
CHAPTER ONE

**The Old Irish Verbal Complex, its Insular Celtic
and Alleged Non-Indo-European Antecedents**

1.1. As is well known, Old (and, for that matter, Middle or Modern) Irish regularly places the verb (plus, if present, the negative and various other elements to be discussed below) at the head of its clause. More generally, the normal order of main constituents within a clause containing a finite verb is Verb-Subject-Object (VSO) followed by other elements such as prepositional phrases and adverbial expressions, typical examples being *gaibid^[V] Conchobor^[S] a rig^[O]* ‘Conchobor seizes his forearm’ (TBC 1.438), *nícon^[Neg]:taibred^[V] Connlae^[S] taitheisc^[O] do neoch^[IndO]* ‘Connlae would not give an answer to anyone’ (EC 122, §12) and *béoigidir^[V] in spirut^[S] in corp^[O] in fecht so^[Adv]* ‘the spirit vivifies the body (at) this time’ (Wb. 13d7).

1.2. There is a notorious distinction in Old Irish verbal inflection between the so-called ‘independent’ forms of a verb and the corresponding ‘dependent’ forms used when it is preceded by what is conventionally termed a ‘conjunct particle’. The last named category consists chiefly of negatives (GOI 538-42), whether alone (e.g. *ní(con)* ‘not’) or attached to another conjunction (e.g. *ma-ni* ‘if not’), the interrogative particle *in* (GOI 290-1), interrogative *co* ‘how (far)?’ (GOI 290) and *ce, ci* or *cía* ‘who(m)?, what?’ (GOI 286-8), prepositional relatives (GOI 312-3) such as *ar-a* ‘on account of which’, *di-a* ‘to/from which’, *fri-s(s)a* ‘to(wards)/against which’, *la-s(s)a* ‘with which’ or irregular *i* ‘in which’, and various conjunctions such as *ara* ‘(in order) that’, *dia* ‘if, when’, *i* ‘when, since’ (all three originally prepositional relatives) or nasalising *co* ‘(so, in order) that, until’ as well as their negatives formed by adding *-na* (e.g. *i-n(n)a* ‘in which, when, since.. not’, *co-n(n)a* ‘that.. not’) or substituting it for *-a* (e.g., *ar-na* ‘on account of which.. not, (so, in order) that.. not, lest’, *las-na* ‘with which.. not’).

1.3. In the case of simple verbs, independent and dependent forms are typically realised by a shift in the personal endings from the so-called ‘absolute’ to the corresponding ‘conjunct’ set, as in abs. 3sg. *gaibid* ‘(s)he takes’, 1pl. *gaibmi* ‘we take’, 3pl. *gaibit* ‘they take’ versus conj. 3sg. *ní:gaib* ‘(s)he does not take’, 1pl. *ní:gaibem*, 3pl. *ní:gaibet* ‘we/they do not take’ and so on. It is to be noted that the stress usually falls upon the first syllable of a word in Old Irish and that conjunct particles are invariably unstressed or ‘proclitic’. A colon is used in the present work to mark the boundary between a proclitic and a following initially stressed element, the *a* of *gaib-* taking the main stress in each of the preceding examples. In what follows a hyphen is placed before a verb’s dependent form in order to indicate that this would,

as a rule, be preceded by a conjunct particle, and a bracketed hyphen may be used in the case of forms like 1sg. (-) *benaim(m)* ‘I strike’ that are identical in both independent and dependent position.

It is to be noted that not all proclitic conjunctions placed before a verb are conjunct particles. For instance, clause-initial *ocus* ‘and’, *acht* ‘but’ and *can* ‘whence?’ are regularly followed by independent forms, as is *ma* ‘if’ unlike its negative *ma-ni* ‘if not’, which is a conjunct particle requiring dependent forms: e.g., *ma be[i]th na galar [m]bec for corp duini, ma gorith loc(h) - cith ine chuis nu ine láim nu ine méraib - fo:geir a nggalar in uile corp* ‘if there be any slight sickness on a person’s body (and) if it heat a place - whether in his foot or in his hand or in his fingers - that sickness heats the whole body’ (*Thes.* II, 245.34-246.3, Cambrai Homily; neg. equivalents *ma-ni:bé* ‘if there be not’ and *ma-ni:gora* ‘if it should not heat’ with conj. as opposed to abs. endings).

1.4. Old Irish also possesses a large number of compound verbs formed by prefixing a so-called ‘preverb’ or preverbs (often closely related to various prepositions used with nouns) to a verbal root in order to modify its meaning in some way. The following are typical enough examples: simple *so(a)id/-soí* ‘turns’ with compound *im(m):soí* ‘turns round’ (+ *im(m)-*), *do:int-ai* ‘returns’ (+ *to-* + *-ind-*); simple *lé(i)cid/-léici* ‘leaves, lets’ with compound *do:léici* ‘lets go, throws’ (+ *to-*), *ar:léici* ‘lets go, releases’ (+ *ar-*); simple *be(i)rid/-beir* ‘carries’ with compound *do:beir* ‘brings, gives’ (+ *to-*), *as:beir* ‘says’ (+ *ess-*), *im(m):beir* ‘plays’ (+ *im(m)-*), *for:beir* ‘increases’ (+ *for-*); simple *claidid/-claid* ‘digs’ with compound *do:claid* ‘digs up’ (+ *to-*); simple *gaibid/-gaib* ‘seizes, takes’ with compound *fo:gaib* ‘finds, gets’ (+ *fo-*), *as:in-gaib* ‘surpasses’ (+ *ess-* + *-in-*); simple *benaid/-ben* ‘strikes, smites’ with compound *do:fui-ben* ‘cuts off, destroys’ (+ *to-* + *-fo-*), *in:á-r--ban* ‘expels’ (+ *ind-* + *-ad-* + *-ro-* + *-uss-*).

Like a conjunct particle, the first preverb of an independent compound verb is unstressed or proclitic, a commonly used alternative term for such preverbs being ‘pretonic’. Being proclitic or pretonic, the first preverb is followed by a colon in the foregoing examples and the main stress falls upon the syllable directly to the right of the colon (e.g. *-soí* in the case of *im(m):soí*, *-int-* in the case of *do:int-ai* and so on). Since compound verbs are normally preceded by a proclitic element even when independent, their endings are invariably conjunct (as can be seen from the examples above) and so do not change when such a verb becomes dependent by virtue of being preceded by a conjunct particle. The proclitic in question is, of course, the pretonic (first) preverb in the case of an independent compound verb, the form of which is then conventionally designated ‘deuterotonic’ by virtue of being stressed on the second

element, whether the verbal root itself as in the case of *im(m):soí* or a second preverb as in the case of *do:int-ai*. However, when a conjunct particle is placed before a compound verb, which is thus rendered dependent, it pushes the first preverb out of the proclitic slot into the stressed part of the verb. Since (unless its vowel is elided as in the case of *-t'-int-ai* below) it then naturally comes under the initial stress normal in Old Irish, the resultant dependent form of the compound verb is termed ‘prototonic’. The following are typical instances of the alternation between independent deuterotonic and dependent prototonic forms (both with conjunct endings, a hyphen being used to indicate the boundaries between preverb(s) and verbal root in the stressed part of the verb): deut. *im:soí* ‘turns round’ but prot. *ní:imp-ai* ‘does not turn round’, deut. *do:int-ai* ‘returns’ but prot. *ní:t-int-ai* ‘does not return’, deut. *do:léici* ‘throws’ but prot. *ní:te(i)-lci* ‘does not throw’, deut. *ar:léici* but prot. *ní:air-lici* ‘does not release’, deut. *do:beir* ‘brings, gives’ but prot. *ní:ta-bair* ‘does not bring/give’, deut. *as:beir* ‘says’ but prot. *ní:e-pir* ‘does not say’, deut. *im(m):beir* but prot. *ní:im-bir* ‘does not play’, deut. *for:beir* but prot. *ní:for-bair* ‘does not increase’, deut. *do:claid* ‘digs up’ but prot. *ní:to-chlaid* ‘does not dig up’, deut. *fo:gaib* ‘finds, gets’ but prot. *ní:fo-gaib* ‘does not find/get’, deut. *as:in-gaib* ‘surpasses’ but prot. *ní:es-n-gaib* ‘does not surpass’, deut. *do:fui-ben* ‘destroys’ but prot. *ní:t-ui-ben* ‘does not destroy’, deut. *in:á-r--ban* ‘expels’ but prot. *ní:ind-a-r--ban* ‘does not expel’.

An curious feature of the deuterotonic form of a compound verb is the failure a preverb otherwise causing lenition to do so when in initial position (see II.3.1), whence oppositions such as those in the previous paragraph between prot. *-tabair* (*b* = fricative /β/; cf. *-epir* with /b/ written *p* internally after a vowel), *-tochlaid*, *-tuiben* (*f* lenited to Ø in Old Irish) and deut. *do:b(b)eir* (with /b/), *do:claid*, *do:fuiben*.

1.5. Old Irish can thus be said to have a clause-initial ‘verbal complex’ that was characterised by a single main stress (falling on the element highlighted in boldface in the formulae below) and consisted of a simple verbal stem (V* with absolute and V with conjunct endings) to which various elements, notably conjunct particles (C) and preverbs (P, P₂ and so on), might be prefixed as required. The basic structure of this initial complex may be summarised as follows with the help of a symbol # to mark the clause boundaries, of dots to indicate the possibility of further constituents (noun subject, object etc. as in 1.1) within the clause and of round brackets to designate the possible occurrence of extra elements within the verbal complex itself.

#V* ...#	e.g. # <i>beirid</i> ...#	- indep. simple verb.
#P:V ...#	e.g. # <i>do:beir</i> ...#	- indep. cpd. verb (one preverb).
#P:P ₂ (P ₃₋₄)V...#	e.g. # <i>as:in-gaib</i> ...#	- indep. cpd. verb (two or more preverbs).
#C:V ... #	e.g. # <i>ní:beir</i> ... #	- dep. simple verb

#C:P(P₂₋₄)V...# e.g. #ní:ta-bair# - dep. cpd. verb
or #ní:es-n-gaib....#

On occasion P in #P:V...#, one (usually the last) of P_{2/3/4} in #P:P₂(P₃₋₄)V...# or one (usually the last) of P_{1/2/3/4} in #C:P(P₂₋₄)V...# was a so-called ‘augment’ with a specific grammatical function rather than the lexical one evinced by the preverbs in the examples above. Thus the preverb *ro* is sometimes found as a lexical preverb (e.g. *saigid* ‘seeks’, *ní:saig* ‘does not seek’ versus *ro:saig* ‘attains’, *ní:ro-ig* ‘does not attain’; similarly *ind:á-r--ban* ‘expels’, *ní:in-a-r-ban* ‘does not expel’ in 1.4 above) but is appreciably more frequent as an augment (cover symbol R below) with resultative (e.g. *carais* ‘loved’, *ní:car* ‘did not love’ [V* and C:V] versus *ro:car* ‘has loved’ [R:V], *ní:ro-char* ‘has not loved’ [C:RV] or *as:bert* ‘said’, *ní:e-pert* ‘did not say’ [P:V and C:PV] versus *as:ru-bart* ‘has said’ [P:RV], *ní:é-r-bart* ‘has not said’ [C:PRV]) or potential meaning (e.g. *reithim* ‘I run’ [V*] versus *ní:ro-rthim* ‘I cannot run’ [C:RV] or *as:beir* ‘says’ [P:V] versus *as:ro-bair* ‘can say’). As an augment, *ro* is overwhelmingly preponderant in #R:V...# or #C:RV...# and quite markedly so in #P:P₂(P₃₋₄)RV...# or #C:PP₂(P₃₋₄)RV...#, R as a rule only being followed by the final lexical P if this was *uss*, as in unaugm. pres. *do:fuis-sim* ‘begets’ [P:PV], *ní:t-uis-sim* ‘does not beget’ [C:PPV] versus augm. *t-pret. do:rósat* ‘has begotten’ [P:RPV], *ní:torsat* ‘has not begotten’ [C:PRPV]. However, the preverbs *ad* (e.g. *con:boing* ‘breaks’ versus *con:a-bbaing* ‘can break’), *com* (e.g. *fris:ort* ‘offended’ or *do:ind-nacht* ‘bestowed’ versus *fris:com-art* ‘has offended’ or *do:é-com-nacht* ‘has bestowed’) and some rarer combinations were also used under certain circumstances. Crucially, the augment can only be the first preverb when no lexical preverb is present, as in the examples involving simple *carais* ‘loved’ etc. above. It must be placed second or even further back in the preverb chain when combined with one or more lexical preverbs, as indicated in the examples and formulae involving compound verbs above. Further details will be found in *EIV* 89-161 and in IV.2.1-3 below.

