

DIRECT OBJECT DOUBLE MARKING IN CELTIC AND SOUTH SLAVIC LANGUAGES –
PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

ELENA PARINA

ABSTRACT: Двойное маркирование прямого дополнения в кельтских и южнославянских языках – предварительные замечания. В островных кельтских языках, также как и в южнославянских языках, входящих в балканский языковой союз, распространено двойное маркирование прямого дополнения. В нашей работе мы предлагаем схему описания, благодаря которой это явление может быть описано единообразно в языках различных групп, и применяем ее к средневаллийскому материалу. Наиболее распространенным типом двойного маркирования прямого объекта в средневаллийском языке является одновременное употребление аккузативных клитик и репризных местоимений, причем эта конструкция встречается гораздо чаще в 1-2 лице, чем в 3. Описание двойного маркирования прямого объекта в кельтских и южнославянских языках по предложенной схеме обогатит представления о возможном межъязыковом варьировании этого явления.

The phenomenon of direct object double marking in Old and Middle Irish was described by Ina Lucht in her paper "Doppelte Markierung des Akkusativs beim Transitivum im Altirischen" (Lucht 1994).¹ She describes constructions like

(1) Old Irish (SSMD§9,1.8)

ni- s -toirchi in muicc fon indas sin
3Sgf V art:AccSg pig:AccSg
'You will not get the pig in that way'

Ina Lucht analyses these constructions as "after-thought topic shift", the phenomenon described by T. Givón (Givón 1976: 154) (in his later works he prefers the term "R-dislocation" (Givón 1990: 761)). The NPs doubled by object clitic are usually characterized by definiteness and/or givenness (Lucht 1994: 89-90). The author

¹ The author expresses her deep gratitude to Dr. Alexander Ju. Rusakov and Dr. Anna B. Borisova (St. Petersburg) for their generous help in the preparation of this paper.

records a Middle Irish tendency for cooccurrence of object clitic and independent pronoun, impossible in Old Irish (Lucht 1994: 112).

(2) Middle Irish (LU 8877)

no- s- curat 7 no- s- traethat inna geniti hé
 Obj3Sgm V Obj3Sgm V 3Sgm
 ‘the spirits were beating and overpowering him’

In conclusion of her paper I. Lucht asserts that the construction analysed is possible in all languages that possess object clitics and enumerates the following languages: colloquial French, Balkan languages and Middle Welsh.

Is the construction in those languages really the same? In how far can we consider examples (1,2) and the following (3,4,5) as the same phenomenon?

(3) French

Je veux la voir, elle ‘I want to see her’

(4) Bulgarian (Lopashov 1978: 28)

A познаваше го тя и него хубаво
 V 3SgmAcc:clitic 3SgmAcc
 ‘And she knew also him well’

(5) Middle Welsh (PKM87.2-3)

Pwy bynnac a 'm metrei i yuelly...
 Obj1Sg V 1Sg
 ‘Whoever should smite me so...’²

What all these examples have in common is the possibility of presence of an NP or a strong pronoun and an object clitic in the same sentence. We think the following oppositions to be essential.

1. The NP can be either separated as an R-dislocation or L-dislocation, standing in a neutral case and divided from the clitic containing clause by a pause, or be case-marked as object and stand within the same clause as the clitic (one should bear in mind that in languages lacking case-marking this distinction is difficult to draw, and if we deal with a written language where we know nothing about the intonation these constructions are almost undistinguishable).

2. The clitic can be either anaphoric or cataphoric, and a language may allow either both constructions or only one of them.

3. The type of the NP doubled by the object clitic may vary. First, the language may allow or not the use of a strong pronoun in this position. Secondly, referential properties of the NP may differ (though there are certain universal tendencies, on which we shall comment later)

² The translation is cited after Jones G., Jones T. The Mabinogion. London, 1949.

4. The extent of grammaticalization of such constructions is essential – whereas in some languages it shall be a topic-marking device, in others it will be a syntactic device which would help to identify syntactic roles within the sentence (the extreme point of such a grammaticalization is verb conjugation with obligatory object agreement).

5. These anaphoric and cataphoric constructions may be characteristic only for the direct object double marking or else such an option could be possible for NPs with different syntactic functions: subject, indirect object, possessor etc.

