Negation in Middle Welsh

David Willis, University of Cambridge

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the evidence from Middle Welsh for the emergence of the Modern Welsh marker of clausal negation *ddim*. It considers cases where the indefinite pronoun *dim* 'anything' appears not to be an argument of its verb, and therefore can be considered to be a 'pseudoargument' with an adverbial function 'at all'. Isolated examples of this use can be found from the thirteenth century onwards, with robust attestation in a number of texts from the fourteenth century. It is argued that the pattern of attestation is consistent with pseudoargument *dim* being a late-thirteenth-century innovation, found only in texts first committed to writing from that time onwards. The primary factor in its emergence is argued to be the potential ambiguity in the analysis of optionally transitive verbs. Syntactic differences between Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* and the present-day Welsh clausal negation marker suggest that the former is not the direct ancestor of the later, but rather Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* instead survives in semi-fossilised form as a sentence-final adverbial today.

1   INTRODUCTION

The history of Welsh negation is marked by a shift from a preverbal negative marker (Middle Welsh *ny*(*t*), Modern Welsh *ni*(*d*)), characteristic of Middle Welsh and present-day literary Welsh, to a postverbal negative marker (Modern Welsh *ddim*), characteristic of present-day spoken and informal written Welsh. Thus, corresponding to Middle Welsh (1), present-day informal Welsh might have (2).

(1)   "…ny wnn i pwy wytti."

         "'…I don't know who you are."'   (*PKM* 2.22–3)

(2)   Wn i ddim pwy wyt ti.

This shift in the expression of negation from a preverbal to a postverbal marker is paralleled in a number of other languages, among them French and Breton, in a recurring sequence of changes, termed Jespersen's Cycle after Otto Jespersen's original observation in 1917:

The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in its turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development as the original word.

(Jespersen 1917: 4)

Thus, in Welsh, the original negative marker, Middle Welsh *ny*(*t*), is strengthened by the addition of *dim*,. Such 'strengthening' elements are known to emerge historically according to recurring patterns, common across different languages, deriving typically from 'minimisers' (nouns denoting small units, for example, French *pas* < 'a step'), negative pronouns (for example, English *not* < Old English *nan wiht* 'no creature'), or from generic nouns such as 'thing', perhaps used as indefinite pronouns (for example, Moroccan Arabic *shi* < Classical Arabic *shay* 'thing') (Roberts & Roussou, 2003: 155). Welsh follows the third of these options, using *dim*, originally a noun meaning 'thing',[1] but in Middle Welsh already largely an indefinite pronoun 'anything', to which the negative sense is eventually transferred.

Although the essential features of the development and its parallels in other languages were recognised already by John Morris-Jones (1913: 314, 1931: 154–5), there has been surprisingly little research into the details. Erich Poppe has noted the crosslinguistic parallels and the link to Jespersen's Cycle (Poppe, 1995). Simon Evans's *Grammar of Middle Welsh* notes the development of *dim* and *neb* from indefinite pronouns (essentially 'anything' and 'anyone') to inherently negative pronouns ('nothing' and 'no one'), and exemplifies the use of *dim* as an adverb 'at all' in Middle Welsh (D. S. Evans, 1964: 105–8, 173–4). A few articles have dealt with specific aspects of the history of negation, such as the development of the southern negative auxiliaries *s*(*i*)*mo* and *sana* (Morgan, 1987), or the negation of verbnouns (Richards, 1948).

Synchronic work on Welsh negation has progressed rather further. In various works (Borsley & Jones, 2000, 2001, in press), Bob Borsley and Bob Morris-Jones have developed an elaborated account of negation in present-day informal Welsh. Various dialect forms, especially those of the south, which differ markedly from the literary language, have also received some attention (see, for instance, Awbery, 1988, 1990).

One prominent feature of Borsley & Jones's analysis is that it distinguishes six (nearly) homophonous items that make up present-day (*d*)*dim*: argument *dim* (*byd*), adverb /

---

[1]   *Dim* may originally have meant 'small thing' (see below), in which case an element of the first option is also involved.

pseudoargument *ddim*, quantifier *dim*, pseudoquantifier *dim*, sentence-final adverbial *dim*, and focus-fronting *dim*. These six items are distinguished partly by their form and partly by their syntactic distribution. Borsley & Jones offer good evidence for the syntactic independence of these six homophonous forms of (*d*)*dim*.

From a historical perspective, their analysis implies that what was once a single item *dim*, which split successively into the multiple forms found today. Given this, the question arises as to whether the history of negation can be traced from a single *dim* via changes that give rise successively to the six items that we have today. The aim of this paper is to document and account for some of these developments. Discussion will be restricted to developments directly relevant to Jespersen's Cycle, that is, to the emergence of the postverbal marker of pure negation *ddim*, as found in (2). This focus of course does not exhaust the intricacies of the history of Welsh negation, and it leaves untouched a number of important areas, such as the development of the negative pronouns *dim byd* 'nothing' (from argument *dim*) and *neb* 'no one'; the southern negative auxiliaries *s(i)mo* and *sana*; and the history of the complex syntactic patterns found with negative *dim o* and *mo* + direct object or verbnoun phrase. The focus will be on what conclusions can be made based on the evidence provided by Middle Welsh texts, although some reference is made to developments at a later period. The Middle Welsh data are drawn from an exhaustive search for examples of *dim* in editions of the following texts: *Y Bibyl Ynghymraec* (*BY*), *Brenhinedd y Saesson* (*BS*), *Breudwyt Ronabwy* (*BR*), *Brut Dingestow* (*BD*), *Brut y Tywysogyon* (Red Book of Hergest Version) (*BTy*), *Buched Dewi* (*BDe*), *Buchedd Sant Martin* (*BSM*), *Chwedleu Seith Doethon Rufein* (*SDR*), *Dares Phrygius* (*DPh*), *Llyfr Blegywryd* (*LlB*), *Mabinogi Iessu Grist* (Peniarth 14.ii version) (*MIG*), *Owein* (*O*), *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (*PKM*), *Peredur* (*P*), *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* (*YCM*), *Ystorya Gereint uab Erbin* (*G*) and *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* (*YSG*). Examples are also drawn selectively from other Middle and early modern Welsh texts, in particular from the thirteenth-century texts in Isaac & Rodway (2002), and, for early modern Welsh, from the texts in Mittendorf & Willis (forthcoming).

2   TYPOLOGY OF (*D*)*DIM* IN PRESENT-DAY WELSH

Borsley & Jones's framework for present-day Welsh provides a background for investigating Middle and early modern Welsh. They propose (Borsley & Jones, in press) that (*d*)*dim* consists of the following six nearly homophonous items:

(i)   argument *dim*;

(ii)   adverb / pseudoargument *ddim*;

(iii)   quantifier *dim*;

(iv)   pseudoquantifier *dim o*, *mo*;

(v)   sentence-final adverbial *dim*;

(vi)   focus-negating / constituent-negation *dim*.

Argument *dim* is a pronoun 'anything, nothing' that may occur in any argument position (subject, object of finite verb, object of verbnoun, object of preposition etc.). In this environment, in present-day spoken Welsh, it is often reinforced, and replaced by *dim byd*.

(3)   Ddywedodd Dafydd ddim (byd).
        'Dafydd said nothing.'

Argument (*d*)*dim* varies in form between unmutated *dim* and mutated *ddim* in the same way as any other noun phrase. So, when it is the object of a finite verb, as in (3), it mutates; when it is the subject of a finite verb, or the object of a nonfinite verb, it does not. Argument *dim* existed in Middle Welsh, although, in the main, it did not have the inherently negative quality that it has today.

The second type that Borsley & Jones recognise is adverb or pseudoargument *ddim*. This is the marker of 'pure' sentential negation, and is not an argument of the verb. An example is given in (4). Here, the verb *dod* 'come' is intransitive, hence, although *ddim* superficially occupies the object position, it is not its object. It simply expresses negation pure and simple. Adverb or pseudoargument *ddim* always appears in the mutated form *ddim*, irrespective of its syntactic environment.

(4)   Ddaeth Dafydd ddim.
        'Dafydd didn't come.'

Note that the first two types of (*d*)*dim* may appear together:

(5)   Dyw Dafydd ddim wedi gwneud dim.
        'Dafydd hasn't done anything.'

This is good evidence that they are indeed independent items. I shall refer to this as pseudoargument *ddim*. The emergence of pseudoargument *ddim* will be the main issue in much of this article. Examples containing what looks like pseudoargument *ddim* can be identified in Middle Welsh, although ultimately it will turn out that they have rather different syntactic properties from those of present-day Welsh pseudoargument *ddim*.

The third type is quantifier (*d*)*dim*. In examples such as (6), Borsley & Jones offer several arguments for considering *ddim* to be a modifier of *anrheg* (rather like other quantifiers such as *rhai* or *peth* in *rhai anrhegion* 'some presents' or *peth awyr* 'a little air'), rather than a separate element.

(6)   Chafodd Dafydd ddim anrheg.
        'Dafydd didn't get a (any) present.'

Quantifier (*d*)*dim* has existed throughout the documented history of the language. I will have little more to say about it here.

