

Title	Review of Kailuweit, Rolf, Künkel, Lisann and Staudinger, Eva (eds), Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar (Freiburg, 2018)
Creators	Hoynes, Mícheál
Date	2020
Citation	Hoynes, Mícheál (2020) Review of Kailuweit, Rolf, Künkel, Lisann and Staudinger, Eva (eds), Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar (Freiburg, 2018). Journal of Celtic Linguistics, 22. pp. 189-192. ISSN 0962-1377
URL	<a href="https://dair.dias.ie/id/eprint/1105/">https://dair.dias.ie/id/eprint/1105/</a>

Kailuweit, Rolf, Künkel, Lisann and Staudinger, Eva (eds), *Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar*. Freiburg: Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg 2018. NIHIN Studies. 378pp.

<https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/fedora/objects/freidok:16830/datastreams/FILE1/content>

This volume contains some sixteen papers divided into five thematic sections. As advertised in the title, the theoretical framework in which these investigations were carried out is Role and Reference Grammar (RRG). Readers of this journal will, of course, be particularly interested in discussions that bear directly on one or more Celtic languages. Passing reference is made to some literature on resultatives in Scottish Gaelic in Anna Riccio's paper 'The syntax-semantic interface in Italian result-oriented argument structures' (pp. 175–88) and on Irish light-verb constructions in Eva Staudinger's 'French/Spanish 'MAKE/GIVE FEAR'-Type LVCs – an RRG constructional account' (pp. 237–61). The only contribution directly concerned with exploring Celtic material is Brian Nolan's 'The encoding of negation in Modern Irish: negation at the layered structure of the clause and noun phrase' (pp. 45–70). Nolan will already be familiar to many readers of this journal from his 2012 monograph, which incidentally contains a brief overview of RRG which may be of some help to those who, like the reviewer, are not particularly familiar with this linguistic theory (Nolan 2012: 5–24). Nolan's 2012 descriptive account of aspects of Irish syntax made an exciting contribution to Irish linguistics by introducing many scholars of the Irish language to RRG and by opening up the Irish language to those engaged in RRG and other non-generative linguistic schools. Sadly, one of the flaws of that thought-provoking book was inadequate control of the subject language. That mixed assessment applies to the present contribution also.

On this occasion, Nolan sets out to survey how negation is encoded at the level of the sentence and the noun-phrase in Modern Irish. Perhaps the most striking claim made in this paper, if I have understood it correctly, concerns the encoding of negation using verbal particles. It is proposed that negative verbal particles are sensitive to tense (past vs non-past) and that this may be due to a realis/irrealis distinction (only negation in the past tense is regarded as certain). It is a pity this suggestion is not explored in more depth. Among other things one would like an account of how negative particles compare with other verbal particles in this regard and how this negative particle system interacts with verbal morphology and semantics in encoding realis/irrealis. Following Nolan, verbs (excluding the copula and the substantive verb) are marked negative by *níor* (relative *nár*) in the past and *ní* (relative *nach*) in other tenses and moods. Surprisingly, it is not mentioned that one finds *ní* and *nach* in the past tense with some of the most commonly occurring verbs in the language, even in standard written Irish, e.g. *ní dúirt mé* 'I did not say', *ní fhaca mé* 'I did not see', *ní dheachaigh mé* 'I did not go', *ní dhearna mé* 'I did not do', *ní bhfuair mé* 'I did not get'. Nolan's proposal also ignores at least one variety of the spoken language (Corca Dhuibhne Irish), where *ní* and *nach* are used in the past tense also even with 'regular' verbs. Furthermore 'past tense' *nár* is admitted in the present subjunctive (e.g. *nár éirí sé* mistranslated as 'he may not rise' at p. 51, *recte* 'may he not rise!'), but no effort is made to accommodate this to the simple distribution past/non-past.