The description of the direct object double marking in Celtic and Slavic languages according to this classification would create a map of crosslinguistic variation of this phenomenon, so that we could understand better the role several types of these constructions play in topic marking, the way object agreement in verbs develops etc. Of course on a later stage of research further languages of the world possessing this construction should also be taken into consideration (in the first line, Romance languages, on the material of which the reprise construction were first studied). This phenomenon was analyzed from several points of view. Clitic doubling in Balkan languages has been studied extensively in works of generativists, as the cooccurrence of clitics with an overt phrase constitutes a problem for the assumption that all clitic constructions by means of movement (van Rijmsdijk 1999: 7ff.). Some generativists claim that clitic doubling and right-dislocation are the same phenomenon with the difference at the logical form level (Kayne 1994), after (Anagnostopoulou 1999: 791 fn.7). From a functional point of view the phenomena described were analyzed by T. Givón as marked-topic constructions (Givón 1990: 752-762).

It should be added that the description of this phenomenon in languages should be "usage description", with a special attention to frequency, obligatoriness or optionality of several types of the construction, rather than a mere "system description" which only marks the presence or absence of the construction (see the distinction drawn, e.g. in (Sobolev 2005:183)).

It should be clear from what has been said that this type of description can hardly be achieved by one scholar on its own and should be conducted by a team of specialists in Celtic and Balkan languages to understand variations and common features of this construction. This meeting of scholars researching Celtic and Slavic parallels seems to me to be a good point to propose such an interdisciplinary study.

What we would like to present now is our analysis of one of the languages mentioned at the end of I. Lucht's paper, Middle Welsh. In the focus of our attention will be the text *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*. As our final aim is to compare the usage of the direct object double marking in Slavic and Celtic languages we shall add preliminary remarks on Bulgarian and Macedonian.

In PKM the following types of concurrence of a clitic with an overt NP are recorded:

1.1. O(N) – L-dislocated - traditionally called *Nominativus pendens* in Indo-European linguistics, this construction has drawn much attention since it is believed to be a starting point for the Welsh abnormal sentence (MacCana 1973).

1.2.

(6) Middle Welsh (PKM 8.15-16)

a'r arglwydiaeth a gaussam ninheu y ulwydyn honno, nys attygy y gennym
 and=art. rule f. 3Sgf V
 'and the rule we have had that year thou wilt not withhold [it] from us'

This construction is not found very often in narrative prose, we find only two examples of it in PKM, both of them with negation (a pragmatic explanation of this fact is given by G. Isaac in (Isaac 1994: 60)). Note that the same construction, also with negation is found in Old Welsh :

(7) Old Welsh (Surexit Memorandum)

grefiat guetic nis minn tutbulc hai cenetl in ois oisou
 title neg=Obj3Sgm V
 'Tudfwlch and his people will require no title ever afterwards'

(translation after (Isaac 1994: 12), for a different interpretation proposed by T. Arwyn Watkins see (Jenkins D., Owen M. 1984: 106-107)). Though quite rare in narratives, this construction is more widespread in functional prose, for example law texts, where the fronted NP plays a role of a heading.

In PKM there is also one example of an independent pronoun fronting:

(8) Middle Welsh (PKM 74.16)

A thitheu,» heb ef, «mi a'th gymeraf yn wreic im
 2Sgconj RP=Obj2Sg V
 'As for thee, he said, I will take thee to wife'

We should add one point here: Welsh has no declination, therefore it is difficult to draw a merger between L-dislocation and NP fronting within the clause boundary. It is questioned therefore whether these constructions are fundamentally the same: whereas E. Poppe claims there is a functional distinction between those constructions

(Poppe 1991: 196-97), G. Isaac claims that left-dislocation and topicalization without a resumptive pronoun are "formal variants, in complementary distribution, of the same functional strategy" (see for length the discussion in (Isaac 1994: 60ff).

2. Now we turn to the Welsh parallels of the sentences described by I. Lucht. As Welsh lacks case-marking it is very difficult to distinguish between a dislocation with neutralized case and a post verbal placing of a case-marked direct object with and NP preceding it (note that such difficulty in distinguishing those constructions is quite common, see (Givón 1991: 761)).