Fourth is pseudoquantifier (*d*)*dim*, which must be followed by the preposition *o* and a definite noun phrase or pronoun. Frequently, *dim* combines with this preposition to form *mo*. In the variety that they consider, pseudoquantifier (*d*)*dim o* may only occur as part of the direct object of a finite verb, as illustrated in (7).

(7)   Welodd Dafydd ddim o / mo'r ffilm.
        'Dafydd didn't see the film.'

Note that, despite the presence of the preposition *o* 'of', pseudoquantifier *dim* does not entail a partitive meaning, hence its name. That is, sentence (7) can mean simply 'Dafydd didn't see the film', rather than 'Dafydd didn't see any of the film.' Pseudoquantifier (*d*)*dim o* is a Middle Welsh innovation. Again, I will have little to say about it here, but it should be noted that significant changes in its use occur in late Middle Welsh and early modern Welsh, some details of which have been documented by T. J. Morgan (1987).

The fifth *dim* is sentence-final adverbial *dim*. This appears in sentence-final position with nonfinite verbs, as in (8).

(8)   Dw i ddim wedi cysgu dim.
        'I haven't slept at all.'   (Borsley & Jones, in press: ch. 6, (64b))

Like adverb (pseudoargument) *ddim* it expresses negation rather than a quantified argument, and it is not an argument of the verb – the verb *cysgu* 'sleep' in (8) is intransitive, so *dim* is not its object. However, it also differs from pseudoargument *dim* in a number of ways. It appears sentence-finally after a verbnoun. This is unlike adverb (pseudoargument) *ddim*, which appears sentence-medially after a finite verb. Furthermore, whereas pseudoargument *ddim* always appears in the mutated form, with sentence-final (adverbial) *dim*, only the

unmutated form is ever found. Historically, the two are difficult to distinguish, and, for much of this article, I will not attempt to do so. However, ultimately I will argue that present-day Welsh adverb *dim* is a relic of an earlier much more prevalent construction, and that apparent examples of Middle Welsh pseudoargument *ddim* in fact represent sentence-final adverbial *dim*.

Finally, we have focus-negating (or constituent-negation) *dim*. This is relatively easy to distinguish. It is used when an element is fronted for contrastive focus in the 'mixed sentence' (cf. Richards, 1938: 99–104):

(9)   Dim Dafydd enillodd y râs.
        'It wasn't Dafydd who won the race.'

Focus-negating *dim* never mutates, and can always be replaced, in slightly more literary Welsh, with the constituent-negation marker *nid*.

3   MIDDLE WELSH

3.1 Nominal *dim*

Although the etymology of *dim* is uncertain, it seems highly plausible that it developed from a noun meaning 'thing'. Morris-Jones suggested an etymology linking it to 'share, part, fraction' (1913: 315). The nominal usage is still found in Middle Welsh, both productively occasionally, and, more often, in fossilised expressions such as *neb ryw dim* 'nothing, nothing of any kind, lit. any sort of thing' (*PKM* 51.27). This usage survives into present-day Welsh in such fossilised forms as *pob dim* 'everything' and *yn gyntaf dim* 'first of all' (perhaps originally 'as the first thing'), which are also attested in late Middle Welsh and early modern Welsh.[2] Another fixed expression found in Middle Welsh is *neb ryw dim* 'anything, any sort of thing'.[3] The original sense of *dim* may survive in fossilised form in Middle Welsh

---

[2]   For *pob dim*, see 2 Cor. 6.10, 7.14, 7.16, 8.7 in the 1567 New Testament translation and the examples given by Morris-Jones (1913: 313); and for *yn gyntaf dim*, see *BSM* 15.15, *DC* 12r.1, *LlH* ii.23.

[3]   For instance, *BTy* 64.10, 142.9; *PKM* 51.27. In the first two examples, there is variation between manuscript versions, which may perhaps be interpreted as an indication that scribes were uneasy about less formulaic versions of this expressions, such as *neb dim* 'any thing' or *neb ryw dim arall* 'any sort of other thing, anything else'.

didim 'destitute, empty handed' (Morris-Jones, 1913: 315). As a (perhaps) productively used item, it appears still in Middle Welsh as a head noun with a definite article and a superlative adjective in the following examples:

(10) a. ...deu vann gochyon vychein yn y grudyeu, cochach oedynt no'r dim cochaf.
'…two small red spots on her cheeks, they were redder than the reddest thing.'
(*P* 23.22)

b. ...a chyn vlaenllymet yw a'r dim blaenllymaf.
'…and it is as sharp as the sharpest thing.' (*P* 68.5)

c. …a chwech ereill onadunt a gymerth vy arueu ac a'e golchassant y mywn role hyny oedynt kyn wynhet a'r dim gwynhaf…
'…and six others of them took my weapons and washed them with a polishing instrument until they were as white as the whitest thing…' (*O* 65–7)

d. kynn hawsset oed gwassanaethv ychorff santeid glan hi ar dim hawssaf.
'Serving her pure holy body was as easy as the easiest thing.' (*LlA* 81.9–10)

Nevertheless, even these examples are, to a large extent, syntactically very similar to each other, which suggests that, even here, use of *dim* as a noun was largely formulaic.

3.2 Argument *dim*

Despite its origins as a generic noun, by the time of Middle Welsh, the most frequent use of *dim* is as an indefinite pronoun, 'anything', serving as an argument (typically the subject or object of a verb) in its own right. An example is given in (11). This is Borsley and Jones's argument *dim*.

(11) Ac ny mynnwys ef dim.
'And he didn't want anything.' (*PKM* 27.10–11)

It is reasonable to suppose that this use of *dim* arose from reanalysis of the earlier nominal *dim*. The historical development from generic noun to indefinite pronoun is a common one in the world's languages, with the relevant reanalysis arising easily in contexts where the noun *dim* is used indefinitely ('I didn't see a thing' understood as 'I didn't see anything'). Research on recurrent paths of grammaticalisation has demonstrated the frequency of such developments, and exactly the change THING > INDEFINITE PRONOUN is attested in such diverse languages as Albanian, Nahuatl, Swahili and Yoruba (Heine & Kuteva, 2002: 295–6, see also Haspelmath, 1991, 1997). Given the already limited use of *dim* as a noun in Middle

Welsh, the reanalysis itself must date back to the Old Welsh period, although perhaps no further, since *dim* did not develop in this way in Breton or Cornish.[4] This seems also to have been the (independent) fate of the cognate *dim* in Irish, which, by the Old Irish period, seems already to have developed at least into an indefinite pronoun 'anything' (for examples, see Quin 1983: ii.114).

We can see the sort of context which may have given rise to the reanalysis in Middle Welsh examples such as (12), where both a nominal reading ('a thing') and an indefinite pronoun reading ('something') could be entertained:

(12) Y neb a gudyo dim y mywn tir dyn arall trwy glad, perchen y tir bieiuyd y gudua…
'(In the case of) anyone who buries a thing / something / anything in another man's land, the hidden object belongs to the owner of the land…' (*LlB* 80.20)

This reanalysis would have been favoured by the absence of an indefinite article in Welsh, since this meant that indefinite *dim* could not easily be identified as a noun merely from the presence of an indefinite article.

Argument *dim* shows a pattern of distribution typical of weak negative polarity items in other languages, such as English *anything* or *ever*. Negative polarity items are 'expressions (either words or idiomatic phrases) with a limited distribution, part of which always includes negative sentences' (Hoeksema, 2000: 115). Weak negative polarity items are those permitted in the widest range of contexts, including, in addition to negation, a range of pseudonegative, interrogative and irrealis contexts. English *ever* shows the typical pattern. It is permitted, in (13), in the presence of a clausal negative marker -*n't*, but not, in present-day English, in such cases as (14), where no appropriate licenser is found.

(13) I don't think I could ever trust you.
(14) *I think I could ever trust you.

---

[4] Although Breton does undergo Jespersen's Cycle, its new postverbal negative marker *ket* is not related to *dim*, and the Breton developments seem to be independent and largely the result of contact with French (for further details on Breton negation, see Hemon, 1975: 281–6 and Poppe, 1995: 103–5). Cornish is the most conservative of the Brythonic languages with respect to sentential negation, and seems essentially to have maintained the inherited system.

Hoeksema (2000) lists all the other environments that allow *ever* and weak negative polarity items like it, among them interrogatives (15), conditional clauses (16), comparative clauses (17), and complements of 'adversative' predicates (18).[5]

(15)   Do you think I could ever trust you?

(16)   If you think I could ever trust you, you're wrong.

(17)   I love you more than I could ever say.

(18)   Fred denied ever having had an affair with Edna.

Middle Welsh argument *dim* shows exactly this pattern, appearing in negative contexts, with the negative marker *ny(t)* in (11). It also appears in a pseudonegative contexts, that is, contexts where there is a negative sense, even though there is no formal marker of negation, for instance, the preposition *heb* 'without', illustrated in (19a). It can be surmised on the basis of comparison with other negative polarity items, such as *neb* 'anyone', that *rac* 'before, for fear of', plus an ill-defined group of verbs that includes *gwahard* 'forbid', *gwrthot* 'refuse', also behaved in this way. A possible example of the latter case is given in (19b), although, since the verb here is subjunctive, it may belong in the next category.

