([\text{NEG, C-PAST}]\) is spelled out from syntax, the past tense VI is selected due to the Subset Principle because it is the more specific option. On the other hand, when a bundle of \([\text{NEG, C-FUT}]\) is spelled out, the past VI is incompatible, which makes the non-past one the only available option. Regular verbs, as well as non-dependent irregular verbs, are also dealt within a similar way, and therefore we have the set of VIs in (6) for the verb \texttt{creid} ‘to believe’.

Now let us consider the irregular verbs with dependent/independent alternation. The most crucial point we propose here is that both T-tense and C-tense are required to realize a dependent form, whereas we need only the T-tense to realize an independent form. An illustration of this point with the verb \texttt{bí} is provided in (7). Therefore, an independent form is correctly inserted when the verb comes either with no particle or with a tense-insensitive particle since C-tense is not available, as in (8). On the other hand, a dependent form is selected when it comes with a tense-sensitive particle, and since the C-tense specification is used up by the verb, the particle now surfaces as non-past.

(1) \(\text{ní}/*\text{níor}\) dhearna tú ...  
\(-\text{DEP did} \) you 
You did not do ...

(2) a. \(\text{Present: ní} \) chreideann tú ...  
\(\text{Future: ní} \) chreidfidh tú ...  
\(\text{Past: níor} \) chreid tú ...  
‘I don’t/won’t/didn’t believe ...’ Negation \text{ní}: Tense Sensitive

b. \(\text{Present: NP a} \) chreideann tú ...  
\(\text{Future: NP a} \) chreidfidh tú ...  
\(\text{Past: NP a} \) chreid tú ...  
‘NP which you (will) believe(d) ...’ Wh-extraction \(a^L\): Tense Insensitive

(3) a. \(\text{An bhfuil tú ...?} \)  
\(\text{Q is} \) you  

b. \(\text{An a} /\emptyset\) tá tú  
\(\text{Q a}^L\) is you

(4) \(\text{níor}/*\text{ní} \) chuala/rug mé ...  
\(-\text{DEP heard} \) caught I  
‘I did not hear/catch ...’

(5) \(\langle [\text{NEG}] \leftrightarrow \text{ní} >, \langle [\text{NEG, C-PAST}] \leftrightarrow \text{níor} >\)

(6) \(\langle [\text{believe, T-PRES}] \leftrightarrow \text{creideann} >, \langle [\text{believe, T-FUT}] \leftrightarrow \text{creidfidh} >, \ldots \)

(7) \(\langle [\text{be, T-PAST}] \leftrightarrow \text{bhi} \text{(Independent)}, \langle [\text{be, T-PAST, C-PAST}] \leftrightarrow \text{raibh} \text{(Dependent)} >\)

(8) \(\lfloor \text{Wh, be, T-PAST} \rfloor \Rightarrow \lfloor \text{be, T-PAST} \rfloor \) \(a^L\) \(\text{bhi}\)

(9) \(\lfloor [\text{NEG, C-PAST, be, T-PAST}] \Rightarrow [\text{NEG}] [\text{be, T-PAST, C-PAST}] \)

\[\text{ní} \] \[\text{raibh}\]
The Semantics of Scottish Gaelic Tense and Aspect
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This paper investigates the nature of viewpoint aspect and its relation to tense in Scottish Gaelic (Gàidhlig), following Parsons’ formalism (Parsons 1990), and claims that there is a major distinction between two types of grammatical aspect in Gàidhlig. The phenomena at issue here are those of the Perfect, ‘After-Perfect’, and Prospective aspects on the one hand, and the Aorist and Imperfective aspects on the other. This paper shows that the former three aspects (which we will refer to as ‘state-relational viewpoint aspects’ or ‘state-relational aspects’) are best understood as part of a branch of viewpoint aspect distinct from the branch containing perfective and imperfective aspects (which we will refer to as ‘simple viewpoint aspects’ or ‘simple aspects’). The state-relational aspects describe an event (or state) in one time as relating to a state in another. The simple aspects do not—they merely tell us what we know about the architecture of the event time itself, without separate reference to the utterance time (in monoclausal circumstances, without modifying adverbials, etc.). The fact that these two branches carry distinct semantic and syntactic values will be used as support for a theoretical division between the two. This binary typology leads to a more consistent and explanatory theory, and also makes important predictions that the unary typology does not.

Parsons’ neo-Davidsonian (i.e. patterning after (Davidson 1980)) formalism is extended to account for the phenomena of Gàidhlig. Specifically, we introduce two conventions to allow us to define a time in relation to another time, in varying stages of nearness to the first time. First, we use t for the time specified by the tense (the state time), and t’ for the event time. Second, we use $<<$ for ‘just before’ and $>>$ for ‘just after’ now. We thus represent ‘past’ in the usual way, by saying $t < \text{now}$. Any time closer to now than that specified by $t<\text{now}$ will be marked with an increasing number of $<$ signs, with more meaning time closer to now. A similar treatment occurs in the future. In this way, our formalism will be able to easily accommodate languages with any number of relational aspects. A sentence like ‘I have written a letter’, then, would have the logical form found below:

(1)  \(\text{Tha mi air litir a sgriobadh.}\)
    \(\text{be.pres I perf letter tran write.vn}\)
    ‘I have written a letter.’