1.6. Object personal pronouns were invariably enclitic (E) in Old Irish, the basic forms being 1sg. *-(u)m(-)* ‘me’, 2sg. *-(u)t(-)* ‘you’, 3sg. m./n. *-i* or *-a-* ‘him, it’, 3sg. f. *-(u)s(-)* ‘her, it’, 1pl. *-(u)n(n)(-)* ‘us’, 2pl. *-(u/i)b(-)* ‘you’, 3pl. *-(u)s(-)* ‘them’. These were added to the verbal complex, being either suffixed to an independent simple verb (e.g. *táth-um* ‘there is to me, I have’) or infixes between a proclitic and the rest of the verb (e.g. *ní-m:thá* ‘there is not to me, I do not have’). Verbs other than the verb ‘to be’ typically used these pronouns as direct objects and only suffixed them in normal prose if both verb and pronoun were in the third person. Where 3sg. abs. *-th* was followed by an enclitic, it was no longer on the word boundary and so was not voiced to *-d /-ð/* (contrast Early OIr. *gorith* in 1.3 above with standard *gor(a)id*), whence *ain[†]gid* ‘protects’ (< *ain[†]gith*; conj. *-anaig*) but *ain[†]gith-i* ‘protects him’. More often than not,

the addition of a suffixed pronoun changed a disyllable into a trisyllable liable to lose the post-tonic second syllable by syncope (lost vowel indicated by †), as in *beirid* ‘bears, carries’ (< *beirith*) but *beir†th-i* ‘carries him/it’ and *beir†th-ius* ‘carries her/it/them’ or *marbaid* ‘kills’ (< *marbaith*) but *marb†th-ai* ‘kills him/it’ or *marb†th-us* ‘kills her/it/them’. If syncope brought a root-final dental into contact with the *-th-* of the 3sg. abs., this became liable to the delentition, as in *benaid* ‘smites’ (< *benait*) but *ben†t-ai* ‘smites him/it’ and *ben†t-us* ‘smites her/it/them’ (< **ben†th-*) or *guidid* ‘beseeches’ (< *guidith*) but *guit†t-i* ‘beseeches him’ and *guit†t-ius* ‘beseeches her/them’ (< **guid†th-*).

Factors such as these made the use of suffixed pronouns with independent simple verbs somewhat complicated and that is doubtless why their use had been largely restricted in Old Irish to the most frequently occurring forms. Where suffixing was impossible or no more than optional, there was a need for a structure compatible with the more straightforward process of infixing. This was met by using a proclitic element *no* as a dummy conjunct particle capable of supporting an infixed pronoun, the following simple verb then predictably switching to conjunct inflection. The basic Old Irish distribution may be illustrated by the following examples involving *beirid* ‘carries’: *beirth-i* ‘carries him/it’ (3sg. vb. + 3sg. m./n. pron.; suffixing); *beirth-ius* or *no-s:(m)beir* ‘carries her/it/them’, *n-a:berat* or *bert-(a)it* ‘(they) carry it’ (3sg. vb. + 3sg. f. or 3pl. pron. or 3pl. vb. + 3sg. m./n. pron.; suffixing or infixing); *no-t:beir* ‘carries you’, *no-n:berat* ‘(they) carry us’, *n-a:biur* ‘I carry it’, *no-s:(m)beram* ‘we carry her/it/them’, *no-m:bir* ‘you carry me’, *no-b:beram* ‘we carry you’ (any other person of the verb or pronoun; infixing).

For obvious reasons, *no* never occurs when another proclitic is present, whether this be the pretonic preverb of an independent compound verb or a meaningful conjunct particle such as negative *ní*. In both cases an infixed pronoun attached to the proclitic is the only possibility: e.g., *imm-a:soí* ‘turns him/it round’, *imm-un:soí* ‘turns us round’, *do-s:léici* ‘casts it (f.)’, *ar-ub:léici* ‘releases you’, *ar-us:léici* ‘releases her/it/them’, *ar-a:l(l)éici* ‘releases him/it (m.)’, *do-s:(m)beir* ‘brings her/it/them’, *d-a:mbeir* ‘brings him/it (m.)’, *d-a:chlaid* ‘digs it (n.) up’, *fo-t:gaibet* ‘(they) find you’; *ní:mbeir* ‘does not carry him/it’, *ní-s:(m)beir* ‘does not carry her/it/them’, *ní-n:berat* ‘(they) do not carry us’, *ní-b:impai* ‘does not turn you round’, *ní-n-airlici* ‘does not release him/it’, *ní-s:tabair* ‘does not bring her/it (f.)/them’, *ní:thochlaid* ‘does not dig it (n.) up’, *ní-t:fogbat* ‘(they) do not find you’. It can be seen that the forms of the basic infixed and suffixed pronouns are identical except in the 3sg. m./n., where suffixed *-i* corresponds to infixed *-a* (which elides a previous vowel as in *d’-a:chlaid* above) and the vowel of the infix is entirely absorbed by negative *ní*. It is also apparent that certain infixed pronouns are followed by a particular mutation,

namely 1sg. *-m* and 2sg. *-t* by lenition, 3sg. f. and 3pl. *-s* by optional nasalization, 3sg. m. *-a* by nasalisation, and 3sg. n. *-a* by lenition (as in *d-a:chlaid* and *ní:thochlaid*).

The basic set of infixated pronouns illustrated above is known as Class A and is used after various elements with a final vowel such as negative *ní*, the particle *no* and the pretonic preverbs *do*, *fo*, *ro* as well as *im(m)* and *ar* (which once ended in a vowel that can still be seen in their relative forms *imme/a* and *ara* discussed in 1.7 below). However, so-called Class B infixated pronouns are used after pretonic preverbs such as *ad*, *as*, *con*, *for*, *fris* or *in(d)* with an invariable final consonant. In the first and second persons a dental element /d/ plus vowel (usually *a* or *o*) is simply prefixed to the basic Class A form to produce Class B 1sg. *-t/dom* or *-t/dam* [len.], 2sg. *-t/dot* or *-t/dat* [len.], 1pl. *-t/don* or *-t/dan*, 2pl. *-t/dob* or *-t/dab* but in the third person only the dental element appears, namely 3sg. m. *-t/d* [nas.], n. *-t/d* [len.] and usually non-mutating 3sg. f. or 3pl. *-t/da*. Apart from *-r* the final consonant of a preverb is lost before the initial /d/ of a Class B pronoun, *as*, *ad* and *in* all appearing as *a-*: e.g., *a-t:beir* ‘says it’ /ad/ (*as:beir* ‘says’), *a-ta:árban* ‘expels her/them’ /ada/ (*in(d):árban* ‘expels’), *a-tot:aig* ‘impels you (sg.)’ /adod/ (*ad:aig* ‘impels’), *co-t:mboing* ‘breaks him’ /cod/ (*con:boing* ‘breaks’) *fri-tan:orgat* ‘(they) offend us’ /fridan/ (*fris:oírg* ‘offends’, *for-dom:chanid* or *for-tom:chanid* ‘you (pl.) teach us’ /fordom/ (*for:cain* ‘teaches’) with the /d/ of the pronoun written *t* after a vowel but *t* or *d* after a consonant in accordance with standard Old Irish spelling rules.

1.7. Old Irish (like Middle and Modern Irish) had no relative pronoun as such but rather various uninflected relative markers, including the already mentioned (1.2) relative element *-(s)a* [nas.] attached to prepositions. The basic (non-prepositional) relative markers can be subsumed under the category E(nclitic) because, like the object pronouns in 1.7, they were suffixed to independent simple verbs under certain circumstances but otherwise were infixated between a proclitic (conjunct particle, pretonic preverb or *no*, as the case might be) and the rest of the verb.

A suffixed relative marker (or relative ending) was compulsory with an independent simple verb in the 3sg., the 3pl. and the 1pl. but was otherwise inadmissible. As long as the absolute ending was not palatal *-th* (> *-d*, usual 3sg. pres./subj./fut. act.), palatal *-s* (the 3sg. *s*-pret./*s*-subj./*s*-future act.) or *-r* (non-pal. in 1/3pl. suffixless and *t*-pret.; pal. in deponent and passive), the relative suffix was *-e*: e.g., 3sg. pres. (irreg.) *téit* ‘goes’ with rel. *té(i)te* ‘who goes’, *t*-pret. *birt* ‘bore’ with rel. *berte* ‘who bore, which he bore’, suffixless pret. *luid* ‘went’, *gáid* ‘prayed’, *geguin* ‘slew’ with rel. *luide* ‘who went’, *gáde* ‘who prayed, which he prayed/whom he besought’, *geg[†]nae* ‘who slew, whom/which he slew’; 1 pl. pres. *guidmi* ‘we pray/beseech’, *tíagmai* ‘we go’ with rel. *guidme* ‘which we pray/whom we beseech’, *tíagmae* ‘which we go (to)’; 3pl. pres.

berait ‘bear’ with rel. *ber[†]t(a)e* or *ber[†]d(a)e* ‘who bear, whom/which they bear’, *gniit* ‘do’ with rel. *gníte* ‘who do, which they do’, *s*-pret. *cáech[†]s(a)it* ‘blinded in one eye’ with rel. *cáech[†]s(a)ite* ‘whom they blinded in one eye’.

Formations with a palatal final *-s* or an *-r* in the 3sg. absolute simply have non-palatal *-s* or *-r* in the corresponding relative, as in *s*-pret. 3sg. *sóerais* ‘freed’ with rel. *sóeras* ‘who freed, whom he freed’ and *gabais* ‘took’ with rel. *gabas* ‘who took, which/whom he took’, whereas 3pl. suffixless pret. *bátar* ‘were’, *t*-pret. *bert(at)ar* ‘they bore’ with non-palatal *-r* were simply identical to rel. *bátar* ‘who/which were’, *bertar* ‘who bore/whom they bore’. 3sg. palatal *-th/-d* is replaced by non-palatal *-s* in the relative: e.g., pres. *marbaid* ‘kills’, *beirid* ‘bears’, *gaibid* ‘takes’, *crenaid* ‘buys’, *gniid* ‘does’ with rel. *marbas* ‘who kills/whom he kills’, *be(i)res* ‘who bears, which he bears’, *crenas* ‘who buys, which he buys’, *gnís* ‘who does/which he does’). It is to be noted that the third person relative endings are indifferent as to whether the antecedent is subject or object.

Where a proclitic is present, the basic relative marker (also formally indifferent as to subject or object antecedent if the verb is third person) is following lenition: e.g., 3sg. pres. *do:tét* ‘comes’, 3pl. *do:tiagat* ‘come’ with rel. *do:thét* ‘who comes’, *do:thiagat* ‘who come’, 3sg. pres. *for:cain* ‘teaches’, 3pl. suffixless pret. *for:cechnatar* ‘they taught’ with rel. *for:chain* ‘who teaches, whom/which he teaches’, *for:chechnatar* ‘who taught, whom/which they taught’. This is not, of course, always clear from the spelling (e.g. *as:beir* ‘he says’ /as ber’/, rel. *as:beir* ‘who says, which he says/whom he mentions’ /as ver’/) and can also fall victim to delenition: e.g., *a(d):treba* ‘dwells’ but also ‘who dwells’ < **at:treba* < **ath:threba* < **ad:threba* /að θreva/. The pretonic preverbs *im(m)* and *ar* (main clause, non-leniting) have an extra final vowel *-e* or *-a* (cf. suffixed rel. *-e* above) as well as following lenition in relative clauses: e.g., 3sg. pres. *imm:tét* ‘goes around, sets out’, imperf. *ar:cliched* ‘used to defend, was defending’ with rel. *imme:thét* ‘who goes around/sets out, which he goes around’, *ara:chliched* ‘who used to defend/was defending, which he used to defend/was defending’.