(19)   a.   A'r marchawc a aeth y'r fforest heb vynnv dim y wrthaw ef mwy.
               'And the knight went to the forest without wanting anything more from him.'
                                                                                      (*YSG* 1981)
         b.   Kyt gwaharddo brenin rodi dim y eirceit yn y wlat hyt ympen yspeit, ryd vyd y penkerd.
               'Although the king may forbid giving anything to supplicants in the land for a period of time, the chief bard will be free [to do so].'   (*LlB* 26.8)

As well as negative contexts, *dim* appears in various interrogative and irrealis contexts, namely with the interrogative particle *a* in main and embedded clauses in (20), with the conditional complementisers *o(t)*, *or*, *os* 'if' etc. in (21); with a comparative in (22); and with a subjunctive verb (for examples of this, see (12) and (19b) above).

---

5   Some languages also have 'strong' or 'strict' negative polarity items, words that may appear in a negative context, but not in the other environments here. An example, on one possible analysis, would be Russian *ničego* 'nothing' (Progovac, 1993; Brown, 1999: 21–4).

(20)   a.   A wdom ninheu dim y wrth hynny?
               'Do we know anything about those?'   (*PKM* 53.16)
         b.   Yna Paredur a ovynnawd idaw a welsei yr hynny hyt hediw dim y wrth yr hynn yd oedynt yn y geissyaw.
               'Then Peredur asked him whether he had seen, from that day to this, anything of what they were seeking.'   (*YSG* 5407)

(21)   …or dyweit yr hawlwr neu yr amdiffynnwr dim yn gam, neu yn aghyfreithawl…
         '…if the plaintiff or the defendant say anything false or unlawful…'   (*LlB* 128.1)

(22)   a.   ...rac ouyn colli y wreic, yr hon a garei ynteu y wuy no dim daearavl.
               '…for fear of losing his wife, whom he loved more than anything on earth.'
                                                                                      (*BD* 136.26–7)
         b.   Ac edrych ar d[r]ylleu y cledyf a oruc a'e hoffi yn vwy no dim...
               'And he looked at the remains of the sword and judged it to be better than anything…'   (*YSG* 4198–9)

A few examples in Middle Welsh fall outside of these patterns. Most involve the phrase *hyt ar dim* 'right down to nothing' (*BTy* 38.4; *HGK* 23.3; *YCM* 139.20, 147.1, plus the example in *LlA* 60.14 cited by D. S. Evans, 1964: 107). This expression may perhaps be best understood as a fossil of the earlier nominal 'minimiser' use, having once meant 'as far as a (small) thing, part', rather than as pointing forward to the inherently negative *dim* of present-day Welsh. In a few other examples, *dim* is used for the abstract concept of 'nothing', as in (23) (cf. also the examples given by Morris-Jones, 1913: 313 and D. S. Evans, 1964: 107).

(23)   "Yr hwnn a wnaeth nef a dayar … ac a grewys pob peth o dim…"
         '"The one who made heaven and earth … and who created everything from nothing…"'   (*YCM* 30.12–13)

3.3 Pseudoargument *dim*

Borsley & Jones (2000) distinguish argument *dim* from pseudoargument *ddim*, the normal postverbal marker of negation in present-day Welsh. The latter does not fulfil any grammatical function (subject, object etc.), and therefore does not satisfy any of the argument requirements of the verb. In fact, it is not selected by the verb at all, and may therefore occur freely with any verb. Although synchronically distinct items, the two are obviously related historically, and it is natural to suppose that pseudoargument *ddim* arose out of argument *dim*. *Dim* is found in Middle Welsh in positions where it is not an argument of the verb, although

not in all texts, and, even in those texts in which it does appear, its frequency is far below that found in present-day spoken Welsh. I shall henceforth refer to cases where *dim* is not an argument of the verb in Middle Welsh as pseudoargument *dim*, although it will become clear later that the properties of this item in Middle Welsh are rather different from pseudoargument *ddim* in Modern Welsh. The following interrelated research questions need to be addressed:

(i)   are secure examples of pseudoargument *dim* attested in Middle Welsh?

(ii)   when did pseudoargument *dim* arise?

(iii)   does its presence have any geographical significance in Middle Welsh?

(iv)   what factors led to it being innovated?

(v)   what is the relationship between Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* and present-day Welsh pseudoargument *ddim*?

3.3.1 Defining pseudoargument dim

Before we can say anything definite, we need to establish what data there is. It is not easy to identify secure examples of pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh. Often it is difficult to establish whether a given instance of *dim* is to be understood as the direct object of a transitive verb (or some other argument of a verb), and hence is to be classified as argument *dim*, or whether the same verb is being used intransitively, with pseudoargument *dim* meaning 'at all'. Careful comparison with other instances of the same verb is necessary. In what follows, I consider a number of cases of this problem, reaching different conclusions in different cases. In deciding whether a given example is really a case of pseudoargument *dim*, I take the following factors into consideration:

(i)   the argument structure of the verb, as evidenced from other examples of its use in Middle Welsh;

(ii)   the properties of the text as a whole, specifically, whether unambiguous examples of pseudoargument *dim* are independently attested in it;

(iii)   the surrounding context;

(iv)   for translated texts where some reasonable approximation to the source can be found, the original wording in Latin or French.

The first of these is the most important, but in cases where it gives inconclusive results, the other factors must be used.

Let us begin with the most secure evidence, proceeding to the more difficult cases. A secure example of pseudoargument *dim* is one where the verb is unambiguously intransitive. Frequent attestation of examples of this kind show that pseudoargument *dim* was well established in the language by the end of the fifteenth century. Texts can be cited from the late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in which it is attested beyond any doubt. Such texts include *Buchedd Sant Martin*, *Darn o'r Ffestival,* the 1567 New Testament, *Treigl y Marchog Crwydrad* and *Ystori Alexander a Lodwig*. Examples are given below:

(24)   a. …ac yr hynny ni chyffroai ef ddim.
           '…and despite this he didn't wake up.'   (*BSM* 21.25–6)

        b. Ac nid ae ef ddim oddyno…
           'And he didn't go away from there…'   (*DFf* 135.5)

        c. …nyd atepawdd ef ddim.
           '…he didn't answer.'   (*TN* 1567, Matt. 27.12)

        d. ...y may y sawl na phechoedd dim erioed mewn dylyed y Dduw...
           '…those who have never sinned are in debt to God…'   (*TMC* 2672–3)

        e. …nag ofnwch ddim eithr byddwch lawen a sirys ...
           '…don't be afraid but be happy and cheerful…'   (*YAL*, NLW 13075B, 84v.15)

Before this time, possible examples of pseudoargument *dim* are rarer, and need careful interpretation.

3.3.2 Verbs of succeeding

The first group of cases to consider involves verbs meaning 'avail, benefit, profit', namely *dygrynhoi, grymhau/grymyaw, talu* and *tygyaw*, which frequently co-occur with *dim* in Middle Welsh:

(25)   a. Ny thalwys idaw hynny dim…
           'And this didn't help him…'   (*YCM* 99.23)

        b. Ac ny dygrynoes y gelynyon dim yn eu herbyn…
           'And the enemies had no success against them…'   (*BD* 135.12–13)

        c. Ac am na thygyei dim udunt, wynt a ffoassant y'r ffenestri…
           'And since it didn't help them / since nothing helped them, they fled to the windows…'   (*YSG* 4645)

        d. …ac ny rymhaawd idaw dim.
           '…and it did not help him.'   (*BTy* 264.8)

The question is whether *dim* in these cases is the object or subject of the verb, a predicate noun phrase (possibly selected by the verb), or an adverb optionally modifying the verb. In all except the last case, we could conclude that *dim* is an indefinite pronoun, and hence we would not be dealing with pseudoargument *dim*. In the last case, *dim* would not be an argument of the verb, and we would have evidence for the appearance of pseudoargument *dim*.

These questions are particularly important since the only three possible instances of pseudoargument *dim* in *Brut Dingestow* are with *dygrynhoi*, and, if these are excluded from consideration, pseudoargument *dim* is entirely absent from the text. The same holds for the three cases of *dim* with *grymhau* in the Red Book of Hergest version of *Brut y Tywysogyon*.

There is one clear test for object status in Middle Welsh. If an object is fronted in a focus (mixed-sentence) or topicalisation (abnormal-sentence) structure, it is followed by the particle *a*, whereas adverbs are followed by the particle *y(d)* (see Willis, 1998: 51–5). Such fronting is well attested with *talu* 'be worth, be of use', and the particle found after the fronted element expressing the degree of success is *a*:

(26)   a.   Ychydic a dal eu Chyarlys hwy hediw.
           'Their Charles is of little use to them today.'   (*YCM* 147.2)

       b.   'Yn lle gwir,' heb y meudwy, 'bychydic a dal vy nghyngor j y ti…'
           " 'In truth,' said the hermit, 'my advice is of little use to you…'   (*YSG* 1444–6)

       c.   A gwybyd di yn lle gwir mae mwy a dal vyn dued i no gwynder ereill.
           'And you should truly know that my blackness is more powerful than the whiteness of others.'   (*YSG* 3336–7)

This suggests that the syntax of *talu* in the sense that we are dealing with here parallels its syntax in its literal meaning 'pay', and the extent of the benefit obtained is the direct object, just as the amount of money paid is the direct object in the literal use. It can therefore be concluded that *dim* in (25a), and examples like it (*BTy* 86.19; *LlB* 115.11; *YCM* 59.2, 92.27), is the direct object of *talu*, and that this is therefore an instance of argument *dim*.