Examples with anticipated NP are quite rare in Middle Welsh. None is found in PKM, the example quoted by I. Lucht

(9) Middle Welsh (BR 4.29)

Mi a 'e dywedaf itt yr ystyr
 =Obj3Sgm V art. meaning
 'I will tell it to you, the meaning'

comes from another text, *Breudwyt Ronabwy*.

Further examples are gathered in (Strahan 1909:36) and (GMW 56-57). It is interesting to note that not all of the anticipated objects are definite, cf. the following sentence from the *Gododdin*:

(10) Middle Welsh (A 210)

neu -s goreu o^L gadeu ^Lgewilyd
 =Obj3Sgm V disgrace
 'he made [it] a disgrace of armies'

This is a remarkable point, because typologically definite objects are more often doubled by a pronoun clitic or affix than indefinite (cf. I.Lucht's results for Old Irish summarized at the beginning of our paper, on primacy of definite over indefinite in grammatical agreement on example of Swahili see (Givón 1984: 372)). All Balkan languages support this universal, though the referential status of doubled NPs and the obligatoriness of the reprise varies from language to language (Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Hellan 1999: 509 fn.13). In Bulgarian the doubled NP has to be specific, "which signifies that the expression in question is used about an entity or matter which is being identified by the speaker as a particular entity", a feature distinct from definiteness (Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Hellan 1999: 484). In Macedonian double marking of direct object is more widespread than in Bulgarian (whereas in a literary Bulgarian text only 10% of transitive verbs have double marked direct objects, in Macedonian this figure reaches 50% (Assenova 1989: 84)). Specific direct and

indirect objects marked by the definite article and also pronominal forms necessarily trigger clitic doubling (Dimitrova-V, Hellan 1999: 509, fn. 14), this double marking is irrespective of the position of the NP to the verb (Lopashov 1978: 38).

In contrast to Old Irish, where the cooccurrence of pronominal clitic and independent pronoun is impossible, both Balkan Slavic languages and Middle Welsh make wide use of such construction. It was noted that in Bulgarian and Macedonian pronominal reprise is more frequent with full form pronouns (Lopashov 1978: 32). According to P. Assenova, clitic doubling in Bulgarian started out as the doubling of topicalized pronominal objects (Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Hellan 1999: 509 fn. 17; Assenova 1989: 80). The semantics of this reprise is described in alternative ways: whereas some scholars claim the reprise has often a semantics of contrast or emphasis (de Bray 1951: 206):

(11) Bulgarian (de Bray 1951: 206)

Мене ме мама не дава.
 1SgAcc 1SgAcc:clitic V
 ‘Mother does not give *me*’

the others assert that in the case of logical stress personal pronouns are not doubled and only the full form is used:

(12) Bulgarian (Assenova 1989: 290)

a. *Него изключиха от училище*
 3SgmAcc V
 ‘It was him who was expelled from college’

vs. neutral

b. *Него го изключиха от училище*
 3SgmAcc 3SgmAcc:clitic V
 ‘He was expelled from college’

The same is true for Macedonian: while some authors report obligatoriness of cooccurrence of clitic and full form pronouns (Lopashov 1978: 32), others describe it as means of emphasis expression (Lunt 1952: 38; Illich-Svitych 1963: 568)

(13) Macedonian (Lopashov 1978: 15)

Мене ме остава, него го зема
 1SgAcc 1SgAcc:clitic V 3SgmAcc 3SgmAcc:clitic V
 ‘He left me, he took him’

(14) Macedonian (Lopashov 1978: 32)

Не ме сака тој мене, мајко
 1SgAcc:clitic V 1SgAcc
 ‘He doesn't love me, mother’

It is rather an illustration of the vagueness of the terms like "emphasis", "logical accent" as they are commonly used in linguistics (cf. A. Wierzbizka: "One could say,

of course, that the function of the Italian reduplication is that of 'emphasis' – as people often do speaking of devices whose exact force they are unable to state (Wierzbicka 1986: 290)), than an attempt to describe the semantics of this construction. We shall see the same obstacle in our analysis of Middle Welsh.