Negative *ní* (in main clauses, non-leniting) has a special relative form *nad* (leniting, except where delenition applies): e.g., 3sg. pres. *ní:ceil* ‘does not conceal’, *ní:cotlai* ‘does not sleep’ (deut. *con:tuili* sleeps’), *ní:tabair* ‘does not give/bring’, *s*-pret. *ní:car* ‘did not love’ with rel. *nad:cheil* ‘who[(m)/which he] does not conceal’, *nad:chotlai* ‘who does not sleep’, *na(d):tabair* ‘who[(m)/which he] does not give/bring’ (/na tavər’/ < **nath:thabeir* /naθ θaver’/ by delenition, < **nad:thabeir* /nað θaver’/ by devoicing), *nad:char* ‘who[(m)/which he] did not love’.

The meaningless conjunct particle *no* was also available in the relative system in order to generate a structure compatible with the more straightforward process of infixing, the rule being that a simple verb unaccompanied by negative *nad* invariably takes the suffixed relative endings in the 3sg., 1pl. and 3pl. in Old Irish but regularly uses *no* plus infixing relative lenition (or nasalisation, on which below) in the 1sg., 2sg. and 2pl. Thus, say, 1sg. *no:charaim* ‘whom/which I love’, 2sg. *no:charai* ‘whom/which you love’ (both infixing), 3sg. *caras* ‘who loves’ or ‘whom/which (s)he loves’, 1pl. *carmae* ‘whom/which we love’ (both suffixing), 2pl. *no:charaid* ‘whom/which you love’ (infixing), 3pl. *cart/dae* ‘who love’ or ‘whom/which they love’.

Lenition always serves as the basic infixing relative marker when the antecedent is the relative verb’s subject. However, where the antecedent is the relative verb’s object, potentially ambiguous lenition may optionally be replaced by unambiguous infixing nasalisation, although this so-called nasalising relative is rare with a neuter singular object antecedent: e.g., *a torbe do:áirci* or *táirci* ‘the profit (*torbe*, n.) that it brings (about)’ (see 1.8 below on prototonic *táirci* here) rather than *a torbe do:n-áirci*. Thus *in fer ad:chi/do:beir/nad:chara a mac* may be translated as ‘the man who sees/brings/does not love his son’ or ‘the man whom his son sees/brings/does not love’, whereas *in fer ad:ci/do:mbeir/nad:cara a mac* can only mean ‘the man whom his son sees/brings/does not love’. Since a simple verb with relative ending displays no lenition, it cannot be nasalised either, as in invariable *in fer caras/beires a mac* ‘the man whom his son loves/bears’. However, lenition can naturally be replaced by nasalisation where appropriate after *no*: e.g., *in ben no:charai* or *no:carai* ‘the woman whom you (sg.) love’ or *in salm no:gaibid* or *no:ngaibid* ‘the psalm that you (pl.) utter’ but only *in salm gaibme* ‘the psalm that we utter’.

A nasalising relative competes with (and is generally commoner than) a non-relative construction after various antecedents denoting time, manner or degree, including certain conjunctions such as *amal* ‘like, as’, *in ta(i)n* ‘the time (that), when’, *(h)óre/(h)úare* ‘since, because’ (gen. sing. of *úar* ‘hour, time’), *a* ‘when, while’ developed from such constructions. In this case nasalisation can even be prefixed to simple verbs with relative endings: e.g., *is dían imma:mberat a cossa* ‘it is swiftly that they ply their feet’ (Ml. 111b17; *im(m):beir*), *hóre no:pridchim in rúin sin* ‘because I preach that secret’ (Wb. 27c22; *no* + rel. nas., as opposed to non-rel. *hóre pridchim soscéle* ‘because I preach the Gospel’, Wb. 5c6), *in tan mberes claind* ‘when she bears offspring’ (Ml. 129c8), *amal du:ngní int aís sechmaill* ‘as the folk (of) passing by does’ (Ml. 102a15).

The so-called Class C infixing pronouns used in leniting and nasalising relative clauses are basically class B forms with a lenited (/ð/ always written *d*; cf. rel. neg. *na-d*

above) or a nasalised (/N(d)/ > /N/ usually written *nd*) initial dental respectively: e.g., *do-da:aidlea* ‘who visits her’ and *amal for-nda:congair* ‘as he orders it (f.)’. Because of their final vowel in relative clauses, *imm* and *ar* regularly combined with the 3sg. m. and n. of class C as *imm-i(n)d* and *ar-i(n)d*: e.g., *ar-id:gair* ‘which forbids it’ (non-rel. *ar-a:gair* ‘forbids it’), *amal imm-ind:ráitset* ‘as they discussed him’ (non-rel. *imm-a:ráitset* ‘they discussed him’). This form came to be used after other preverbs with a final consonant: e.g., *for-id:tét* ‘who helps him’ (*for-t:tét* ‘helps him’), *friss-id:n-oirctis* ‘who used to harm/offend him’ (*fri-t:n-oirctis* ‘used to harm/offend him’), *amail ass-ind:be(i)r* ‘as he says it’ (Cambray; *a-t:beir* ‘says it’). Replacement of main-clause class A or B by C in a relative clause is obligatory in the case of a third person pronoun but merely optional in the other persons: e.g., *ní tú no-d:n-ail acht is hé no-t:ail* ‘it is not you that nourishes it (m.) but it is it (m.) that nourishes you’ (Wb. 5b28) with 3sg. m. class C and 2sg. class A respectively in a leniting relative clause or *hóre no-ndob:molor-sa et no-m:moídim indib* ‘because I praise you and boast of (lit. ‘vaunt myself in’) you’ (Wb. 14c18) with a more or less arbitrary switch from 2pl. class C to 1 sg. class A in a nasalising relative clause. It is also to be noted that class C can only be infixated, never suffixed, so that *no* is required to make the transition from main clause *alt-(a)i* ‘nourishes it (m.)’ (< **alaith-i*) to leniting relative *no-d:n-ail* in the first example. The relative negative *nad* uses a special form of class C infixated pronoun in which *ch* is substituted for lenited *d* and nasalised *nd* (GOI 265-6): e.g., 3sg. n. *na-ch:beir* ‘who does not bear it’ or *na-chid:chúalatar* ‘who have not heard it’ (presumably a conflation of 3sg. n. *-ch* with the 3sg. n. *-id* seen in *imm-id*, *ad-id* etc. above) in leniting relative clauses with subject antecedent and *húare na-chan:soirai-ni* ‘because you do not free us’ in what would normally be a nasalising relative clause. However, *d* and *nd* are occasionally found instead as in *na-did:chreti* ‘who does not believe it’ in a leniting and *na-nda:tibérad* ‘that he would not give them’ in a nasalising relative clause. The nasalised variants of class C are also used after nasalising conjunct particles such as *co* ‘until, (so) that’, interrogative *in*, *ara* ‘(so) that’, *dia* ‘when, if’ and prepositional relatives (see 1.2): e.g., *i-ndat:tadbat ní?* ‘does he show you (sg.) something?’ (*do:ad-bat* ‘shows’), *dia-ndob:acci* ‘when he sees you (pl.)’, *fon chéill fu-a-nd:ro-gab* ‘in (lit. ‘under’) the sense in (lit. ‘under’) which he uttered it’ (3sg. m. referring to m. *salm* ‘psalm’, Ml. 38c3), *ar-ind:nderoíma-som Día* ‘so that God may protect him’, *co-ndub:tánicc* ‘until it came to you (pl.)’.

1.8. Since lenition prefixes nothing to a vowel, the vowel of pretonic *to*, *ro* and *fo* was liable to be elided before a following stressed vowel to give rise to independent prototonic forms in leniting relative clauses: e.g., *a-ní táirci in (m)bríg móir sin dúib-si* (deut. *do:áirci*; Wb. 12c31) ‘that which causes that great privilege to you’. The same elision also applied to verbs of this shape in main clauses (*t-* to *d-* before a proclitic

vowel being thereby impeded) with the result that main-clause verbs of this shape often display independent (as well as dependent) prototonic forms contrary to the normal distribution, although deuterotonic forms conforming to the pattern normal elsewhere are quite frequently encountered (as also in leniting relative clauses): e.g., indep. *ro:ic* or *ric*, dep. *-ric* ‘reaches’; indep. *fo:ácaib* or *fácaib*, dep. *-fácaib* ‘leaves’; indep. *do:intai* or *tintai*, dep. *-tintai* ‘returns’; indep. *do:ic* or *tic*, dep. *-tic* ‘comes’.

1.9. Old Irish had a special set of *notae augentes* or emphatic pronominal particles (GOI 252-3; variants given are the usual ones after palatal and non-palatal finals respectively but *-som* is widely used after palatals too): 1sg. *-se(a)* and *-sa*, 2sg. *-siu* or *-su/-so*, 3sg. m./n. *-sem/-sium* or *-som*, f. *-si*; 1pl. *-ni*, 2pl. *-si*, 3pl. *-sem/-sium* or *-som*. These were used to highlight a wide range of pronominal elements, including a verb’s subject as expressed by its personal endings (e.g. *biuu-sa* ‘I am (wont to be)’, *a:tá-som* ‘it is’) or its object as expressed by an unstressed pronoun (e.g. *du-m:eim-se* ‘protect me!’). There was also a similarly used third person anaphoric pronominal particle meaning ‘the aforementioned’: 3sg. m.. *-side*, n./f. *-ade*, 3pl. *-sidi* etc. An important property of these adjuncts (A) is the need to attach them to a stressed element with the result that, when used with a finite verb, they always come at the end of the complex after its stressed part. That completes the inventory of constituents of the Old Irish verbal complex, which may now be schematised as follows, bearing in mind that E refers enclitic relative markers as well as enclitic object pronouns and that the E slot is invariably filled (by a pronoun) in the actual examples given below, since the corresponding forms without E are to be found in 1.5 above .

#V*(E)(A) ...#	e.g. #beirth-i(-som)....#
#P(E):V(A) ...#	e.g. #do-s:(m)beir(-si)....#
#P(E):P ₂ (P ₃₋₄)V(A)....#	e.g. #a-ta:in-gaib(-side)....#
#C(E):V(A) ... #	e.g. #ní-n:beir(-ni)....#
including #no-E:V(A)....#	e.g. #no-b:beir(-si)....#
#C(E):P(P ₂₋₄)V(A)....#	e.g. #co-nda:tabair(-si)....#
	e.g. #ní-s:(n-)es-n-gaib(-som)....#

1.5 above may be consulted on the augment R, typically one of a very limited number of Ps (usually *ro* but sometimes *ad*, *com* etc.), as a further grammatically conditioned optional constituent of the Old Irish verbal complex. The following (unaugmented on left, augmented on right) will serve here as reasonably typical examples (augment in small capitals).

#V*(E)(A)...#	e.g. #cars-ai(-som)...	>	#R(E):V(A)...	e.g. #R-a:car(-som)...
#P(E):V(A)...	e.g. #a-t:beir(-som)...	>	#P(E):RV(A)...	e.g. #a-t:RO-bair(-som)...