Dygrynhoi is a difficult case. It appears in two syntactic frames: with instrument subject and the (optional) beneficiary in a prepositional phrase headed by *y* 'to', as in (27); and (less frequently) with beneficiary subject and instrument left unexpressed, as in (28).

(27)   …ac ny dygrynoes ydav hynny namyn ychydyc.
       '…and this helped them only a little.'   (*BD* 6.34)

(28)   …ac ny dygrynoynt dim yn y erbyn nac ar uor nac ar dir.
       '…and they had no success against him either on sea or on land.'   (*BD* 168.24–5)

The nature or extent of the success (either 'none / nothing' or 'a little') is sometimes expressed, as it is in both these examples. In (29), both options (*dim* and *ychydig*) are conjoined, which suggests that they have the same grammatical status. But what is that status?

(29)   Ac ny dygrynnoes henny hagen namyn ae echedyc ae dym…
       'And this helped them only either a little or not at all…'
                                                 (Llanstephan 1, 3.5–6, Isaac & Rodway, 2002)

When *ychydig* is fronted, as in (30), it is followed by the particle *a*, which suggests that it is the object of *dygrynhoi*. If it were an adverb we would expect *y(d)*

(30)   …ac echedyc eyssyoes a dygrynnoes ydav henny. nev entev ny dygrynnoes dym.
       '…and yet this was of little use to him, or else he had no success.'
                                                 (Peniarth 44, 4.2, Isaac & Rodway, 2002)

I tentatively conclude that this justifies us in analysing *dim* as the direct object of *dygrynhoi* in (25b) and (28), that is, they mean something like 'the enemies achieved nothing against them' and 'they achieved nothing against him…' respectively. This makes the syntax of *dygrynhoi* essentially parallel to that of *talu*.

Tygyaw normally selects either a verbnoun phrase or else *hynny* 'this' as its subject, and the beneficiary is expressed by a prepositional phrase headed by *y* 'to' (D. S. Evans 1964: 155–6). It regularly appears in Middle Welsh with only these two arguments:

(31)   ac ni thygyei ymi y hymlit hi.
       '…and it was no use me pursuing her.'   (*PKM* 10.9)

It also allows an instrument as its subject:

(32)   Ac ny thygyawd udunt nac arueu na dim…
       'And neither weapons nor anything helped them…'   (*YCM* 147.19–20)

In (32), *dim* is conjoined with *arueu* 'weapons', which is clearly a subject, hence *dim* must also be a subject in (32). In all the other Middle Welsh examples found with *tygyaw* and *dim* (*BS* 100.23, 192.14; *SDR* 423; *YCM* 69.14; *YSG* 4645), there is neither a verbnoun phrase nor any other overt subject. Again, this suggests that *dim* is the subject. Therefore, we can be fairly sure that *dim* is the subject in sentence (25c), and that it means 'Since nothing helped them…' rather than 'Since it didn't help them at all…'. The other examples merit a similar conclusion. In order to conclude that *dim* was not a subject, but rather an adverb, we would need to encounter sentences of the type **Ny thygyawd hynny udunt dim* 'This was of no use to them', but these are not found.

The final verb of succeeding that we have to consider is *grymhau*. There are three examples of *grymhau* with *dim* in the Red Book of Hergest version of *Brut y Tywysogyon*:

(33)   a.   …ac ny rymhaawd idaw dim.
            '…and it did not help him.'   (*BTy* 264.8)

       b.   A gwedy na rymhaei dim idaw, kyrchu a oruc y Gelli a Maesyueid...
            'And after he didn't succeed, he headed for Hay and Radnor…'
                                                               (*BTy* 208.25–6)

       c.   A gwedy na rymheynt dim anun a orugant at y brenhin y geissaw nerth.
            'And since they were powerless, they sent to the king to seek aid.'   (*BTy* 50.27–8)

Grymhau normally selects for the instrument of success as its subject, and the beneficiary as a prepositional phrase headed by *y* 'to':[6]

(34)   a.   …kyfreith adweid na rymha idaw hynny…
            'the law says that this doesn't help him…'   (*Llan. 116*, 119.35–6)

       b.   Fferracut eissoes a duc gantaw gledyf, ac ny rymhaawd idaw.
            'Fferacud, however, took a sword with him, but it didn't help him.'(*YCM* 27.14–15)

This suggests that, in (33a–b), *dim* is the subject. On the other hand, we have the following fronting evidence:

(35)   Beth arymhaa olew y dynyon gwann.
            'What use is oil to weak men?'   (*LlA* 47.22–3; R. J. Thomas, 1950–2002: 1540)

In (35), *beth* looks like the object, since it cannot be the subject, which is *olew*, and it triggers the particle *a*, which is not compatible with fronting of an adverb.

The interpretation of (33c) may be different, given the third-person plural ending of the verb *rymheynt*, which rules out the possibility that *dim* is the subject. Both direct object and pseudoargument *dim* are possible interpretations, and it is difficult to decide between them.

This section has considered various cases of *dim* with verbs of succeeding, a characteristic context for potential cases of pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh. In almost all cases, a plausible analysis is available in which *dim* is in fact an argument of the verb. I therefore conclude that, with the possible exception of example (33c), these cases cannot be used as evidence that pseudoargument *dim* had been innovated in the texts in which they are found. This, of course, is not to deny the possibility, which will be discussed below, that the existence of such cases was a factor in the emergence of pseudoargument *dim*.

3.3.3 Other questions of argument structure

Other verbs present similar issues of analysis and interpretation. There are four cases of possible pseudoargument *dim* in *Llyfr Blegywryd* with *diwygyaw* 'compensate, rectify, expiate':

(36)   a.   ...ny diwygir dim idaw.
            '…he is not to be compensated at all.'   (*LlB* 23.9)

       b.   …ny diwygir dim idaw am hynny.
            '…he is not to be compensated at all for this.'   (*LlB* 27.24)

       c.   Dros ki kyndeirawc, na thros y drwc a wnel, ny diwygir dim.
            'For a mad dog, or for the damage that it might do, there is no compensation.'
                                                               (*LlB* 53.3)

       d.   Tri ouer llaeth yssyd – llaeth cath, a llaeth gast, a llaeth cassec – ny diwygir dim ymdanunt.
            'There are three worthless types of milk – cat's milk, and bitch's milk, and mare's milk – no compensation is given for (any of) them.'   (*LlB* 110.27)

Comparison with other instances of this same verb in Middle Welsh suggests that, while *diwygyaw* is optionally transitive, its direct object may express the nature of the loss or offence (cf. *LlB* 113.28), but not the nature of the compensation. Therefore, in (36), *dim* cannot be considered to be an argument of the verb (its object). However, in two of these cases, (*LlB* 23.9, 53.3) *dim* translates Latin *nichil*, which suggests that the translator

understood it be represent 'anything, nothing' rather than an adverbial adjunct interpretation. In the other two cases, no corresponding Latin text can be identified. Finally, there is the fact that the rest of the text contains a number of examples of fairly unambiguous pseudoargument *dim* with other verbs. Overall in this case, I take the translation evidence as crucial, indicating that, although this is an instance of pseudoargument *dim* (since *dim* is not the object of *diwygyaw*), its use is also essentially a translation error.

Another verb that co-occurs frequently with *dim* is *argywedu* 'injure, harm'. The frequency of this collocation (*BS* 66.19, 130.8, 174.23; *YCM* 27.18, 27.20; Peniarth 14.i 65.15 = *MIG* 242.7–8; *RhY* 5.13) could lead us to suspect that *dim* is really an argument of this verb. However, this does not seem to be justified. *Argywedu* takes two arguments: the source of the injury, expressed as the subject; and the person injured (the 'patient'), expressed variously as the direct object[7] or as a prepositional-phrase complement headed either by *ar* 'on' or *y* 'to' (on the use of *ar* with *argywedu*, see also D. S. Evans, 1954: 3). No other argument seems ever to be expressed. Furthermore, the two examples in *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* translate Latin *minime* (*YCM* 27.18 = *T* XVII.60) and *nullo modo* (*YCM* 27.20 = *T* XVII.63) respectively, rather than *nichil*, which is what would be expected if this were an argument or a mistranslation of an argument. Hence, it is hard to see how *dim* can fill the role of any other argument in these examples, and these must be interpreted as examples of pseudoargument *dim*.