Before we start analysing the tendencies of pronoun reprise in Middle Welsh, like that in example (5), it must be noticed that Welsh full form pronouns have another status as the full form pronouns in South Slavic languages. The Welsh pronouns found in this construction have the same form as pronouns used independently (the discrepancies in 1-2Sg are described with a compact set of rules):

(15) Middle Welsh

a. *ef a glywei diaspat* (PKM 78.4)
 3Sgm P V cry

‘he heard a cry’

b. *y wreic a 'e magwys ef* (PKM 26.23)
 Obj3sgm V 3Sgm

‘the lady that nursed him’

They are classified as affixed and distinguished from independent pronouns by John Morris-Jones (WG 274), a classification adopted also by D. Simon Evans in his Grammar of Middle Welsh (GMW 57) and in many other grammars, whereas T. Arwyn Watkins brings both the dependent affixed and independent pronouns of J. Morris-Jones into one class labelled "General pronouns" (Watkins 1977: 157; Watkins 1993: 316). They can support (or "echo" using a term proposed by I. Roberts and U. Shlonsky (Roberts, Shlonsky 1996: 181ff.)) not only object proclitics, but also possessive proclitics (16a), verbal flexions, denoting subject (16b) and prepositional flexions, denoting prepositional object (16c).

(16) Middle Welsh

a. *Wy gwreic i yw hi* (PKM 64.3-4)
 my 1Sg

‘She is my wife’

b. *Y mab hagen a gymeraf i* (PKM 75.20)
 take-prs1Sg 1Sg

‘The boy however I will take’

c. *Nyt oes arnaf i ouyn cael kymriw* (PKM 9.8)
 on-1Sg 1Sg

‘I do not fear to receive wounds’

They depend on clitics or agreement affixes in that their use without them is ungrammatical: e.g. **gwreic i* 'my wife' or **ar i* 'on me'³.

³ In colloquial Modern Welsh the forms like *gwreic fi* are possible, though *ar fi* is not acceptable.

This construction of pronominal reprise has drawn much attention of Welsh scholars (an excellent summary of this discussion is given in (Rowlands 1981: 424ff)), particularly because, as T. Arwyn Watkins wrote, the difference in the usage of affixed pronouns reflects strikingly the gap between spoken and literary Modern Welsh (Watkins 1977-8: 349). It is generally admitted that in spoken Welsh affixed pronouns are used very often, whereas in literary Welsh they are used much less frequently. In spoken Welsh there is also an opposition between stressed (or better described in terms of vowel lengthening⁴) affixed pronouns conveying emphasis and non-stressed affixed pronouns without vowel lengthening, which do not convey any emphasis. Prof. Pr. MacCana noticed that the discrepancy between spoken and literary languages might go back to Middle Welsh and noted a tendency for a more frequent usage of affixed pronouns in PKM dialogues in (MacCana 1975-6: 323).

Interestingly, the usage of pronominal reprise as a feature of oral speech is noticed for Balkan languages too, especially for Bulgarian (Lopashov 1978: 37, 122; Assenova 1989: 83).

Whereas in Modern Welsh we could hope to take the stress as a guide-line for distinguishing between emphasising and non-emphasising uses of echo pronouns, in Middle Welsh we know next to nothing about it (instances of reduction of pronouns after flexions they echo may serve as indication of the lack of stress, cf. *ny chawni* 'we shall not have' from *ny^s chawn ni* (PKM 70.04-5), but spellings like that occur unconsistently). And as the notions of "emphasis" and "logical stress" are quite vague, we are unlikely to understand the function of an echo pronoun in each separate case. But this is not an obstacle to understand something about general tendencies of the usage of such constructions in Middle Welsh. To achieve this goal we have analysed all the examples of object clitics, possessive clitics and personal forms of conjugated prepositions in PKM. The statistic follows:

Table 1. *Echo pronouns supporting object clitics in PKM*

	Direct speech				Indirect speech	
	1-2 person		3 person		3 person	
	—	+	—	+	—	+
#	11	6	52	4	18	2
%	64.7	35.3	92.8	7.2	90	10

⁴ We are indebted to Dr. Iwan Wmffre for this remark

Affixed pronouns are more frequently used in 1-2 persons also with possessive pronouns and personal forms of the conjugated prepositions.

Table 2. *Echo pronouns supporting possessive clitics denoting possessor in PKM*

	Direct speech				Indirect speech	
	1-2 person		3 person		3 person	
	—	+	—	+	—	+
#	147	58	64	12	271	36
%	71.8	28.2	84.2	15.8	88.3	11.7

Table 3. *Echo pronouns supporting personal forms of conjugated prepositions in PKM*

	Direct speech				Indirect speech	
	1-2 person		3 person		3 person	
	—	+	—	+	—	+
#	102	92	68	18	194	49
%	52.6	47.4	79.1	20.9	79.9	20.1

Thus we see that the drawing line lies not between oral vs. written registers, but between 1,2 vs. 3 person.