#P(E):P₂(P₃₋₄)V(A)...# e.g. #do-s:n-indnacht(-si)...#
 > #P(E):P₂(P₃₋₄)RV(A)...# e.g. #do-s:n-é-COM-nacht(-si)...#
 #C(E):V(A)...# e.g. #ní-s:car(-si)...# > #C(E):RV(A)...# e.g. #ní-s:RO-char(-si)...#
 #C(E):P(P₂₋₄)V(A)...# e.g. #con-id:e-pert(-som)...# or #ni-s:t-ind-nacht(-si)...#
 > #C(E):P(P₂₋₄)RV(A)...#
 e.g. #con-id:é-R-bart(-som)...# or #ni-s:t-é-COM-nacht(-si)...#

It can thus be seen that the Old Irish verbal complex could be quite complicated, to say the least. The only indispensable element was the verb itself (V) but lexical and/or grammatical factors could cause this to be accompanied by any given combination of up to five further categories according to a well regulated positional hierarchy, namely a conjunct particle (C), an enclitic object pronoun or relative marker (E), one or more lexical preverbs (P), an augment (R, basically a grammaticalised preverb), and/or a ‘postclitic’ emphatic or anaphoric pronominal adjunct (A). The principal aim of the present work is to trace the construction of this imposing clause opening conglomerate of elements around a single main stress back from Old Irish via Insular Celtic and Proto-Celtic to its Proto-Indo-European antecedents.

1.10. If an element or phrase other than the verb requires emphasis, it is taken out of its clause and placed in front of the otherwise initial verb. Sometimes it is simply left as a so-called *nominativus pendens* or hanging nominative and is resumed in the following sentence by the verbal ending or an unstressed object, possessive or prepositional pronoun as syntactically appropriate: e.g., *messe immurgu, ní-mad:airgénus fleid* (TBC ll. 592-3) ‘(as for) me, however, not propitiously have I prepared a feast’, *druídecht, ní-s:grádaigther* (EC 122, §11) ‘druidry, you are not to love it’ or *maisse doíne ní-s:toimled* (Thes. II 309.5) ‘the glory of men, he did not partake of it’, *óclach no:gébad gaisced and, for:biad a ainm ar gnímaib gaiscid firu Érenn* (TBC 613-4) ‘(he said that) a warrior who took up arms on it, his name would be upon the men of Ireland for deeds of valour’, *samlaid da én bátar remib, cuing arcit etarru* (§2 of *Compert Con Culainn*; Thurneysen, 1912, 34-8 = 1991, 619-23) ‘likewise two birds who were in front of them, (there was) a yoke of silver between them’.

However, a commoner method, particularly in the Glosses, is to employ a so-called ‘cleft’ sentence in which the word or phrase to be emphasised is introduced by the copula, which is sometimes omitted. The rest of the sentence then follows without a resumptive element of the type just discussed, a relative form of the verb being used with a subject/object antecedent (e.g. *gaibes*) but a plain non-relative form otherwise (e.g. *berid, as:biur*): e.g., *ar is do thabirt díglae berid in claideb sin* ‘for it is to inflict vengeance (lit. ‘for it is for the inflicting of vengeance’) (that) he carries that sword’

(Wb. 6a13), *ní ar formut frib-si as:biur-sa in so* ‘it is not because of envy towards you (that) I say this’ (Wb. 12c9), *rethit uili et is óenfer gaibes búaid diib inna chomalnad* ‘they all run and it is one man who/that gets victory of them for its completion’ (Wb. 11a4).

2.1. (a) Arwyn Watkins (1987) and Mac Cana (1973, 94) have pointed to the strong evidence provided by the admittedly small corpus of Old Welsh prose for basic word order patterns that precisely match those exhibited by its far larger Old Irish counterpart as just described above, namely basic VSO word order along with optional pendens constructions and topicalisations by clefting with or without the copula. These can be illustrated by the following examples taken from Watkins’ article.

Basic VSO: *agit*^[V] *eterin*^[S] *illud* ‘that bird goes’,
 diprotant^[V] *gener*^[O] *Tudri* ‘they dispossess T.’s son-in-law’
 prinit^[V] *hinnoid*^[S] *iiii aves*^[O] ‘that buys four birds’

Copular cleft: *is*^[Cop] *did ciman hact*^[V] ‘it is a full day (that) thou wilt have’

Pendens: *grefiat*^[Pend]... *ni-s*^[N-E] *minn*^[V] *Tutbulc*^[S] ‘a title deed... T. does not need it’

Mac Cana was surely right to argue that the agreement with the basic, clefted and pendens patterns of Old Irish is so circumstantial that inheritance from a common ancestor of Irish and British is at least highly likely. Once we posit an Insular Celtic intermediary via which Goedelic and British derive from Proto-Celtic (see III.3.1-3), the lack of Continental Celtic evidence for VSO ceases to be a major problem. Indeed, for all Koch’s (1987) phonetically and syntactically forced claims that the phenomenon also existed in Gaulish, clefting by means of an expressed or suppressed copula is securely attested only in Insular Celtic and is most obviously connected with the rise of unmarked verb-initial patterns there.

(b) By the time of their earliest adequate attestation (the stages conventionally known as Middle Welsh, Middle Cornish and Middle Breton) the British languages generally did not differentiate inflectionally either between simple and compound verbs or between independent and dependent verbal forms. Suffixed pronouns and relative markers are likewise almost entirely absent, as is the infixing of such elements after the first preverb of a compound verb. However, such infixing is widely employed after various preverbal particles and conjunctions broadly comparable to the Old Irish conjunct particles: e.g. MW *ny-s aruollasant* ‘they received him not’, *neu-s rodes y uelly* ‘he has given it thus’, *minheu a’e kymmeraf* ‘I (who) will accept it’ (see *GMW*

55-6 for details). Moreover, etymological considerations reveal the compound origins of quite a few British verbs (e.g. MW *kymmer-* ‘accepts’ above < **kom-ber-* like OIr. *con:beir* ‘bears, conceives’), as can be seen from the lists of Irish and British compound verbs formed from various verbal roots given by Schumacher (*KPV, passim*). Given that the main stress gravitates towards the end of the word (i.e. automatically to the final syllable at first but subsequently to the penultimate in stressed words of more than one syllable) in British unlike Irish (1.3 above), a distinction between deuterotonic and prototonic forms of compound verbs (1.4-5 above) could not survive there as such. That said, there are a number of doublets such as MW *dychanu* or *dyganu* ‘sing’ with a historically unlenited (here spirant *ch*; *RChron.* 92-6) alternating with a historically lenited variant (here *g*; *RChron.* 91-2) of the root-initial consonant after what is etymologically a preverb with a final vowel (see *GMW* 62 for more examples). An obviously comparable alternation is seen in Old Irish between deuterotonic forms in which the pretonic first preverb does not cause lenition in a main clause (e.g. *do:cain* ‘chants’, *do:claid* ‘digs up’) and prototonic forms in which the now stressed first preverb does lenite if it ends/ended in a vowel (e.g. *-dichain*, *-tochclaid*; *RChron.* 89-91, and note that voiceless stops were lenited to voiceless fricatives in Irish but to voiced stops in British). British doublets of this type thus provide good evidence for the erstwhile existence there of a formal distinction between independent and dependent forms of compound verbs matching the one still clearly attested in Old Irish.

(c) There are further tell-tale survivals pointing to the previous existence in British of a basic system corresponding (except for the lack of suffixed emphatic particles) closely to the one given in 1.9 above that was still more or less fully operative in Old Irish. The augment is a case in point, Old and Middle Welsh providing a number of instances where OW *ri*, MW *ry* (= OIr. *ro*; 1.5 above) still has an obvious resultative (perfect) or, rarely, potential sense when prefixed to verbs in various tenses and/or moods (see *GMW* 166-8 for these examples and further details): e.g., *dy glot ry gogleu ym pob gwlat* ‘your fame (that) I have heard (of) in every country’, *ny ry goglef i eirmoet y uorwyn a dywedy di* ‘I have never heard (of) the maiden that you mention’ (pret. + perf.), *kylt ry wnelych di sarhaedu llawer a cholledu* ‘though you may have brought about many outrages and losses’ (pres. subj. + perf.), *mynet a oruc serch y uorwyn ym pob aelawt itaw kyn ny-s ry welhei eiroet* (past subj. + perf.) ‘love of the maiden entered into his every limb, although he had never seen her’, *ry seiw gur ar un conin* ‘a man can stand on a single stalk’ (pres. + pot.), *ry phrinom dy gerenhit* ‘may we deserve your friendship’ (pres. subj. + pot. expressing wish; see *EIV* 109-110). It is true that a reflex of *ro* is the only surviving augment in British and that this is almost invariably prefixed to the verb as a whole, whether alone or attached to a preverbal particle. However, this is hardly a surprise in view of the already mentioned demise of

a regular inflectional distinction between compound and simple verbs there. Moreover, various well motivated and documented developments in and after the Old Irish period resulted in a very similar scenario in Middle Irish (*EIV* 149-161, 183-191) and there is at least one highly significant British survival of the augment *r(y)* between a preverb and the verbal root in OW *di-r-gatisse* glossing Lat. *concesserat* ‘had granted’ (*GMW* 166).

(d) Finite verbs are unfortunately something of a rarity in the limited corpus of Old Welsh material but, in the earlier (basically 9th. or 10th. cent.) texts at least, the 3sg. of etymologically simple verbs with no preceding particle such as the negative seems usually to have a subsequently abandoned ending *-it* corresponding precisely to OIr. abs. *-id* (Early OIr. *-ith*; e.g. *gorith* in 1.3 above). *Agit* ‘goes’ and *prinit* ‘buys’ in the citations above (from the Ox.1 glosses along with a further example, *hegit hunnoid* ‘that goes’) are cases in point, as is *retit loyr ir did hinnuith* (Computus fragment) ‘the moon turns that day’ (lit. ‘runs’; OIr. *rethid*). *Ni-s minn* ‘does not need it’ (*Surrexit* memorandum) from the citations above duly shows a zero ending characteristic of many Old Irish 3sg. conj. forms after negative *ni* (plus infixes pronoun) and the same memorandum significantly uses *-it* with independent 3sg. pret. *rodessit* ‘gave’ (Isaac, 2001, 148; see McCone, 1991, 79-80, on OW abs. *-ss-it*). This contrast is also found in a number of aphorisms (well known as a category prone to retain archaisms, as in Eng. *manners maketh man* with a now obsolete SW Middle English pl. ending deriving directly from OE *-ap*) preserved in later manuscripts such as *trenghit golut, ny threigk molut* ‘wealth perishes, fame does not perish’ (see *GMW* 119), where the Old Irish cognate would display abs. *tréicid* ‘abandons’ vs. conj. *ní:tréici* ‘does not abandon’. One is bound to concur with Isaac’s (2001, 147) ‘observation that the double system of verbal flexion is properly an Insular Celtic phenomenon.... The Brittonic languages preserve clear evidence of the system, though there is no evidence that it was ever as fully developed as in Old Irish’. Nor, of course, is there any firm evidence that it was not, given the likelihood that this moribund distinction was most resilient in the particularly common 3sg.

Imm-it-cel (from the Ox. 1 glosses) is probably to be translated as ‘it hides it(self)’ and taken as an instance of a 3sg. pronoun infixes after the first preverb of a compound verb with a conjunct ending in the Old Irish manner (see Faliliev, 2000, 91, and V.2.5 below), and a similar infixing pattern is seen in the 3sg. imperfect *imm-is-line* ‘used to smear it’ (glossing Lat. *alinebat* in the Martianus Capella glosses). Moreover, *GMW* 56 gives a few examples such as *dy-m-kyfeirch* ‘greet me’ from early poetry surviving in later manuscripts, rightly concluding that these ‘undoubtedly represent the original construction in compound verbs’. Finally, OW *issit* (Juvencus glosses) has been analysed as 3sg. ‘it is’ plus a 3sg. suffixed pronoun ‘to it/him’ and so ‘has it’ by

Schrijver (1997, 173; see V.2.5). Be that as it may, there are a few certain attestations of this pattern in older Welsh poetry preserved in later manuscripts, e.g. *yss-ym eur ac aryant* ‘I have gold and silver’ (lit. ‘there is to me...’; *GMW* 142) comparable semantically with the OIr. suffixing possessive construction *táth-um* ‘there is to me, I have’ etc. with the 3sg. substantive verb but etymologically with the *iss-um:écen* ‘it is a necessity for me, I must’ with 3sg. copula plus a historically suffixed but synchronically infixes (see III.1.2.1) pronoun.