There is a similar issue with some idiomatic expressions, namely, *dyfot cof y* 'remember (lit. come memory to)' and *bot gwerth ar* 'be worth (lit. be value on)'. These are found with *dim* in *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*:

(37) a. Ac yr a welsynt o ouut yn y gwyd, ac yr a gewssynt e hun, ny doy gof udunt wy dim…
          'And whatever grief they saw in its presence, and whatever grief they suffered themselves, they didn't remember any of it…'   (*PKM* 46.28)
      b. Guir yw, Arglwyd, nyt guerth arnaw ef dim.
          'It is true, Lord, it has no price.'   (*PKM* 62.28)

The syntax of (37a) is one way (along with the verb *coffau*) of expressing 'remember' in Welsh before the formation of the modern Welsh verb *cofio* by the mid-sixteenth century (for

---

[7]   See, however, Thomas Jones's comments in his edition of *Brenhinedd y Saesson* on *BS* 130.8, where he suggests that the transitive use of *argywedu* here is an error, the result of a miscopying of earlier *argysyryaw* 'be afraid' (Jones 1971: xxvii)

details, see Thomson's note to *G* 322). Where it occurs elsewhere, it occurs with a noun phrase expressing the thing remembered:

(38) a. A dyuot cof idaw adaw y drws y agoret…
          'And he remembers leaving the door open…'   (*PKM* 22.24)
      b. Sef achos y doeth kof im hynny…
          'This is the reason that he remembered this…'   (*P* 33.26)
      c. Dyuot cof a oruc y Ereint ymadrawd y corr vrthaw…
          'Gereint remembered the dwarf's comments to him…'   (*G* 322)
      d. …a dyuot cof itaw y dolur yna yn uwy no fan y cawsei.
          '…and he remembered his pain then greater than when he had suffered it.'   (*G* 1131–2)

Whether *cof* is to be understood as the subject of *dyfot* or whether *dyfot cof* itself functions as a unit, effectively a transitive verb, is unclear, but, either way, the element referring to the thing remembered seems to be compulsory. If *cof* is the subject of *dyfot*, then the thing remembered is the complement of *cof* ('memory of x'); if *dyfot cof* is a unit, then the thing remembered is its compulsory object. On either interpretation, *dim* in (37a) is an argument of 'remember'. This example is therefore not an instance of pseudoargument *dim*.

Much the same applies to *gwerth* in (37b), where *gwerth* normally takes a complement expressing the value, as in (39).

(39)   …oed diryeit hagen y minheu treulaw gwerth seith ugein punt o iryeit gwerthuawr wrth dyn heb wybot pwy yw.
          '…it was unfortunate, however, for me to use up a hundred and forty pounds' worth of valuable ointment on a man without knowing who he is.'   (*O* 615–17)

Comparison with (39) suggests that, in (37b), *dim* is the complement of *gwerth*, and that, therefore, this is argument *dim*. These two conclusions are consistent with the fact that both unclear cases are from *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*, and that robust examples of pseudoargument *dim* are not attested in the text.

3.3.4 Optionally transitive verbs

Finally, there is the case of optionally transitive verbs, such as *barnu* 'judge', *bwyta* 'eat', *clybot* 'hear', *gwadu* 'deny', *gwybot* 'know' and *talu* 'pay'. An example is given in (40).

(40)   Y chwedyl hwn, gwell yw ac odidogach, kany cheir gan ueird na chroessanyeit, y
         rei a beidwys oll ac ef, am na wybuant dim y wrthaw...

         'This story is better and finer, for it is not found among poets or jesters, who have
         all given up on it, for they know nothing about it.' (or 'for they don't know about
         it at all.')   (YCM 43.15–18)

These can only be decided in context on a case by case basis. On the whole, I have treated them as argument *dim*, while checking for contexts which might dictate otherwise, for instance, if *clybot* meant 'to have the ability to hear, not be deaf' rather than 'to hear (something specific)'. The relevant cases are: for *bwyta*, *YSG* 2293; for *clybot*, *MIG* Pen. 5 209.22; *YSG* 776, 2914, 3478 (x2); for *dywedut*, *BTy* 72.19, *P* 38.12, *YSG* 5299; for *gwybot* *BD* 82.8, 100.26, 139.21; *BTy* 222.20; *DPh* 11.33, 27.18; *G* 986; *MIG* Pen. 14.ii 194.21; *PKM* 35.9, 39.27, 52.3, 53.16, 54.9; *YCM* 32.10, 43.18, 132.14, 156.12; *YSG* 1253, 2916; for *prynu*, *PKM* 53.3, 54.20, 58.15; for *talu*, *LlB* 32.19, 67.3, 115.11, all judged as argument *dim*. Examples with *barnu* 'judge' (*LlB* 125.3), *dadleu* 'argue' (*LlB* 45.21) and *gwadu* 'deny' (*LlB* 36.15, 43.30), on the other hand, were judged to involve pseudoargument *dim*.

3.4 Temporal and textual distribution of pseudoargument *dim*

The previous section considered a range of examples in Middle Welsh where *dim* might be analysed as not an argument of the verb. On the whole, close examination of these cases reveals them to be cases of argument *dim*. This nevertheless leaves a core of examples that stand up to scrutiny. These remaining examples cluster in certain texts. This section sets out these examples, and examines their distribution in the hope that they will allow us to say something about the emergence of pseudoargument *dim*.

3.4.1 Texts with isolated examples
In some of the texts examined, pseudoargument *dim* occurs only in isolated occurrences that may themselves be open to reinterpretation, particularly in the case of optionally transitive verbs. This is the case for the Red Book Version of *Brut y Tywysogyon* (only example (11c) above) and for the Peniarth 14.ii redaction of *Mabinogi Iessu Grist* (only example (41), which is perhaps open to reinterpretation as 'they walked among wolves and feared nothing').

(41)   ...ym plith y bleidieu y kerdynt ac nyt ouynheynt dim...
         '...they walked amongst wolves and were not afraid...'   (*MIG* 187.11–12)

Owein has two examples of pseudoargument *dim*, given in (42). However, *dim* is included in (42b) only in the Jesus 20 redaction.

(42) a. 'Duw a wyr,' heb y uorwyn, 'na char hi dydi na bychydic na dim!'
          '"God knows,' said the maiden, 'that she does not love you, neither a little nor at
          all!'   (*O* 368–9)
      b. ...a gwr du mawr a wely ympen yr orset. ny bo llei dim no deu wr o wyr ybyt
          honn...
          '...and you will see at the end of the mound a big dark man who is no smaller than
          two men of this world...'   (Jesus 20, *Owein*, Jones (1953: 116))

Early possible examples in (43) from the thirteenth-century manuscripts in Isaac & Rodway (2002) are also isolated examples:

(43) a. Gwr o leing'. marthin y enw a oedet en e boeni o gryt ... en gemeint ac nat oed
          allu e lavuryav dim nac e uwyta.
          'A man from Ligny, named Martin, was being tormented by fever ... so much that
          he could not work at all or eat.'
                                      (Peniarth 14, 34.29–31, *Gvyrthyeu Seint Edmund Archescop Keint*)
      b. ..cany gerrus perchenauc ar y mab dym...
          '...since the owner did not make any charge against the son...'
                                                                      (Peniarth 30, 328.9–11)
      c. ...ac nyt argywedynt udun dim ket bedynt y gyt.
          '...and they did not harm them at all even though they were together.'
                                                            (Peniarth 14.i 65.15 = *MIG* 242.7–8)

Although (43a) is fairly secure, (43b) is open to the alternative interpretation '...since the owner did not charge the son with anything...' with *dim* as the direct object of *gyrru ar* 'prosecute a crime against someone, make an accusation of something against someone'. This verb normally selects *ar* + the person prosecuted, and a direct object of the charge or crime. Both arguments appear to be optional; for instance, the crime argument is omitted in (44).

(44)   O deruyd e den mennu guadu amot ac arall en gerru arnau...
         'If a man wants to deny an agreement, and someone else prosecutes him...'
                                                                              (*LlI* 42.20–1)

Although both orders are attested, the order direct object (crime) followed by *ar* + person accused seems to be unmarked when the crime is a single word, as in (45).

(45)   ...kyn gerro ef lladrat ar arall...

'...before he prosecutes someone else for theft...'   (*LlC* 20.35).

Taken together, these facts suggest that *dim* in (43b) is not the direct object of *gyrru*, and that it is perfectly possible to interpret *gyrru* as being used intransitively on this occasion. However, an alternative interpretation cannot be entirely excluded.

3.4.2 Texts with systematic attestation of pseudoargument dim

In addition to these examples, there is another group of Middle Welsh texts where pseudoargument *dim* is fairly robustly attested. This group contains four texts: *Brenhinedd y Saesson* (Cotton Cleopatra B.v.) (*BS* 34.24, 50.6, 66.19, 70.10, 130.8, 174.23), *Llyfr Blegywryd* (*LlB* 23.9, 27.24, 36.15, 43.30, 45.21, 53.3, 61.27, 110.27, 125.3), *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* (*YCM* 27.18, 27.20) and *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* (*YSG* 759, 1259, 1919, 2782, 2874, 3336, 4235, 4386, 4493, 4746, 5213, 5446). Examples from these four texts are given in (46).

(46)   a.   A hwnnw … a gymyrth ryvic a balchter yndaw heb didorbot nac am Duw nac am dyn dym.

'And he … took on arrogance and pride without caring at all either for God or for man.'   (*BS* 34.24)

b.   …blwydyn a hanher y mac y vam ef, a gwedy hynny nys mac dim.

'…for a year and a half his mother must raise him, and after that she doesn't have to raise him.'   (*LlB* 61.27)

c.   ...ac nyt argwedwys idaw dim.