If we glance at the history of Welsh, we can see the same phenomenon in other texts. Though it may not be considered as statistically reliable evidence, the only example of an echo pronoun supporting an object clitic in *Gododdin* is first person plural:

(17) Middle Welsh (CA 930, after Isaac 1994: 229)

an gelwir ny faw glaer fwyre

Obj1Pl V 1Pl

‘We are called bright of fame’

In Sir Ifor Williams' *Canu Llywarch Hen* edition there are several instances of pronouns marked as later insertions (this has been already noticed in (MacCana 1975-6: 321)⁵). All those pronouns are 1 and 2 Sg. In *Culhwch ac Olwen*, a text more archaic than PKM, echo pronouns are used less frequent than in PKM, but 1-2 person pronouns are used more frequent than 3 person. In *Buched Dewi* we can see the transition between the PKM state of affairs and modern writing – 1-2 person pronouns are echoed more frequently than 3, but in direct speech 3 person pronouns are echoed more often than in narrative. In the writings of Kate Roberts we could not find the opposition 1, 2 vs. 3 person in the usage of echo pronouns.

⁵ It must be noticed that we write further about affixed pronouns in several syntactic positions, not only direct object double marking

At the beginning of our paper we claimed that the usage of constructions analysed may be conditioned grammatically or pragmatically. This double marking is claimed as a grammatical device in Bulgarian and Macedonian which helps to identify syntactic function (Zychun 1963: 111). They are used "for clearness sake" (Lopashov 1978: 92), the same is claimed to be one of the main functions of echo pronouns in Modern Welsh – it is asserted that it helps to distinguish between masculine and feminine in 3Sg (King 1993: 81). Following T. Givón, Ina Lucht showed that in Old Irish the direct object double marking is an afterthought device, used when the speaker having first named the referent with an anaphoric pronoun decides later that the referent is not so accessible and so be re-coded as full NP (Lucht 1994: 91; Givón 1990: 761). This phenomenon is thus dictated in many languages by the hearer's requirements.

For Middle Welsh where we could expect the same tendency we can propose that the usage of echo pronouns reflects another feature of human language, i.e. the distinction between the locutors and non-locutors, known for many languages of the world (see e.g. (Nichols 1988: 580; Kibrik 2004: 150-1; Bhat 2004 : 132ff.; Siewierska 2004: 5ff.). The idea of this distinction has a long history in both in theoretical and historical linguistics: it was already E. Benveniste who noticed a particular status of the 3 person pronoun (Benveniste 1966: 255). There are no common Indo-European personal pronouns of the 3rd person and O. Szemerényi writes "das Pronomen der 3. Person ... ist natürlich nicht ein Personalpronomen, sondern ein Anaphoricum" (Szemerényi 1989: 224).

We have thus another point of crosslinguistic variation, which should be added to the guidelines of classification, proposed by us in the beginning of our paper – does a language make difference in the usage of pronominal reprise in 1-2 person vs. 3.

Our paper should be considered as a preliminary step towards a convertible description of pronominal reprise in Celtic and Slavic, which would add to a better understanding of this phenomenon in the languages of the world.

Bibliography.

- Anagnostopoulou, E. 1999 *'Conditions on clitic doubling in Greek'* in: *Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Eurotyp 20-5*. H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) Berlin, N.Y. 761-798
- Assenova, P. 1989 *Balkansko jezikoznanie. Osnovni problemi na balkanskija ezikov sajuz*. Sofia