(e) There is also a good deal of evidence for an early British relative system that (apart from the lack of relative nasalisation) worked in essentially the same way as its Old Irish counterpart (see *GMW* 61-3) as described in 1.7 above. To begin with, one isolated form still in full use in Middle (and, for that matter, Modern) Welsh undoubtedly continues the practice of suffixing the relative marker to an independent simple verb, namely rel. *yssyd* (Mod. *sy(dd)*) ‘who/which/that is’ (*GMW* 63) as opposed to non-rel. *ys* ‘is’ in the extremely common 3sg. of the verb ‘to be’ (copula). Otherwise so-called ‘proper’ relative clauses (with subject or object antecedent) are normally introduced in Middle Welsh by a leniting particle *a* (after which a pronoun may be infixes as in *a’e kymmeraf* above) < OW *hai* (*GMW* 63, n. 4) if positive and by *ny* if negative, the latter generally identical with the main-clause negative as regards both form (*ny* before a consonant, *nyt* before a vowel) and following mutation (spirantisation in the case of *p*, *t*, *c* but otherwise lenition, except often in the case of *b* or *m*; *GMW* 62, n.1): e.g., *yr erchwys a ladyssei y carw* ‘the pack that had killed the stag’, *yr ych nyt el o gartref deir milltir* ‘the ox that does not go three miles from home’, *nit oed gyueir arnei hi ny bei yn llawn o’e garyat ef* ‘there was not a part of her that was not full of love of him’ (see *GMW* 60-61). However, it is evident from cases such as *pawb o’r pobloed ny bara* ‘all of the peoples who will not last’ (*GMW* 61, n.1; *para* ‘lasts’, standard MW *ny phara*) that there was originally a contrast after the negative between non-lenition (ultimately leading to spirantisation of *p*, *t*, *c*) in a main clause and lenition in a relative clause in British (see V.2.6 on this and an earlier corresponding opposition between main-clause *nyt* and relative *ny* before a vowel) as in Irish. Similarly in earlier sources there are survivals of spirant mutation in main clauses after *ry* and *neu* (e.g. *ry phrinom* above and *neu cheint* ‘I have sung’; *GMW* 62, n.1), which typically lenite in all contexts in normal Middle Welsh. This too doubtless reflects an older state of affairs with *ry* and *neu* (like proclitic *ro* and *no* in Old Irish) causing lenition in a relative clause but not in a main clause. Finally, there are Old Welsh examples of compound verbs in a relative clause that are not preceded by *a*, no doubt because the relative marker (presumably lenition despite orthographic ambiguity) was infixes after the first preverb as in Old Irish: e.g., *gur di-cones* ‘a man/he who made’, *ir pimphet eterin di-guor-mechis Lucas* ‘the fifth bird which Luke added’ (*GMW* 61, n.1).

(f) There can, then, be no reasonable doubt that, apart from the emphatic particles (A) attachable to the very end of the verbal complex, the basic set of patterns set out in 1.9 above with reference to Old Irish also applied once to British. Indeed, the admittedly meagre Old Welsh evidence suggests that significant parts of it may still have been quite well preserved as late as the ninth century, Isaac (2001, 148) remarking that ‘the system is apparently still intact in Old Welsh’ at least with regard to the 3sg. abs./conj. The crucial point is that, to all intents and purposes, the Old Irish scheme in 1.9 can (with the probable exception of A) be projected back as far as an Insular Celtic phase of linguistic evolution shared with British (see III.3.3).

2.2. Whereas copula clefts and pendens constructions retained their status as clearly marked variants of a basic VSO pattern from Old right through to Modern Irish and (as far as can be judged from the rather meagre record) in Old Welsh, the fronting of a subject, object or adverbial became the rule rather than the exception in Middle Welsh, Cornish and Breton prose. This is illustrated by the typical enough passage below from the Middle Welsh tale *Pwyll Pendewic Dyuet* (Thomson, 1957, ll. 72-85) with fronted subjects and objects typically followed by the direct relative particle *a* and fronted adverbials, including preposition phrases, by the indirect relative particle *y* or *yd*. It is to be noted that the simultaneous fronting of two or more constituents is by no means infrequent.

‘... *A chyrch y llys...*’ ¹*KYRCHU Y LLYS oruc ynteu; ac* ¹*YN Y LLYS* ²*EF a welei hundyeu ac yneuadeu ac ysteuyll...* *Ac* ¹*Y’R NEUAD ry gyrchwys y diarchenu.* ¹*EF a doeth makweyt a gueisson ieueinc y diarchenu...* ¹*DEU UARCHAUC a doeth i waret i wisc hela y amdanaw...* *A* ¹*’R NEUAD a gyweirwyt.* ¹*LLYNA y guelei ef teulu ac yniueroed...* *Ac* ¹*AR HYNNY* ²*E YMOLCHI yd aethant...*

“...And make for the court...” MAKING FOR THE COURT (T¹, vb.noun O) did he; and IN THE COURT (T¹, adv.) HE (T², pron.S) could see sleeping quarters and halls and chambers... And TO THE HALL (T¹, adv.) he set off to remove his boots. (To) HIM (T¹, pron.O) came squires and servants to remove his boots. TWO KNIGHTS (T¹, S) came to remove his hunting clothing from about him... And THE HALL (T¹, S) was prepared. THERE (T¹, adv.) he could see a warband and retinues... And THEREUPON (T¹, adv.) TO WASH (T², adv.) they went...”

Studies of this phenomenon by Fife and King (1991) and Poppe (1991) argue that Middle Welsh possessed two fronting constructions with a considerable degree of formal overlap. The first had emphatic/contrastive function and obviously derives from the copular cleft sentence still more or less intact in Old Welsh as in Old Irish. The second was probably originally an outgrowth of the pendens construction as Mac Cana suggests and underwent major expansion as the British languages developed the

topic/comment structure so apparent in the *Pwyll* passage above and elsewhere. In Breton this has continued down to the present but in Modern Welsh only the emphatic usage remains.

In Mac Cana's (1973, 114-20) opinion non-emphatic fronting was essentially a southern phenomenon still surviving vestigially in the optional Southeast Glamorgan concord of preposed pronoun seen in the contrast between *fi wn* 'I know', *ti wddot* 'you (sg.) know', *fe/i wŷr* 'he/she knows', *ni wddon* 'we know', *chi wddoch* 'you know', *nw wddon* and in the petrification found elsewhere in South (*fe fydda(f) i* 'I will be', *fe fydd e(f)/i* 'he/she will be', *fe fyddan nhw* 'they will be') and North (*mi fydda(f) i*, *mi fydd o/i*, *mi fyddan nhw* etc.) Wales (B. and P.W. Thomas, 1989, 74-7). After attaining great prominence in Middle and Early Modern Welsh literature it eventually gave way to VSO norms retained in more northerly Welsh speech. Since, however, the main declarative preverbal particles, northern *mi* and southern *fe*, are generalised first and third person singular pronouns respectively, it would appear that such VSO patterns in Modern Welsh are due at least in part to the development of particles from Middle Welsh structures with fronted pronominal subject and relative verb in Middle Welsh. Fife and King (1991, 144-5) suggest that the fronting of one and especially of two or more constituents in response to nuances of topicalisation reached extremes in the upper literary register that were unlikely to have been matched in ordinary speech and that this discrepancy laid the foundation for its subsequent decline and demise in Modern Welsh.

3.1. Viewed from an overall Celtic and Indo-European perspective to be discussed in the next chapter, the Insular Celtic system described in section 1 above displays a number of unusual features. These have played a pivotal role in arguments advanced by certain scholars in favour of the hypothesis that a pre-Celtic substrate exercised significant influence upon key areas of Insular Celtic grammar, particularly where syntax (above all, word order) was concerned. The remainder of the present chapter will be concerned with this issue.

Britain and Ireland had undoubtedly been inhabited for a considerable time before the Celts can plausibly be supposed to have reached them and there is no reason to suppose that speakers of any other Indo-European language had crossed the English Channel or the Irish Sea prior to this. Consequently it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the first Celtic settlers encountered a non-Indo-European language or languages on these islands. It has sometimes been claimed (e.g. by Meid, 1990, 101) that the mysterious Pictish language spoken in the Highlands of Scotland down to about the end of the first millennium AD continued a pre-Celtic non-Indo-European idiom of this type, but an alternative theory that Pictish was merely a variety of British

Celtic also has determined adherents (e.g. Forsyth, 1997). No remotely firm conclusion is possible in our present state of almost complete ignorance regarding Pictish. Indeed, with the solitary exception of Basque in a small area on either side of the western Pyrenees, the earlier languages of western and central Europe as a whole have been so thoroughly blotted out by incoming Indo-European idioms that little is known about them. Given this shortage of information, it is hardly surprising that speculation regarding the pre-Celtic language or languages of Ireland and Britain should mostly have revolved around allegedly non-Indo-European features of Irish and British grammar that are then supposed to have emanated from an older insular substrate, the linguistic affinities of which have been the object of a good deal of speculation.

3.2. The earliest such effort known to the present writer was made by the renowned Welsh scholar Rhys (1890) in line with the then orthodox division of the Celtic languages into so-called ‘p’- and ‘q’-varieties represented by Gaulish and British on the one hand and by Irish on the other. Rhys posited two waves of Celtic settlement in Britain, the earlier of which was a Goidelic one that came into direct linguistic contact with a non-Indo-European population first in Britain and then in Ireland before being overlaid in Britain by a second wave of Gallobritish speakers from the Continent. This led to the doubtless congenial conclusion (Rhys, 1890, 30-31) that British Celtic had been less affected by non-Indo-European linguistic influence than its Irish counterpart, and it will be argued towards the end of this section that such direct influence upon British is indeed unlikely if it and Irish are derived from a shared Insular Celtic intermediary. The main evidence adduced by Rhys (1890, 34-9) consisted of Irish names of the type *Nad Froich*, *Mug Núadat* that were made up of an inflected noun followed by a genitive with parallels in Semitic and occurred alongside compound names of typically Indo-European structure in early Ogam inscriptions as well as in Old and Middle Irish (see McManus, 1991, 101-10). However, this type could have arisen quite naturally as a consequence of the regular placing of a genitive after its head noun in Old Irish (3.5 below) and it is to be noted that, notwithstanding the comparison with Semitic, Rhys refrained from seeking to specify the non-Indo-European substrate language that he had posited.

Morris Jones (1900) set the ball rolling in earnest by arguing that various features of Welsh and Irish syntax, particularly those relating to word order, found striking parallels in what he regarded as the two main branches of the so-called ‘Hamitic’ language family, namely Ancient Egyptian and Modern Berber. This led him to the conclusion that the pre-Celtic inhabitants of the British Isles had spoken a Hamitic language that had left its mark upon the syntax of the new language acquired by these natives after the Celtic conquest but had not significantly affected its vocabulary or morphology. Morris Jones was young at the time and his views were not well received.

He never repeated them during the remainder of his distinguished scholarly career (but see Adams, 1956, for a generally lucid and sympathetic discussion accompanied by some further suggestions).

However, they were taken up and elaborated with enthusiasm in a series of articles on the non-Indo-European substratum in Old Irish by the prominent German Celticist and Indo-Europeanist Pokorny (1927-9, 1960 etc.), who went a good deal further than Morris Jones by envisaging a whole series of pre-Celtic substrates in Ireland and presumably also Britain. In addition to the so-called ‘Hamito-Semitic’ layer, he also countenanced earlier ones connected with Basque, Finno-Ugric, Caucasian and even Eskimo. At about the same time a typologically orientated geographical classification of Europe’s languages was attempted in a monograph on the structure of Europe’s languages by Lewy (1942). This characterised Irish and Basque as particularly fundamental members of a so-called ‘Atlantic’ group, to which English and the Western Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, France and Italy also belonged, and made it clear that he regarded the influence of pre-Indo-European substrates as paramount in the creation of later European *sprachbunds* or groups of languages classified as similar on typological rather than genetic grounds.