'…and it didn't harm him at all.'   (*YCM* 27.18)

d.   A phan weles ynteu daruot llad y varch, ny lidiawd dim yr hynny…

'And when he saw that his horse had been killed, he still didn't get angry.'   (*YSG* 2874)

Ystorya de Carolo Magno is interesting in that the three parts of it differ in their patterns of usage. Pseudoargument *dim* is attested in two cases in 'Cronicl Turpin'; in 'Rhamant Otuel', we find *o dim* used frequently in the same function; and in 'Cân Rolant' it is entirely absent.

3.4.3 O dim *and questions of translation*

A further complication is that some texts use the prepositional phrase *o dim* 'of anything, in any way' in much the same way as pseudoargument *dim*. This is particularly characteristic of 'Rhamant Otuel' in *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* (*YCM* 45.10, 46.20, 57.5, 57.25, 95.20, 106.16, 124.4) and *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* (*YSG* 51, 940, 3537, 3828, 4650, 4951, 5622), although occasional examples are found outside of these texts (*BTy* 208.4; *O* 108).

(47)   a.   A gwedy na dygrynoi idaw hynny o dim…

'And after this failed to help him at all…'   (*BTy* 208.3–4)

b.   …twyllwr ny charei Duw ef o dim.

'…a deceiver who did not love God at all.'   (*YCM* 106.15–16)

c.   Ac ynteu … ny chredawd udunt o dim…

'And he … didn't believe them at all…'   (*YSG* 5622)

The question, which cannot be resolved on the evidence of these texts, is whether this should be treated as a variant of pseudoargument *dim* or as an independent phenomenon. It is noteworthy that most of the examples are translated from Old French, which might suggest translation influence. Although *o dim* has various correspondences in the French, in a few cases (*YCM* 46.20; *YSG* 940, 4650) it seems to be a literal translation of Old French *de riens* 'of anything' (corresponding to *Otinel* 106; *QSG* 44.15, 230.29). Except in the cases of *o dim* just mentioned, pseudoargument *dim* in *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* and *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* does not translate Old French *riens* (although, of course, argument *dim* does).

3.4.4 Geographical and temporal distribution

Although pseudoargument *dim* seems to be characteristic of certain Middle Welsh texts, these texts do not show any clear geographical pattern. We have seen that it is characteristic of four of the texts examined, and it is possible that *Owein* should be added to this list. However, these texts, in their current form, are associated linguistically with all parts of Wales. P. W. Thomas (1992, 1993) identifies the linguistic affiliation of various Middle Welsh texts on the basis of three morphological variables, namely the presence or absence of /j/ in various endings, the presence of -t- /t/ or -th- /θ/ in the third person endings of the prepositions *gan* 'with' and *rwng* 'between', and the form of the third-person singular past tense verbal ending, either *-awd* or vowel plus -s. On this basis he identifies *Brenhinedd y Saesson* as representing an earlier northern variety, manifesting absolutely regular use of /j/ and /θ/, both northern features, and low-to-moderate (36%) use of *-awd*, a northern innovation. By similar logic, *Llyfr Blegywryd* is identified as (later) southwestern (low use of /j/, no /θ/, moderate-to-high

use of *-awd*), and 'Cronicl Turpin' in *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* as southeastern (low use of /j/, no /θ/, low use of *-awd*) (P. W. Thomas, 1993). The edition of *Llyfr Blegywryd* can be compared with other manuscript copies of the *Dull Blegywryd* redaction of the Welsh laws. It is noteworthy here, that the Jesus 57 version, despite marked dialect differences in morphology which suggest a more northerly dialect attribution for it, retains essentially the same use of *dim*. Although *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* is not dealt with in P. W. Thomas (1993), it clearly belongs in the later northern category linguistically (general use of /j/, /θ/ and *-awd*), notwithstanding the southeastern provenance of its manuscript, Peniarth 11.

Of course, comparison with morphological variables may not be entirely justified, since syntactic features are probably more likely to survive copying – overall, a scribe may be more willing to alter the spelling of words, including aspects of their morphology, than to omit or to add words entirely. This means that it is at least conceivable that the syntax of a particular manuscript copy of a text may better reflect the dialect of the original than the morphology or phonology of that copy does, a possibility that cannot be excluded in the current instance with the comparison of *Llyfr Blegywryd* (Peniarth 36A) and Jesus 57 above. The result would be a text of mixed dialect features, say with northern syntactic features, but southeastern morphological features. Although this is conceivable, and future research may indeed identify such cases, there is little reason in the current instance to expect that such factors would allow us to associate pseudoargument *dim* with a particular dialect area. I conclude that pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh is not regionally marked, and is therefore not diagnostic of dialect.

Investigation of temporal variation may be more enlightening. Examples of pseudoargument *dim* are found from the mid-thirteenth century onwards, so it can be concluded that it had been innovated by that time. In the fourteenth century, it is attested robustly in some manuscripts or texts, but not at all in others. Given that the possibility of dialect variability does not seem promising, there are two plausible explanations for this.

First, assuming that syntactic features are relatively resilient, and survive copying better than morphological features, any text that was composed or acquired written form before the development of pseudoargument *dim* is unlikely to acquire it during manuscript transmission. Therefore, if, in the early fourteenth century, pseudoargument *dim* were a recent innovation (say, having been present in adult speech from around the 1270s), then we would expect to find it only in those fourteenth-century texts with short histories of manuscript transmission, and not in those with longer histories of manuscript transmission. It is perfectly conceivable that this is what we have here.

All four of the texts where *dim* is robustly attested are translations, either from Old French or from Latin. The *Dull Blegywryd* version of the Welsh laws is a rendition into Welsh

of the Latin D redaction of the laws (Emanuel, 1967: 72; Charles-Edwards, 1989: 20, 34). Emanuel argued that the Latin D redaction was compiled in south Wales in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. The earliest manuscripts of this redaction in Welsh (Trinity O.7.1 and Peniarth 36A) date from the beginning of the fourteenth century (Huws, 2000: 59). The date of translation into Welsh must therefore be placed somewhere between the two, perhaps early in the fourteenth century.

Brenhinedd y Saesson is probably a translation of an earlier lost Latin chronicle compiled partly from the Latin original of *Brut y Tywysogyon*, partly from the *Annals of Winchester* and partly from other sources (Jones, 1971: xxxi).[8] There is little secure evidence on which to base the date of translation (as opposed to the date of the surviving manuscripts), except to say that *Brenhinedd y Saesson* records events up to 1197, and so its Latin source must have been compiled after this date.

'Cronicl Turpin' was translated into Welsh some time between 1265 and 1282 (Williams, 1930: xxxi). Williams suggests that the other parts of *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* were translated later in sequence between about 1275 and 1325 (Williams, 1930: xlix).

Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan has suggested that the translation of *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* was made at the end of the fourteenth century, not long before the earliest extant manuscript (Jones, 1992: xxi).

These datings would all be consistent with the idea that pseudoargument *dim* was innovated towards the end of the thirteenth century. The earliest manuscript attestation ((45) above) dates from this period. Thereafter, pseudoargument *dim* appears in some texts newly translated into Welsh after this date, but not in those with a manuscript tradition that leads further back.

A second possibility is that pseudoargument *dim* was regarded as a substandard innovation, and avoided by 'better' Middle Welsh scribes. P. W. Thomas (1993: 22) has suggested that this must be the case with the southern focus marker *taw*, which is very rarely attested in Middle Welsh, but which must have existed. Although in principle plausible, this leaves us with the task of explaining why pseudoargument *dim* is found fairly regularly in certain texts, and why, in these texts, but not in others, it does not seem to have the character of an occasional error. For this reason, this second possibility seems less likely as a general

---

[8]   Jones (1971: xlvii) believed *Brenhinedd y Saesson* (Cotton Cleopatra B.v.) and the version of *Brut y Brenhinedd* in Cotton Cleopatra B.v. to have been translated by the same person. This is not consistent with their use of *dim*, where they differ markedly, with pseudoargument *dim* being characteristic of the former text, but absent in the latter.

explanation, although it is easy to suppose that there may have been some reluctance to use pseudoargument *dim* for some time after its innovation.

To conclude, there is good evidence for the pseudoargument *dim* from a group of fourteenth-century Middle Welsh manuscripts. Isolated instances from the thirteenth century suggest that it had already been innovated some time before the start of the fourteenth century. It exhibits no obvious association with any particular dialect area. The textual attestation is consistent with the view that it was available for use in newly composed texts in the fourteenth century, but that scribes did not introduce it into older texts as they were recopied.