- Benveniste, E. 1966 *'La nature des pronoms'* // Benveniste E. *Problèmes de linguistique générale, 1*. Paris. 251-257.
- Bhat, D.N.S. 2004 *Pronouns*. Oxford.
- de Bray, R.G.A. 1951. *Guide to the Slavonic Languages*. London – NY.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M., Hellan, L. 1999 *'Clitics and Bulgarian clause structure'* in: *Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Eurotyp 20-5*. H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) Berlin, N.Y. 469-514
- Givón, T. 1976. *'Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement'* in Li, C.N., Thompson S. (eds.) *Subject and Topic*. New York. 149-188.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction. Vol. I*. Amsterdam.
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction. Vol. II*. Amsterdam.
- GMW: Evans, D.S. 1964 *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin.
- Illich-Svitych, V. M. 1963. *'Kratkij grammatičeskij spravočnik'* in: Tolovski, D., Illich-Svitych, V. M. (ed.) *Macedonsko-russkij slovar'*. Moscow.
- Isaac, G. R. 1996. *The Verb in the Book of Aneirin. Studies in Syntax, Morphology and Etymology*. Tübingen.
- Jenkins, D., Owen, M. 1984. *'The Welsh Marginalia in the Lichfield Gospels. Part II'* in: *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*. Vol. 7
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The asymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Kibrik, A.A. 2003. *Constanty i peremennye jazyka*. Sankt-Peterburg,
- King, G. 1993. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London – NY.
- Lopashov, J.A. 1978. *Mestoimennye povtory dopolnenija v balkanskix jazykax*. Leningrad.
- Lucht, I. 1994. *'Doppelte Markierung des Accusativs bei Transitivum im Altirischen'* in: *ZCP 46*. 80-118
- Lunt, H. 1952 *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje.
- Mac Cana, P. 1973, *'On Celtic word-order and the Welsh "abnormal" sentence'* in: *Ériu 24*, 90-120.
- Mac Cana, P. 1975-6 *'Notes on the Affixed Pronouns in Welsh'* in: *Studia Celtica X-XI*, 318-325.
- Morris-Jones, J. 1913. *A Welsh Grammar*. Oxford.
- Nichols J. 1988. *'On alienable and inalienable possession'*. in: *In honor of Mary Haas. From the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*. William Shipley (ed.) Berlin etc. 1988, 557-609.

- Poppe, E. 1991. 'Word order in *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys*: notes on the pragmatics of constituent-ordering in MW narrative prose' in: Fife, J., Poppe E. (ed) *Studies in Brythonic Word-Order* (=Current Issues in Linguistic Theory Vol. 83). Amsterdam, 155-204.
- Rijmsdijk, H. van. 'Clitics: A State of the Art Report' in: Rijmsdijk, H. van (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Eurotyp 20-5. Berlin, N.Y., 1-30.
- Roberts, I., Shlonsky, U. 1996 'Pronominal Enclisis in VSO Languages' in *The Syntax of the Celtic Languages*. Cambridge, 171–199.
- Rowlands, E. I. 1981 'Dosbarthu'r Rhagenwau Personol' in: *BBCS* 29-3, 419-431.
- Siewierska A. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge,.
- Sobolev, A. 2005 'Zametki ob arumynskom dialektnom sintaksise' in: *Jazyki i dialekty malyx etnicheskix grupp na Balkanax. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferenzii*. SPb. 181-191
- Strahan, J. 1909. *An Introduction to Early Welsh*. Manchester.
- Szemerényi, Oswald 1989. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt (3. Auflage).
- Watkins, T. Arwyn 1993 'Welsh' in: Ball, M. (ed.) *The Celtic Languages*. London, 289-349.
- Watkins, T. Arwyn 1977-78. 'Y Rhagenw Ategol' in: *Studia Celtica* XII-XIII, 349-366
- Wierzbizka, A. 1986. 'Italian reduplication: cross-cultural pragmatics and illocutionary semantics' in: *Linguistics* 24 (2), 287-315.
- Zychun, G. 1963, *Sintaksis mestoimennyx klitik v yuzhnoslavjanskix jazykax*. Minsk.

Texts

- PKM: *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* allan o Lyfr Gwyn Rhydderch. Ifor Williams (ed.), Caerdydd 1951.
- SMDD: *Scéla mucce Meic Dathó*. R.Thurneysen (ed.) Dublin, 1935.
- Canu Llywarch Hen*. Ifor Williams (ed.) Cardiff, 1935.
- Culhwch ac Olwen*. Bromwich R. and Evans D.S. Cardiff, 1992.
- Buched Dewi*. The Welsh Life of St. David. D.Simon Evans (ed.) Cardiff, 1988.
- Roberts Kate*. Deian a Loli. Argraffiad cyntaf: 1925; Argraffiad newydd: Caerdydd, 1992