These two streams merged in a book on the verb in the languages of the British Isles by Wagner (1959), who dedicated it to his ‘honoured teachers and friends’ Pokorny and Lewy as ‘a contribution to the geographical typology of the verb’. This ascribed great importance to the role of an alleged Berber-like Hamitic substratum in the creation of typical Insular Celtic sentence structure, which was then supposed to have influenced the way in which English developed after its introduction first into Britain and then a good deal later into Ireland. Although not explicitly stated, the underlying hypothesis seems to rest upon a rather subjective contrast derived from Finck’s (1909) book on the main language types between ‘anreihend’ or serial languages of the Bantu type in Africa and ‘unterordnend’ or subordinating languages such as Turkish in the Near East. Wagner terms these ‘Euroafrican’ and ‘Euroasiatic’ respectively, regarding the Insular Celtic and Hamito-Semitic languages as typically ‘Euroafrican’, the Finno-Ugric and Caucasian languages as typically ‘Euroasiatic’ and Basque as a sort of crossroads where both types overlap. It can thus be seen that Wagner’s belief in a Berber-like substrate in Ireland and Britain is part of an appreciably broader and more elaborate theory of linguistic relationships encompassing Eurasia and Africa.

Be that as it may, the basic idea to concern us here is that, despite their manifest Indo-European origins, Irish and British Celtic have particular structural affinities with those languages of Northern Africa and the Near East that were formerly called ‘Hamito-Semitic’ but are nowadays usually termed ‘Afro-Asiatic’ (see Huehnergard,

2004, 138-141). The most important of these for our purposes are the Amazigh or Berber languages still surviving in large and small pockets from Western Egypt to Morocco, the now extinct Ancient Egyptian (the last phase of which, Coptic, is still used as a liturgical language), and the Semitic languages that have been exported from the Arabian peninsula at various times.

We may begin by noting that our knowledge of the long dead Continental Celtic languages, notably Gaulish and Celtiberian, has increased considerably as a result of quite a few inscriptions that have come to light in the past three decades or so. The more we know about these languages, the clearer it has become that most of the 'Afro-Asiatic' features stressed by Morris Jones, Wagner and others were confined to the Insular Celtic of Britain and Ireland. That being so, it looks as though any 'Hamitic' migration would have to have taken place from North Africa along the Western seaboard of Europe to Ireland and Britain without a significant landing in between. While this is not impossible, it is not unduly likely from a geographical point of view and history teaches that the Iberian peninsula is the obvious first stop for such occupations from Africa, whether by Carthaginians some centuries before Christ or by Arabs and Berbers from the Maghrib in the eighth century A.D.

The simple fact is that we have no good non-linguistic reason to posit a population speaking a variety of Afro-Asiatic in the British Isles before the arrival of the Celts (cf. Eska, 1994, 33). That being so, we would need to be very sure that linguistic features such as a basic word order Verb-Subject-Object seen in Irish and British Celtic as well as in Amazigh or Berber, Ancient Egyptian, Biblical Hebrew and Classical Arabic must be due to influence from a substratum with Afro-Asiatic affinities. Most scholars, including the present writer, would regard such confidence as misplaced. Some of the features in question are not found in the oldest Irish or Welsh sources and so can hardly have emanated from a long extinct pre-Celtic language, while others can have arisen quite naturally from inherited Indo-European constructions without pressure from a non-Indo-European substratum. Thomason and Kaufman (1988, 111-112) rightly insist upon 'strict methodological limitations on the study of interference through shift' and go on to make the following statement: 'In order to be able to make educated guesses in this area, we must be able to identify a substratum language or language group.. whose speakers shifted to the target language at the relevant time period; we must have information about its structure; and we must have information about the structure of the target language before the shift. These methodological prerequisites have frequently been ignored by substratum enthusiasts, and this fact probably accounts in large part for the widespread suspicion with which historical linguists tend to view substratum explanations of language change. It is possible, for instance, that Celtic languages of the British Isles owe their

un-Indo-European-like ... features.. to a pre-Indo-European substratum; but since we have no information about what language or languages the pre-Indo-European inhabitants spoke, we cannot establish such a cause for these changes (even if we were to agree that an external explanation is needed). All the hypotheses that have been advanced about such a substratum... rest on such tenuous historical and linguistic evidence that the chances for a convincing proposal in this area seem remote’.

In a major recent contribution to this debate that unfortunately remains unpublished, Gensler (1993) has voiced justified doubts about the viability of the far-reaching hypotheses of Pokorny and Wagner. Like Morris Jones, Gensler confines himself to the issue of arguable direct relations between the Insular Celtic and Afro-Asiatic languages. Moreover, he has significantly advanced the discussion by seeking to evaluate these against an extensive collection of typologically relevant features worldwide. Well-founded doubts about the precise relationship between the main members of the Afro-Asiatic family lead him to insist that every shared feature adduced should be an overt surface phenomenon rather than a deeper abstraction and that it should be found at the oldest adequately attested stage of at least one branch of Insular Celtic as well as in at least one branch of a ‘Mediterranean’ Afro-Asiatic language. In practice this means Old Irish or Middle Welsh on the one hand and the older Semitic languages, Middle Egyptian or the present-day Amazigh or Berber languages on the other. Since we now know that a syntactic feature of central importance to the substrate hypothesis, namely unmarked initial position of the verb, had established itself neither in Celtiberian nor in Gaulish (II.2.2-3), Gensler rightly insists that only features confined to Insular and absent from Continental Celtic can be validly used to make a case for an erstwhile Afro-Asiatic substrate in the British isles. However, notwithstanding these improvements on his predecessors’ methodology, Gensler’s procedure remains essentially unhistorical, since it not infrequently boils down to an ‘à la carte’ combination of the evidence of one of two Insular Celtic branches with that of one of three Afro-Asiatic language groups without more ado.

It must be emphasised that the postulation of Afro-Asiatic influence upon the Insular Celtic languages calls for as clear an idea as possible of the historical background assumed to be responsible. From a geographic point of view, an early Afro-Asiatic migration to Ireland and Britain is not particularly probable *a priori*, particularly if the starting point was the Near East rather than Northwest Africa and if the alleged migration is associated (as by Pokorny, 1960, 232-3 and 236-8) with the spread of Megalithic culture. Even though their precise relationship to each other has not been conclusively established, it would seem that Ancient Egyptian occupies a linguistically as well as a geographically intermediate position between the Semitic and the Amazigh

or Berber languages as one might expect, regardless of whether speakers of Afro-Asiatic spread westwards from Arabia to the Atlantic, in the opposite direction or both eastwards and westwards from Egypt (see Brett and Fentress, 1996, 10-16, and Huehnergard, 2004, 138). Given these considerations and the generally late attestation of Amazigh languages, it seems fair enough to compare the very early attested Ancient Egyptian directly with Old Irish and Middle Welsh but Semitic features, surely, should only be admitted as evidence where they have serious claims to Afro-Asiatic provenance.

As far as the Insular Celtic languages are concerned, the substrate theory outlined above clearly entails what Thomason and Kaufman (1988, 212) designate ‘interference that results from imperfect group learning during a process of language shift’, further noting that ‘in shift-induced interference lexical diffusion may be negligible, and in any case phonological and syntactic interference will be more substantial than lexical interference’. They also make the following crucial observation: ‘a process of language shift may take as little as a generation. In such a case the interference features will enter the T[arget] L[anguage] as spoken by the shifting speakers quite rapidly, though the adoption of these features by original TL speakers may take more time. In fact, substratum features are more likely to enter a TL rapidly than slowly: if the shift takes place over long centuries, then the shifting population is likely to become truly bilingual in the TL. In such a case there is no imperfect learning and consequently no interference in the TL’ (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988, 41). If so, the extensive substrate influence upon the syntax of Insular Celtic envisaged is likely to be due to rather rapid language shift from a pre-Celtic to a Celtic idiom in the area affected and direct influence from a pre-Celtic substrate upon British must be regarded as most unlikely in the context of the Insular Celtic hypothesis defended here (see McCone 1992, 20-39; *RChron.* 67-104; 2003, 172-7). This is because any substrate language(s) with the effects envisaged would presumably have been displaced in Britain during an Insular Celtic phase that must have lasted for several centuries at least (see III.3.3), and so could hardly still have been in existence to affect British Celtic directly at a subsequent phase. Consequently exclusively British features are of doubtful validity as comparanda, whereas speakers of what became the Irish branch of Insular Celtic may be assumed to have come into renewed direct contact with a pre-Celtic language or languages on emigrating to the neighbouring island.

It remains to note that substrate approach to various problems of European linguistic history has been advocated of late by Vennemann (e.g., 1994), who combines the notion of a substratum related to Basque over most of the Continent (see Trask, 1997, 364-8, for some telling criticisms) with the aforementioned idea of an Afro-Asiatic substratum on the British Isles (e.g., Vennemann, 2002, pp. 323-6 of which offer a

convenient, if bare and uncritical, list of the features alleged by Pokorny in support of this hypothesis).

3.3. At this point it seems appropriate to look in more detail at some of the more significant similarities alleged in support of the Afro-Asiatic substrate hypothesis, beginning with the well-known rule that in Irish and British a phrase consisting of a head noun followed by another in the genitive only the latter can be supplied with a formal marker of definiteness (e.g. Adams, 1956, 11-12). In this respect a construction such as that seen in Modern Irish *fear an tí* ‘[the] man (*fear*) of the (*an*) house (*tí*, gen. of *teach*)’, *teach Phádraig* ‘[the] house (nom.) of Patrick’, Mod.W. *pen y mynydd* ‘[the] summit (*pen*) of the (*y*) mountain (*mynydd*)’, *tŷ Dewi* ‘[the] house of David’ is very similar to that found in certain Semitic languages with a definite article as represented by Modern Arabic *bayt al bint* ‘[the] house (*bayt*) of the (*al*) girl (*bint*)’, *bayt Anwar* ‘[the] house of Anwar’. This striking agreement is, however, almost certainly due to coincidence. To begin with, the rule in question is merely optional in the older phases of Irish and Welsh, as can be seen from variation between the commoner type *rún na cruche* ‘[the] secret (*rún*) of the (*na*) cross (*cruche*, gen. of *croch*)’ and the rarer *fornaib gnímaib inna pregeptóire* ‘on (*for*) the (*-naib*) deeds (*gnímaib*, dat. pl. of *gním*) of the (*inna*) preachers (*pregeptóire*, gen. pl. of *pregeptóir*)’ in Old Irish (GOI 295-7) as well as from a similar freedom evinced by Middle Welsh *coron y dernas* ‘[the] crown (*coron*) of the (*y*) kingdom (*teyrnas*)’ versus rarer *y kic yr ederyn* ‘the (*y*) flesh (*kic*) of the (*yr*) bird (*ederyn*)’ (GMW 25). This indicates that the restriction to a single marker of definiteness on the genitive, which is rigidly applied in later Irish and Welsh, had arisen and begun to oust a system of double marking in both branches separately not long before the beginning of their respective written records. Moreover, as far as Semitic is concerned, not only is there no definite article in the group’s oldest attested member Akkadian but the forms in the other other languages are too diverse for the reconstruction of a protoform to be possible. It thus looks as though a definite article was developed relatively late in a number of West Semitic languages separately and was not present in Proto-Semitic. A definite article is likewise absent from Early Egyptian and the Berber languages.