3.5 The origin of pseudoargument *dim*

The difficulty of interpreting many of the Middle Welsh examples above suggests a path for the emergence of pseudoargument *dim*. Difficulty in interpreting examples above arose from two main sources: verbs whose argument structure had to be established explicitly; and verbs which could (and often still can) be used transitively or intransitively. In both of these cases, two syntactic structures could be conceived of, one where *dim* was an argument (often a direct object), and one where it was an adverbial adjunct of the verb phrase. In the first case, the verbs under consideration were often ones which have not survived into present-day Welsh, and, hence, their syntax is particularly uncertain from a modern perspective. However, the argument structure of these verbs can usually be established with relative certainty by comparison with other examples from Middle Welsh. For instance, *argywedu* 'harm, injure' takes a subject of the source of the injury and a prepositional phrase headed by *ar* 'on' or *y* 'to' expressing the affected person. We can suppose that speakers of Middle Welsh would have learned this straightforwardly just like other aspects of their language. In the case of rare or obsolescent verbs, the details of the argument structure may not have been learned successfully, and, in this regard, it is perhaps significant that nearly all the verbs discussed in sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 above have died out. This could, for instance, be the case with *dygrynhoi* 'succeed, avail', which manifests two syntactic frames in Middle Welsh: one with instrument subject and the (optional) beneficiary in a prepositional phrase headed by *y* 'to'; and one with beneficiary subject and instrument left unexpressed, as in (29)–(30) above. It seems likely that the second of these is an innovation, the result of a failure to learn the rather marked pattern of argument mapping, with instrument as subject. In cases such as this, it seems conceivable that *dim*, which had previously been interpreted as, say, the direct object, came to be interpreted as an adverb.

Such ambiguity would, however, have arisen only with a small group of fairly rare verbs, and can hardly have been the main factor in the reanalysis. Far more significant are the widespread difficulties of interpretation that must have arisen with the very frequent optionally transitive verbs, cases such as that exemplified in (48). Particular importance here must be placed on the high frequency verbs *bwyta* 'eat', *clybot* 'hear', *dywedut* 'say', *gwybot* 'know' and *talu* 'pay'.

(48)   Ac eres gynhyf i, ony wdosti dim y wrth hynny.
          'And I would be amazed, if you knew nothing about that.'   (*PKM* 35.9–10)

In sentences like (48), speakers would have to choose between two analyses: one with *dim y wrth hynny* as the direct object of the verb *gwybot* ('And I would be amazed if you knew nothing about that'), and one where *gwybot* was used intransitively, with *y wrth hynny* as a prepositional phrase complement ('And I would be amazed if you didn't know about that at all'). If they chose the latter analysis, then they would come to the conclusion that *dim* was not a noun, but rather an adverb, presumably intensifying the negation, hence 'at all'. In the case of (48), context shows that the former analysis and interpretation was probably chosen, but the potential for reinterpretation exists nevertheless. Similar sentences, and hence similar ambiguity, must have existed in early Middle Welsh, opening up the possibility of reanalysing the direct object of an optionally transitive verb as an emphatic adverb 'at all'.

Finally, there is a potential ambiguity between a transitive structure and a structure with ellipsis of a verb phrase in the case of the two 'premodal' verbs *gallael* 'be able, can' and *dylyu* 'have a right to, have an obligation to, should'. Both of these verbs are may be used transitively with a nominal object in Middle Welsh (although not in present-day Welsh), as well as with a nonfinite verbnoun phrase as in present-day Welsh. This is illustrated for *gallael* in (49). For *dylyu*, see D. S. Evans (1964: 151–2).

(49)   a.   Ac o gallaf les a gwassanaeth idaw, mi a'e gwnaf.
               'And if I can [do] benefit and service to him, I shall do it.'   (*P* 15.20–1)
          b.   A manac ditheu y mi pa furyf y gallwyf hynny.
               'And show me how I can [do] this.'   (*PKM* 3.5–6)

As would be expected, argument *dim* can appear as the object:

(50)   a.   A gwedy dyuot nos arnaw yr yttoed yn gyn vlinet ac na allei dim.
               'And after night had fallen, he was so tired that he could [do] nothing.' (*YSG* 1986)

25

26

b. ...a lledwch wynt yn veirw, kany allant dim...

'...and kill them, for they cannot [do] anything...' (*YCM* 147.9–10)

These verbs also allow ellipsis of the entire verbnoun phrase after them, in which case the content of the verb phrase is reconstructed from the preceding context:

(51) a. "Arglwyd," heb ynteu, "minheu a allaf dy rydhau ditheu o'r geireu hynny. Sef ual y gallaf...

'"Lord," he said, "I can release you from those words. This is how I can..."'

(*PKM* 69.24–6)

b. A guedy eu hannoc y uelly yn herwyd y gallei...

'And having encouraged them thus as much as he could...' (*BD* 97.29)

In context, some cases where *dim* is the object of *gallael* could have been open to being interpreted as cases of ellipsis. This is more likely in the spoken language, where forms such as Middle Welsh *Ny allaf i dim* 'I can't do anything' could be reinterpreted as meaning 'I can't' with reconstruction of an elided verbnoun phrase, such as *gwneuthur hynny* 'do this'. If speakers assume that ellipsis is involved, then *dim* is clearly not the object, so it must be interpreted as having some kind of adverbial function. In this context, it is also worth noting that the transitive use of *gallael* and *dylyu* dies out in modern Welsh; once the transitive use became obsolete, examples such as (50) would necessarily be reanalysed with *dim* as an adverbial adjunct rather than as direct object.

3.6 The syntax of pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh

The innovated pseudoargument *dim* of Middle and early modern Welsh has rather different syntactic properties from those of the pseudoargument *ddim* today. This section sets out these differences, arguing that, whereas present-day pseudoargument *ddim* is a true marker of sentential negation, the Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* discussed here should be identified simply as an adverb. It is therefore, in fact, the ancestor of Borsley & Jones's sentence-final adverbial *dim* ((8) above).

Pseudoargument *ddim* has become fixed in present-day Welsh in the mutated form *ddim*. This can be seen from such cases as (52) where *ddim* is separated from the subject by an adverb and is therefore not in a mutation context. Despite this, the mutated form *ddim* appears.

(52) Dyw Ifan jyst ddim yn deall.

'Ifan just doesn't understand.'

Pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh seems to have alternated between radical /dɪm/ and mutated /ðɪm/ according to mutation environment. Although Middle Welsh orthography does not normally distinguish /d/ from /ð/, it is possible to establish this fact from the usage of early modern texts that reliably notate the distinction between, such as the sixteenth-century *Treigl y Marchog Crwydrad*.[9]

Two further differences mark Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* as distinct from its present-day counterpart. First, Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* appears later in the clause than would be possible today. In fact, many of the Middle Welsh examples would be ungrammatical for reasons of word order if transposed directly into present-day Welsh. Relative word order with respect to prepositional phrases demonstrates this most clearly. *Dim* precedes prepositional-phrase adjuncts (not selected by the verb):

(53) a. ...ny lidiawd dim yr hynny...

'...he didn't become angry nevertheless...' (*YSG* 2874)

b. Ac nyt argyssyryawd ef dim yr hynny...

'And he didn't become angry nevertheless...' (*YSG* 4235)

However, it often, but not always, follows preposition-phrase complements selected by the verb:[10]

(54) a. Pan gigleu Galaath hynny, ny symudawd arnaw dim...

'When Galaath heard this, he didn't ...' (*YSG* 759)

---

[9] Mutation behaviour also allows us to eliminate another conceivable origin for pseudoargument *dim*, namely that it developed from a contraction of *o dim* 'of anything', discussed in section 3.4.3. This possibility also seems unlikely given the association between *o dim* and literary translations from French.

[10] The reverse order is found in *Buchedd Sant Martin* (*BSM* 22.29, 34.18), and, in two cases (*YSG* 4746, 5213), in *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal*. Possibly, the difference between *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* and *Buchedd Sant Martin* on this point already represents a change in the direction of Modern Welsh, with *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* manifesting a more conservative system in this respect.

b. Ac wynteu … nyt arhoyssant arnunt dim…

'And they… didn't wait for him at all…' (*YSG* 1919)

c. …ac na vit waeth gennyt ti dim yr vyng gwelet i yn du.

'…and do not think worse [of me] because I am black.' (*YSG* 3335–6)

d. '…na ryuedet arnawch dim yr vyng gwelet i geyr bronn Seint Greal…'

'"…do not be amazed at all despite seeing me next to the Holy Grail…"'

(*YSG* 5446)

This contrasts with present-day Welsh, where pseudoargument *ddim* would have to precede. In this respect, Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* is more like present-day Welsh sentence-final adverbial *dim*, which, as its name suggests, must occupy sentence-final position.

Secondly, pseudoargument *dim* may be used to modify a nonfinite verb in a subordinate clause, again in an environment where this is not possible in present-day Welsh:

(55) a. A'r pedwar hynny … a aethant ac ef y ryngthunt drwy ffenestyr wydyr heb waethau na thorri dim ar y ffenestyr yr hynny.

'And these four … took it between them through a glass window without damaging or breaking the window despite this.' (*YSG* 4746)

b. …kanhat yw idaw ef tewi heb dadleu dim tra vynho kynhal tauodyawc.

'…he is permitted to remain silent without arguing at all as long as he wishes to keep an advocate.' (*LlB* 45.21)

c. Ac yno y wylyaw a orugant y edrych a allei ymdidan dim ac wynt.

'And then they watched him to see whether he could talk to them at all.'(*YSG* 5213)

d. …eisoes ni ellid peri i Glarius gredv dim iddo.

'…yet it was not possible to make Claris believe him at all.' (*BSM* 22.28–9)

Again, this seems closer to present-day Welsh sentence-final adverbial *dim*, typical examples of which, such as (8) above, involve modification by *dim* of a verbnoun in a periphrastic structure.