The analysis of morphological negation lacks a clear synchronic conception. A disproportionate amount of space is devoted to verbs in *dí-* like *díthocrasaigh* (read rather *díthochrais*) ‘unwind (yarn)’ (p. 49) without establishing the status of these words in the language. Which (if any) of these have escaped the ‘translation-ese’ of officialdom or the English-Irish Dictionary? Some of these are neologisms attested as far back as the medieval language, but that is no guarantee that they have become ordinary elements of the lexicon. In more recent times such words have been coined (and not necessarily by native speakers!) to provide one-to-one equivalents for English technical terms; *dí-* is not available as a negative prefix in Irish like ‘un-’ is in English. The statement ‘Generally, for morphological negation used on a noun, one may employ several prefixes’, taken with the following lists, is quite misleading (p. 63). *Neamh-* and *mí-* may have a claim to be productive negative prefixes today, but the likes of *an-* does not. Would any native speaker asked to negative *casta* ‘complicated’ produce *\*anchasta* or (still better!) *\*éagasta* (the nasalising negative ‘prefix’ *é-*, historically a particular outcome of *an-*, finds no mention here despite common adjectives like *éagrua* ‘soft’ and *éadrom* ‘light’)? Productivity is mentioned at p. 66 as part of an interesting but tentative treatment of negation with *gan* ‘without’, so why is it not taken into account throughout? I do not know on what authority *do-ríomhchlár* ‘non-computer programme’ (p. 63) is given, but the prefix *do-* cannot be used in this way. In addition to greater sensitivity to the question of productivity in negation, one would like more clarity about what exactly is negated in some examples. *Dofheicsint* is explained as ‘unsightliness’ in dictionaries. I have carried out no research into the word, but it is morphologically irregular and probably a back-formation from the more readily explicable *dofheicseana* ‘invisible’. Whatever its etymology and semantic development there is no word *\*feicsint* meaning ‘sightliness’. Likewise, *aineoil* ‘unknown’ does not have a positive counterpart *\*eoil*. Such asymmetry may not be a problem but should at least be addressed. *Doicheallaigh* ‘be unwilling’ is analysed as *do-* + *cealaigh* ‘cancel’ (with unexplained de-lenition of the medial *-l-* after the addition of the prefix!). It is in fact a denominative verb from *doicheall* in the sense ‘unwillingness’. There is a prefix *do-* there, but one must do some etymologising to bring it out and what it negatives is no longer transparent to the native speaker. I do not wish to suggest that only ‘the language of hearth and home’ is worthy of study and, as a historical linguistic myself, I have no issue with diachrony, but in a synchronic survey like this one wants to know what strategies are actually available to speakers to encode negation and how these are used.

Many topics touched upon require much fuller exposition to provide a satisfactory description of the facts (the discussion of responsives at pp. 57–60, for instance, leaves much unsaid), though one cannot, of course, hope for anything like a comprehensive treatment within the bounds of a single paper. More could certainly have been said about ‘lexical negation’ (p. 49). We are given three examples (*bánaigh* ‘whiten; clear out’, *fásaigh* ‘lay waste; empty’, *folmhaigh* ‘empty’). These are all secondary verbs formed from adjectives (though the adjective *fás* ‘waste, empty’ is no longer current to my knowledge). This reviewer was left wondering to what extent these are ‘negative’. Does *bánaigh* not mean basically ‘become/make white, clear’? Is this inherently negative?

It would be churlish to devote too much space to the many typographical errors, mistranslations and false analyses of this short paper, but some are very serious indeed and likely to confuse any intrepid linguists eager to discover what Irish has to offer them in their research. On p. 51, for instance, *éirigh* (read *d'éirigh* 'rose') is given to show positive encoding of the past. The negative forms are confused; present tense *ní éiríonn sé* (so labelled) is mistranslated as 'he won't rise' and the conditional *ní éireodh sé* (so labelled) is translated only with the meaning of the past habitual ('he used not to rise') and not with the primary meaning ('he would not rise'). In a particularly unfortunate slip at p. 54, Nolan analyses the sentence *Ní raibh tuirseach orm*. This is ungrammatical, a hybrid of two more or less synonymous sentences, viz. *Ní raibh mé tuirseach* 'I was not tired' and *Ní raibh tuirse orm* lit. 'Tiredness was not on me'. Nolan glosses *tuirseach* as an adjective throughout but gives the literal translation of the impossible *Ní raibh tuirseach orm* as 'Tiredness was not on me'. What is someone without Irish to make of all this? Other errors will only put off readers with Irish (the mistranslation of *gan fhios d'éinne* 'unbeknownst to anyone' as 'without knowledge of anyone' on p. 67, for instance), but they would have been spotted and the piece as a whole greatly improved had a competent reader been shown the paper prior to publication.

Mícheál Hoyne

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Nolan, B. (2012). *The Structure of Modern Irish: A Functional Account*. Sheffield/Bristol: Equinox. Discussions in Functional Approaches to Language.