(2)  \(\exists t)[t=\text{now} & (\exists t')[t'<t & (\exists e)[\text{writing}(e) & \text{Subject}(e,I) & \text{Object}(e,a\text{ letter}) & \text{Cul}(e,t') & (\exists s)[\text{having written}(s) & \text{Theme}(s,I) & \text{Hold}(s,t) & \text{Cause}(e,s)]]]]\)

That is, there is some time $t$ for which $t$ is now, and there is some time $t'$ for which $t'$ is before $t$; there is some event $e$ which is a writing event of which I am the subject and a letter is the object and which culminates at time $t'$; there is some state $s$ which is a state of having written a letter, of which I am the theme, which holds at time $t$; and the writing event causes the state of having written.
For the sentence ‘I have just written a letter’, with After-Perfect aspect, we need only to redefine t’:

(3) \textit{Tha mi as deidh litir a sgriobhadh.}
\begin{align*}
\text{be.pres is after-perf letter tran write.vn}
\end{align*}
‘I have just written a letter.’

(4) \( (\exists t)[t=\text{now} \& (\exists t')[t'<t \& (\exists e)[\text{writing(e)} \& \text{Subject(e,I)} \& \text{Object(e,a letter)} \& \\
\text{Cul(e,t')} \& (\exists s)[\text{having written(s)} \& \text{Theme(s,I)} \& \text{Hold(s,t)} \& \text{Cause(e,s)}]]]]\)

The formalism makes it clear that state-relational aspect is independent of tense, and that the state-relational aspects pattern with each other and not the other viewpoint aspects. It also allows us to analyze sentences like ‘Mary has been running’ which combine a state-relational (Perfect) and a simple aspect (Imperfective). The formalism and conventions I have adopted also predict the ungrammaticality of a sentence carrying two or more of the state-relational or two or more of the simple aspects. Finally, this model allows us to make predictions about the typology of relational aspects in the world’s languages.

\section*{References}


In this paper I discuss data from Scottish Gaelic concerning the syntactic representation of psych-constructions. In S Gaelic, the experiencer in a psychological predicate is most often expressed as a prepositional phrase. I present joint work with David Adger showing however that the structural position of experiencers is not the same as the structural position of superficially parallel locative arguments in the language. I use the decompositional system developed in Ramchand 08 to explore the nature of small clause predications in the verbal domain more generally and argue that there is crosslinguistic evidence from English and Swedish that experiencer constructions are predicationally multilayered constructions, and that an `animate’ experiencer/possessor as a subject of predication is often (perhaps always) created by movement. This systematically contrasts with the behaviour of inanimates in purely locative predications, despite superficial similarities in morphology and word order. I offer an analysis which ties these pervasive differences to a primitive predicational difference between `have’ and `be’, where the latter is a proper subset of the former in terms of structure (following Freeze, Kayne and others). In addition to providing an explicit analysis of Scottish Gaelic psych and possessive predications of the form [BE PSYCH-N PP-experiencer], I explore the implications of the analysis for double object constructions, applicatives and animacy effects in argument realisation more generally.
Maggie Tallerman

**Phrase structure vs. dependency: the analysis of Welsh syntactic soft mutation**

Maggie Tallerman, Newcastle University, UK

Most familiar syntactic frameworks recognize the category ‘phrase’, and are built around phrase structure relationships, although the theoretical assumptions each model makes may differ radically (compare, for instance, Principles & Parameters with Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar). However, the dependency model known as Word Grammar (Hudson 1990, 2007) does not acknowledge the category ‘phrase’ as a primitive in the grammar; instead, all relationships are word-based, with phrases having no syntactic status. My first goal is to investigate the theoretical validity of the notion ‘phrase’, with reference to the phenomenon in Welsh known as syntactic soft mutation, illustrated in (1) through (3):

(1) **Prynodd y ddynes delyn.** *(telyn)*  
    buy.PAST.3S the woman harp  
    ‘The woman bought a harp.’

(2) **Gwnaeth y ddynes [werthu telyn].** *(gwerthu)*  
    do.PAST.3S the woman sell.INF harp  
    ‘The woman sold a harp.’

(3) **Dymunodd Aled [i Mair ganu ’r delyn].** *(canu)*  
    want.PAST.3S Aled to Mair sing.INF the harp  
    ‘Aled wanted Mair to play the harp.’

According to the phrase-based account of Borsley & Tallerman (1996), Tallerman (1990, 2006), Borsley (1997, 1999), the consonantals mutation on the underscored elements in these data is triggered by an immediately preceding XP (phrasal) trigger. Here, I contrast a phrase-based account of the data with a dependency account. I conclude that an empirically adequate analysis of syntactic soft mutation must make reference to ‘phrase’ as a category, thus ruling out the dependency account.

A second major theoretical issue concerns the role played in the grammar by syntactically present but phonetically unrealized material, including empty categories such as *wh*-traces and unrealized words in contexts involving ellipsis. Both HPSG and Word Grammar inherently assume a more superficial structure than is proposed in Principles & Parameters models, and as a consequence, both have been more reluctant to postulate empty categories. In Word Grammar, unrealized elements were until recently not recognized at all; see, for instance, Hudson (2007: 172). HPSG has also been quite suspicious of empty categories, and some work has avoided them altogether. Recent developments in Word Grammar have resulted in changes in the earlier view of abstract elements, so that certain empty categories are now accepted. Of course, the research question concerns exactly which unrealized elements need to be recognized, and syntactic soft mutation provides an excellent testing ground for this issue. We will see that it is
probably impossible to give a concise account of the environments for the mutation without postulating some syntactically present but unrealized material. Thus, a certain level of abstractness is unavoidable. However, different predictions concerning unrealized elements are made by the two grammatical models, and we will see that the dependency analysis encounters more problems in this regard than the phrase-based analysis.