The differences in behaviour between Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* and present-day Welsh pseudoargument *ddim*, coupled with its similarities with present-day sentence-final adverbial *dim* suggest that it is the latter which forms the continuation of the Middle Welsh form. The conclusion must be that changes subsequent to Middle Welsh brought about the emergence of pseudoargument *ddim* as a marker of pure sentential negation in its current form, and that present-day sentence-final adverbial *dim* is the fossilised remains of the pseudoargument *dim* found productively in Middle and early modern Welsh.

4 CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the evidence from Middle Welsh for the development of the marker of clausal negation *ddim* (Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim*). Detailed examination of the textual evidence for pseudoargument *dim* in Middle Welsh leads us to exclude a large proportion of potential examples from consideration. However, enough remain to demonstrate that cases did exist where *dim* was not an argument of the verb. Isolated examples of its use can be found from the thirteenth century onwards, with a number of texts found in fourteenth-century manuscripts showing robust enough attestation to demonstrate that it was a firmly established feature of the language of that period. The available evidence does not suggest an association with any particular dialect. However, the pattern of attestation is consistent with pseudoargument *dim* being a late-thirteenth-century innovation, restricted to (a subset of) texts committed to writing from that time onwards. I have argued that the primary factor in the emergence of pseudoargument *dim* was potential ambiguity in the analysis of optionally transitive verbs, although other factors, such as the uncertain argument structure of some verbs, and potential ambiguity with respect to ellipsis after modals, may have played a role too. Finally, syntactic differences between Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* and the present-day Welsh negative *ddim* suggest that the former is not the direct ancestor of the later. Middle Welsh pseudoargument *dim* instead survives in semi-fossilised form as the present-day Welsh sentence-final adverbial *dim*.

REFERENCES

Texts cited

Isaac, G. R. and Simon Rodway (2002) (eds.) *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg o lawysgrifau'r 13eg ganrif*. CD-ROM. Aberystwyth: Adrannau'r Gymraeg, Prifysgol Cymru.

Mittendorf, Ingo and David Willis (forthcoming) (eds.) *Corpws hanesyddol yr iaith Gymraeg 1500–1850: A historical corpus of the Welsh language 1500–1850*. CD-ROM. Cambridge: Department of Linguistics, University of Cambridge.

BD   *Brut Dingestow*, ed. Henry Lewis. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1942.

BDe   *Buched Dewi*, ed. D. Simon Evans. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1965.

BR   *Breudwyt Ronabwy*, ed. Melville Richards. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1948.

BS   *Brenhinedd y Saesson or the Kings of the Saxons*, ed. Thomas Jones. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1971.

BSM   *Buchedd Sant Martin*, ed. Evan John Jones. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1945.

BTy   *Brut y Tywysogyon or The Chronicle of the Princes: Red Book of Hergest Version*, ed. Thomas Jones. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.

BY   *Y Bibyl Ynghymraec*, ed. Thomas Jones. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1940.

DC   Robert, Griffith. *Y Drych Cristianogawl* , ed. D. M. Rogers. Menston, Yorkshire: Scolar Press, 1972.

DFf   *Darn o'r Ffestival (Liber Ffestialis)*, ed. Henry Lewis, Supplement to the Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (Session 1923–24). London: Cymdeithas y Cymmrodorion, 1925.

DPh   'Dares Phrygius'. In *The text of the Bruts from the Red Book of Hergest*, ed. John Rhŷs and J. Gwenogvryn Evans. Oxford: J. G Evans, 1890, 1–39.

G   *Ystorya Gereint uab Erbin*, ed. Robert L. Thomson. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

HGK   *Historia Gruffud vab Kenan*, ed. D. Simon Evans. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1977.

Jesus 57   *Cyfreithiau Hywel Dda yn ôl Llawysgrif Coleg yr Iesu LVII*, ed. Melville Richards. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1990 [1957].

LlA   *The Elucidarium and other tracts in Welsh from Llyvyr Agkyr Llandewivrevi A.D. 1346 (Jesus College ms. 119)*, ed. J. Morris Jones and John Rhŷs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.

Llan. 116   *The laws of Howel Dda: A facsimile reprint of Llanstephan Ms. 116 in the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth*, ed. Timothy Lewis. London: Guild of Graduates of the University of Wales, 1912.

LlB   *Cyfreithiau Hywel Dda yn ôl Llyfr Blegywryd*, ed. Stephen J. Williams and J. Enoch Powell. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1942.

LlC   *Llyfr Colan*, ed. Dafydd Jenkins. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1963.

LlH   James, Edward. Pregethau a osodwyd allan trwy awdurdod i'w darllein ymhob Eglwys blwyf a phob capel er adailadaeth i'r bobl annyscedig. London: Robert Barker, 1606. [= 'Llyfr yr Homilïau']

LlI   *Llyfr Iorwerth*, ed. Aled Rhys Wiliam. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1960.

MIG   'Llyma Vabinogi Iessu Grist', ed. Mary Williams, *Revue Celtique*, 33 (1912), 184–248.

O   *Owein or Chwedyl Iarlles y Ffynnawn*, ed. Robert L. Thomson. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1968.

Otinel   *Otinel: Chanson de geste*, ed. F. Guessard and H. Michelant. Paris: F. Vieweg, 1859.

P   *Historia Peredur vab Efrawc*, ed. Glenys Witchard Goetinck. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1976.

PKM   *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*, ed. Ifor Williams. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1930.

RhY   'Rhyfeddode'r Ynys', Peniarth 163.ii. In Mittendorf & Willis (forthcoming).

QSG   *La queste del Saint Graal*, ed. Albert Pauphilet. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1923.

SDR   *Chwedleu Seith Doethon Rufein*, ed. Henry Lewis. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1967.

T   *Karolellus atque Pseudo-Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*, ed. Paul Gerhard Schmidt. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1996.

TMC   *Treigl y Marchog Crwydrad*, ed. D. Mark Smith. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 2002.

TN 1567   *Testament Newydd ein Arglwydd Jesv Christ*. London: Henry Denham, 1567.

YAL   'Ystori Alexander a Lodwig', ed. Thomas Jones and J. E. Caerwyn Williams, *Studia Celtica*, 10–11 (1975–6), 261–304.

YCM   *Ystorya de Carolo Magno*, ed. Stephen J. Williams. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1930.

YSG   *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal*, ed. Thomas Jones. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1992.

Secondary literature

Awbery, Gwenllïan Mair. 1988. Pembrokeshire negatives. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 35, 37–49.

——. 1990. Dialect syntax: A neglected resource for Welsh. *The syntax of the modern Celtic languages*, ed. R. Hendrick. San Diego: Academic Press, 1–25.

Borsley, Robert D. and Bob Morris Jones. 2000. The syntax of Welsh negation. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 98, 15–47.

——. 2001. Negation in colloquial Welsh. *Grammatical interfaces*. R. Cann, C. Grover and P. Miller. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.

——. in press. *Welsh negation and grammatical theory*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Brown, Sue. 1999. *The syntax of negation in Russian: A minimalist approach*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI.

Charles-Edwards, Thomas M. 1989. *The Welsh laws*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Emanuel, Hywel David. 1967. *The Latin texts of the Welsh laws*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Evans, D. Simon. 1952. Yr arddodiad *ar* a'r ferf mewn Cymraeg Canol. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 15, 1–12.

Evans, D. Simon. 1964. *Grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1991. Zur Grammatikalisierung von Indefinitpronomina. *Sprachwandel und seine Prinzipien*. ed. N. Boretzky, W. Enninger, B. Jeßing and T. Stolz. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 103–25.

———. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hemon, Roparz. 1975. *A historical morphology and syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.

Hoeksema, Jack. 2000. Negative polarity items: Triggering, scope, and c-command. In *Negation and polarity*, eds. Laurence R. Horn and Yasuhiko Kato. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115–46.

Huws, Daniel. 2000. *Medieval Welsh manuscripts*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Copenhagen: A. F. Høst.

Jones, Robert M. 1953. Y rhamantau Arthuraidd. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 15, 109–16.

Morgan, T. J. 1987. Simo'i gwbod. Sana-i'n gwbod. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 34, 88–93.

Morris-Jones, John. 1913. *A Welsh Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1931. *Welsh syntax: An unfinished draft*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Poppe, Erich. 1995. Negation in Welsh and 'Jespersen's Cycle'. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 4, 99–107.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Binding domains and functional categories: Negative polarity in Serbo-Croatian and Russian. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Ann Arbor meeting 1992*, ed. J. Toman. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications, 109–28.

Quin, E. G. 1983. *Dictionary of the Irish language*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.

Richards, Melville. 1948. The negativing of the verb noun in Welsh. *Études Celtiques* 4, 369–78.

Roberts, Ian and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, Peter Wynn. 1992. In search of Middle Welsh dialects. In *Celtic languages and Celtic peoples: Proceedings of the Second North American Congress of Celtic Studies*, ed. Cyril J. Byrne, Margaret Harry and Pádraig Ó Siadhail. Halifax, Nova Scotia: D'Arcy McGee Chair of Irish Studies, Saint Mary's University, 287–303.

———. 1993. Middle Welsh dialects: Problems and perspectives. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 40, 17–50.

Willis, David W. E. 1998. *Syntactic change in Welsh: A study of the loss of verb-second*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.