Gensler (1993, 217-23) is, of course, aware of these difficulties and has recourse to the well-known *status constructus* that was undoubtedly already a feature of Proto-Semitic. This entailed a reduced form of the head word in close combination with a following stressed genitive as part of a single accentual unit. For instance, an Akkadian noun used independently (the so-called *status rectus*) basically takes the singular endings nom. *-um*, acc. *-am* or gen. *-im* but lacks these inflections when governing a genitive: e.g., nom. *šarrum* ‘(the) king’, *mātum* ‘(the) land’, *ummānum* ‘(the) army’ but construct *šar mātīm* ‘the king of the land’, *ummān šarrim* ‘the king’s

army’; nom. *bēlum* ‘(the) lord’, *ālum* ‘city’ but construct *bēl ālim* ‘the lord of the city’ (Riemschneider, 1988, 30-1 and 35-6). Gensler plausibly sees the close bond between head noun plus genitive in the inherited *status constructus* as the reason why those Semitic languages that later developed a definite article only employ it once in such combinations. However, he is on much shakier ground in making the following suggestion regarding the optional single article in the earliest records of Insular Celtic: ‘On a substratal account, speakers of a Semitic-like language would have transferred their own speech habits to the syntax of imperfectly mastered Celtic. The Construct, so intimately intermeshed with Semitic-specific morphophonology, could not in itself have been transplanted into Celtic. But a rule of article placement would not be cemented into the concrete stuff of Semitic grammar in the same way, and plausibly could “break loose” from its embedment in Semitic morphosyntax and be taken over as a phenomenon in its own right. And this rule, once divorced from the Construct, would be under no intrinsic structural compulsion to apply rigidly’ (Gensler, 1993, 223). One obvious objection to this approach, namely the doubtful validity of direct comparisons between exclusively Semitic features and arguable Insular Celtic counterparts (see 3.2 above), might be mitigated by appealing to some admittedly less than conclusive indirect evidence from Coptic for a *status constructus* in Ancient Egyptian (see Schenkel, 1990, 81). Even so Gensler’s explanation remains at odds with his own wise insistence (see 3.2 above) that comparisons between Afro-Asiatic and Insular Celtic be restricted to overt surface phenomena to the exclusion of more abstract considerations. The comparison here is far from exact, as he is obliged to admit, and evidence for destressing of the first component (notably prepositions, conjunct particles or first preverbs and the copula; see 1.3-7 above as well as II.2.1/2.4) of certain close syntagms in Insular Celtic makes it difficult to see why the first noun of a genitive construction could not have been similarly affected as a result of influence from a substrate with a *status constructus*. It seems a good deal less problematical to posit well motivated independent developments in Irish, British and Semitic, given that both components of the phrases in question are usually definite with the result that double marking of this feature is largely redundant. In this connection it is worth noting that a similar restriction applies to a phrase containing the preposed possessive genitive in Modern English, e.g. *the girl’s house*, *Patrick’s house*.

Morris Jones (1900, 620-24) attached considerable importance to an alleged similarity between Ancient Egyptian and Middle Welsh with regard to the use of personal endings with verbs. In Ancient Egyptian suffixed pronouns are attached directly to the verbal stem (e.g. *jr.n.f* ‘he has done’ and *jr.n.sn* ‘they have done’) and are naturally omitted when a noun subject is present (e.g. *jr.n ntr* ‘the god has done’, *jr.n ntrw* ‘the gods have done’; see Allen, 2000, 223). It is hardly surprising that the bare stem is also

used with a plural of a noun subject, since the latter suffices to express singular, dual or plural without assistance from the verbal form itself. Morris Jones (1900, 621) notes that in Welsh inflected forms of the verb such as 1 sing. *daethum*, 2 plur. *daethoch*, 3plur. *daethant* ‘I/you/they went’ can only be used with a pronoun subject as a rule, a singular or plural noun subject calling for the third person singular form of the verb: e.g., *daeth y dynion* ‘the men came’ and not **daethant y dynion* or the like. This usage is then compared with that of Ancient Egyptian on the assumption that the third person singular is the least marked form of a verbal paradigm. However, this anyway less than exact correspondence may perfectly well be due to coincidence insofar as plural marking on the verb as well as on the noun subject can be regarded as redundant. For instance, the concord between verb and subject inherited from Proto-Indo-European was well preserved in Old Irish but thereafter the third person singular came to be used increasingly with a plural subject at a date far too late for a pre-Celtic substrate to be invoked: e.g., OIr. *boí (in fer)* ‘he/the man was’ and *bátar (ind fir)* ‘they/the men were’ but Mod.Ir. *bhí sé/an fear* ‘he/the man was’, *bhíodar (or bhí siad)* ‘they were’ and *bhí na fir* ‘the men were’.

3.4. The most germane arguments for Afro-Asiatic substrate influence upon the Insular Celtic languages are best dealt with under the following headings, the first three of which are particularly relevant in the present context:

- (a) word order,
- (b) suffixed and infix pronouns,
- (c) relative clauses,
- (d) verbal nouns.

One or other of these heading covers most of the half dozen direct syntactic comparisons between Ancient Egyptian and Irish or Welsh constructions offered by Isaac (2001, 153-6) as a prelude to suggesting ‘within a purely typological framework (no substrate theory)’ (2001, 147) that the Insular Celtic opposition between absolute and conjunct verbal inflection may have some affinities with certain contextually conditioned alternations in Ancient Egyptian conjugation patterns (2001, 156-63). Isaac (2001, 161-2) proposes ‘that not only are the Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct paradigms formally comparable to the emphatic and non-emphatic forms of Ancient Egyptian, but that their functional typology is comparable too’ (see III.1.6.3), while rightly conceding (2001, 156) that ‘much detail of the verbal system of Egyptian is still a matter of debate’ (see Schenkel, 1990, 94-194; Loprieno, 1995, 72-102; Allen, 2000, 404-8).

3.5. As far as word order is concerned, Old Irish was a consistent VSO language in

terms of the correlates postulated by Greenberg (1963). Not only were the principal constituents of the sentence ordered as described in 1.1-5 above but relative clauses, genitives and almost all adjectives follow their head noun (although cardinal and ordinal numerals precede it), and the language has a marked preference for prepositions over postpositions. These basic rules also seem to have typified the admittedly scanty remains of Old Welsh prose and as such to be of Insular Celtic antiquity at least (see 2.1 above and McCone, 1997, 377-8, 383 and 390-93).

Morris Jones (1900, 619-20) and his followers have understandably pointed out that these rules diverge markedly from those of the SOV type frequently ascribed to Proto-Indo-European (see II.1.1-2 and McCone, 1997, 363-73) but closely resemble those of the VSO type observed in Ancient Egyptian, Berber and most of the older Semitic languages. From this it is deduced that an Afro-Asiatic or at least Afro-Asiatic-like substrate language must have triggered this significant typological shift in Insular Celtic. While it must be conceded that substrate influence can lead to changes in word order, as for instance in the case of Akkadian (which seems to have replaced initial position of the verb inherited from Proto-Semitic with final position under the influence of Sumerian; e.g. Wagner, 1959, 160), it seems clear that word order rules are also capable of undergoing significant change without the catalyst of a substrate. It is, for example, hardly likely that the transition from classical Latin's preponderantly SOV order to the SVO pattern dominant in its Romance descendants was due to substrate influence, and the same goes for the SVO order that has replaced the classical language's VSO in many present-day dialects of Arabic. In the latter case it seems probable that the passage from VSO to SVO was due to the generalisation of a preposed subject originally conditioned by topicalisation, a similar process being quite apparent in Middle Welsh, Middle Cornish and Breton (see 2.2 above; McCone, 1997, 383-5; Ternes, 1992, 386-8).

In this connection considerable importance attaches to the realisation that originally marked word order patterns can sometimes be generalised since (see II.1.2), many old Indo-European languages display an almost certainly inherited topicalisation rule whereby a constituent so affected is shifted to the head of the sentence. Accordingly a topicalised simple verb occupies initial position, the upshot being a stylistically marked and pragmatically conditioned VSO order. Indeed, Delbrück (1900, 74) simply posited generalisation of a topicalised verb frequent in narrative: 'regular initial position of the verb first developed in Insular Celtic, obviously from the practice of using the verb to make a connection with what preceded it in narrative' (my translation). When the verb was associated with a preverb or a negative, the shift of this element to the head of the sentence sufficed to topicalise the verbal expression as a whole. A clause-initial preverb or negative plus enclitics, which were attached to the

first stressed word in the sentence in accordance with Wackerhagel's Law (see McCone, 1997, 367-9), could then attract the rest of the verbal expression rather like a magnet to give rise to a topicalised verbal complex standing at the head of the sentence, this then being generalised in Insular Celtic (Watkins, 1963, 35-41; McCone, 1997, 364-5, 373-4 und 384-93). It is to be noted that so-called 'univerbation' of this type is by no means restricted to Insular Celtic but is also found in other Indo-European languages (see II.1.9 and McCone, 1997, 374). The peculiarity of Insular Celtic consists simply in its having gone a step further by generalising a sentence-initial verbal complex. This development seems natural enough, given that sentence enclitics tend to be placed after the first stressed element in the sentence and that enclitic pronouns are prone to be incorporated in the verbal expression (see McCone, 1997, 369). That being so, it can hardly be taken as compelling evidence for substrate influence. Regular initial position of the verb rules out shifting it to initial position as a topicalisation strategy and also excludes so-called 'amplification' by placing an element or elements after an otherwise final verb. Placing an element to be topicalised before the sentence or clause introduced by the verb was so obvious a solution (McCone, 1997, 385) that it is no wonder that such 'cleft' constructions occur in various VSO languages such as Old Irish and Ancient Egyptian. These matters will be dealt with in greater detail in the next chapter.

The development of regular VSO word order with a sentence-initial verbal complex in Insular Celtic could then, in accordance with Greenberg's (1963) theory of word-order correlates geared to the categories 'governing' (e.g. V) and 'governed' (e.g. O), have triggered typological 'drift' from postpositions to prepositions governing nouns and from preposing to postposing of a genitive, an attributive adjective or a relative clause to its head word. Such shifts conditioned by the position of the verb in relation to the object are, of course, hardly self evident, since many languages display inconsistencies with regard to these correlates: e.g., Basque has unmarked SOV word order, postpositions and preposed genitive or relative clause but postpones most adjectives. Nevertheless, they seem understandable and natural enough to render the postulate of substrate influence unnecessary, particularly when the daughter languages indicate considerable flexibility in the ancestral proto-language as regards the position of adjectives, genitives and relative clauses. For example, despite its retention of unmarked SOV word order classical Latin shows a tendency towards prepositions, postponed relative clauses and a rather free ordering of adjectives or genitives before or after their head word. In this sphere, then, it is a question of choice between already existing alternatives rather than a shift from one rigid sequence to another.

Even though the evidence of Continental Celtic on word order rules in question is not unduly abundant, it does offer some indications. The relative clause characterised by

enclitic *-yo* was placed after its head word in Gaulish as well as Insular Celtic on the evidence of the *Martialis Dannotali* inscription (LG 98-102). Genitives and adjectives denoting father, affiliation or home were normally postposed: e.g., Gaul. ALKOUNOS AŠKONETI (Solinas, 1995, 328) ‘Alk. (son) of Ask.’, METELUI MAEŠILALUI UENIA METELIKNA AŠMINA KRASANIKNA ‘to Metellos son Maeslilos (dedicated this) the offspring of Metellos (and) Asmina the daughter of Krasanos’ (Solinas, 1995, 372-3; McCone, 1993), Σεγομαρος Ουιλλονεος τουουτιος Ναμαυσατις ‘S. (son) of Ou., citizen of Nîmes’ (LG 84-5), *Martialis Dannotali* ‘M. (son) of D.’, ματρεβο Ναμαυσικαβο ‘to the mothers of Nîmes’ (LG 86), Celtib. **Lubos Kounesikum Melmunos** ‘L. of the (kindred) K., (son) of M’ (Bot. I B 1 etc.; Untermann, 1997, 564-74). This usage might, of course, be treated as a special case but there are also other certain or at least probable examples of postposition such as Gaul. *ratin Brivatiom* ‘the rampart of the inhabitants of Briva’, (LG 92-3), *brixtia anderon* ‘spells of the subterranean ones’ or perhaps ‘spells of the women’ (Chamalières 1. 3; LG 150-8), *brixtom uidluias* (Larzac 1a 3; LG 160-72), *Iaia duxtir Adiegias* ‘I daughter of A’ (Larzac 1a 11), *Adiega matir Aiias* ‘Ad. mother of Ai.’ (Larzac 1a 14), Celtib. *voramos Ednoum* ‘the most exalted of the E’ (Untermann, 1997, 630), Gaul. *tarvos trigaranus* ‘the three-crane bull’ (LG 106-7), *nata vimpi* ‘pretty girl’ (LG 123-4), *tuθος decametos* ‘the tenth kiln’ (etc. with postposed ordinals from La Graufesenque; LG 129-33), *indas mnas ueronadas bRICTAS* ‘these uer. (and) speckled women’ (Larzac 2a 6-7), Celtib. **silabur sleitom konskilitom** ‘sl. kon. silver’ (Bot. I A 3; e.g., Meid, 1993), *viros veramos* ‘the most exalted man’ (Untermann, 1997, 640). Apart from numerals and pronouns, reliable examples of preposed adjectives seem so far to be restricted to the Celtiberian type **uirouiaka kar** ‘Tessera of Virovia’ (Untermann, 1997, 713-4; cf. Jordán Cólera, 1998, 147-50) but a genitive does sometimes stand before its noun: e.g., *bnanom bRICTO[m]* (Larzac 1a 1, if not gen. plur. with postposed adjective), **Tokoitos-kue Sarnikio-kue aiuizas** ‘the a. of Togois und Sarnikios’ (Bot. I A 10-11), **karuo kenei... Belaiokum-kue kenis Kariko-kue kenis** (Untermann, 1997, 653-7). Nothing can be deduced from cases such as Gaul. *neððamon delgu linda* ‘I hold the drinks of the next (ones)’ (LG 139-40) and ATEKNATI TRUTIKNI KARNITU ARTUAŠ KOISIS TRUTIKNOS ‘Koisiss son of Drutos set up the gravestones of Ategnatos son of Drutos’ (LG 74-6), where an apparently topicalised genitive stands at the head of the sentence. Continental Celtic, then, turns out to display considerable flexibility with regard to the position of an attributive adjective or genitive. The overall impression is that postposing of an adjective and preposing of a genitive were the norm (cf. Basque above), as in the case of the short and, notwithstanding an apparently Latin genitive plural, essentially Celtiberian inscription *Turos Carorum viros veramos* ‘Turos the most exalted man of the Cari’ (Untermann, 1997, 640). Admittedly scanty attestations such as *insinde* (Larzac 1a 1; cf. OIr. *issin* ‘in the?’), **somei eni touzei** (Bot. I A 8-9) and **es uertai entara tiris matus** (Bot. I A I 6) point

to a Continental Celtic preference for prepositions, although *eni* also occurs as a postposition in **Tokoitei eni** (Bot. I A 4).

It seems quite possible that the just discussed fluctuations between pre- and postposing go back at least as far as Proto-Celtic. If so, the Insular Celtic preference for prepositions but postposed gentives, adjectives and relative clauses, which may well have been enhanced by the emergence of normal VSO word order, did not involve an unduly major shift and is easy enough to envisage without recourse to substrate pressure.

3.6. According to Wagner (1959, 153 und 156-8; my translation here and elsewhere) ‘the Old Irish system of infixed and suffixed pronominal objects has an exact counterpart in Berber. Berber also has verbal prefixes, although these are... grammatical rather than semantic adjuncts..... Similarly to Old Irish, pronominal objects are suffixed to a simple but infixed in a compound verb form..... On the evidence of Greek and Indo-Iranian the semantic verbal prefixes in PIE were not inextricably bound to the verb and have a strongly adverbial character. Since they are stressed in this context, they attract enclitic elements of the sentence such as object pronouns, the upshot being an apparently infixed object pronoun on occasion . Normally, however, further constituents of the sentence also stand between the preverb and a finite verbal form. This seems to be the situation in Hittite..... The great typological difference in relation to the old Insular Celtic system is obvious:.... in Insular Celtic the verb stands right at the head of its clause and all preceding elements (prefixes, infixes) are proclitic..... The aforementioned Hittite, Old Indic and Germanic systems can only be regarded as indicating a formal starting point for the Insular Celtic category..... Since this verbal complex as a whole has its closest typological correspondence in Berber and a whole series of syntactic agreements between Insular Celtic and Berber have been demonstrated by Morris-Jones and Pokorny, this correspondence cannot be ascribed to coincidence but must have pride of place as the basis of all attempts at a historical explanation’.

Since a preverb or a negative standing in tmesis at the head of the sentence served on its own to topicalise the whole verbal expression, a semantically fused verbal complex must be posited in Proto-Indo-European *pace* Wagner (see II.1.7 and McCone, 1997, 373). The univerbation to a clause-initial complex found in various Indo-European languages and generalised in Insular Celtic would then be perfectly understandable as a subsequent formal realisation of the semantic situation. Once a clause could only be introduced by the verb, a preverb or some other verbal prefix connected with it, enclitics hitherto attached to the initial stressed element of the sentence in accordance with Wackernagel’s law would automatically become suffixed or infixed components

of that verbal complex. It is, then, difficult to agree with the view that this correspondence between Insular Celtic and Berber ‘cannot be ascribed to coincidence’. Furthermore, the system of suffixed and infixes in present-day Berber is not necessarily old. The early Semitic languages and Ancient Egyptian only have suffixed pronouns and the definite article masc. *p3*, fem. *t3* (later *p3y*, *t3y*) first developed in the Middle Egyptian period attracts to itself a pronominal suffix otherwise attached to the noun (e.g., *pr.sn* and later also *p3y.sn pr* ‘their house’, *hmt.j* and later also *t3y.j hmt* ‘my wife’) in accordance with a well known tendency of enclitics to gravitate to the head of their (see Kaisse, 1985, 82). It is thus quite possible that the contrast in Berber between, say, *ičča-t uryaz* ‘the man ate it’ and *ur-t ičči uryaz* ‘the man didn’t eat it’ or *la-t zzadənt tširratin* ‘the girls grind it’ (Penchoen, 1973, 56-7 and 59-60) is also secondary, and it may be added that mere omission of the second suffixed pronoun would give the Middle Egyptian construction of the type *jw.f 3tp.f šmw.f* ‘he reaped his harvest’ (Allen, 2000, 268) with particle + pronoun (‘hanging’ *jw.f*) followed by verb + pronoun (*3tp.f*) the appearance of an infixes pronoun (**yw.f 3tp*). The suffixed and infixes pronouns of Insular Celtic can thus be accounted for without difficulty by a combination of Wackernagel’s law with generalised initial position of the verbal complex and constitute no serious argument for the erstwhile presence of a Berber-like substrate language.

From an Indo-European point of view the combination of prepositions with enclitic pronouns in Insular Celtic (e.g. OIr. *do* ‘to’, *dom/duit/dó/dí* ‘to me/you/him/her’ etc.; MW. *ar* ‘on’, *arnaf/arnat/arnaw/arnei* ‘on me/you/him/her’ etc.) is a good deal more remarkable: ‘In the Celtic languages, as is well known, prepositions are conjugated. This is certainly an innovation which, as has already been noted on occasion, is connected with the North African stratum in the Insular Celtic languages (ZCPh. 17, 385f.): conjugated prepositions are found in Berber, Egyptian and Semitic’ (Wagner, 1959, 168-9; cf. 1985, 66).

In Afro-Asiatic it is a matter of combinations of prepositions with enclitic possessive pronouns that can also be suffixed to nouns (and, indeed, are often identical to forms suffixed to verbs; cf. 3.3 above): e.g., Middle Egyptian *šmw.f* ‘his harvest’ above, *hr.f* ‘his face’ or ‘on him’, *hn.j/k.t/f.s* ‘with me/you(m./f.)/him/her’ etc.; see Allen, 2000, 83-8). This usage very probably reflects the nominal origin of many prepositions and is more reminiscent of the Old Hittite type *piran-šet* ‘before him’, *katti-m(m)i* ‘by me’ (Friedrich, 1974, 133-4) with an admittedly inflected clitic possessive pronominal adjective also used with nouns (e.g. nom. sg. *attaš-šiš* ‘his father’, dat.-loc. sg. *kiššari-mi* ‘in my hand’; Friedrich, 1974, 65-6) than of the Insular Celtic situation. The suffixed pronominal elements in Insular Celtic cannot possibly have been possessive in origin, since possessive pronominals were prefixed in both Irish and British (e.g.,

OIr. *a thech*, MW. *y dy* ‘his house’) and retain this position in combination with certain relatively recent prepositions derived from nouns (e.g. OIr. *a dochum(m)* ‘towards him’ lit. ‘in his approaching’; the proclitic dative or accusative form of *tochim(m)* ‘stepping towards, approaching’, verbal noun of *do:cing* ‘steps towards, approaches’). Everything indicates that the ‘conjugated’ prepositions in Insular Celtic (e.g., OIr. *intiu* ‘into them’ < **ande-sūs* with acc. but *indib* ‘in them’ < **and(e)-ēbis* with dat.; see McCone, 1993b) are based upon a typically Indo-European appositional combination of a stressed preposition with the appropriate case form of a stressed pronoun. Whereas it was the preposition that lost its stress in Insular Celtic to become proclitic to a following noun governed by it (e.g. OIr. *a(sin) t(a)ig* ‘out of (the/)a house’), the presumably parallel (cf. proclisis of the copula to a following predicate in II.2.1) introduction of a single stress to combinations of preposition plus pronoun can reasonably be supposed to have resulted in the pronoun losing its stress on the model of the formally similar enclitic pronouns (most inherited from PIE and one or two secondarily cliticised in Insular Celtic) used with verbs (see 1.6 above).

The development of the so-called ‘conjugated’ prepositions of Insular Celtic is, then, easy enough to explain without invoking rather imprecise Afro-Asiatic parallels, particularly when it is borne in mind that combinations of this type are by no means confined to Insular Celtic and Afro-Asiatic. ‘It will, I think, be common ground that the insular Celtic languages have many features which are not readily paralleled in western Europe; Robert Atkinson, a linguist of very wide range, was discussing the conjugated prepositions when he said, in 1885, ‘we are involuntarily hurried into a different field of languages: these combinations, one fancies, might be Hebrew or Hungarian, Tibetan or Tamil’. Hebrew, of course, had been suggested often enough in the pre-scientific age - the Highland Society's Dictionary of 1828 was still giving the Hebrew cognates of Scottish Gaelic words - but Atkinson was discussing what we would call typology rather than vocabulary’ (Greene, 1966, 125-6 as part of an admirably balanced discussion of the merits of substrate influence versus internal development from an inherited base as an explanation of various relevant aspects of Insular Celtic grammar).

As intimated above, clitic pronominal suffixes attached to prepositions tend to correlate with clitic possessive pronominal suffixes used with nouns and/or with subject or object pronouns attached clitically to verbs (e.g. Classical Arabic *min-hu* ‘from him’, *kitābu-hu* ‘his book’, *daraba-hu* ‘he struck him’; Thatcher, 1993, 49). Hungarian (see Rounds, 2001, 140-158, Rounds and Sólyom, 2002, 90-92 and 207-8), for example, has clitic personal pronominal forms that may be suffixed with appropriate vowel harmony etc. to nouns as possessives (e.g. *a barát* ‘the friend’ but *a barát-om* ‘my friend’, *a barát-ja* ‘his/her/its friend’ etc.) or to what are otherwise

postpositions (e.g. *Zoltán nelkül* ‘without Zoltán’ but *nelkül-em* ‘without me’, *nelkül-e* ‘without him/her/it’). Wagner (1985, 66-72) speculates that the similar Old Hittite system referred to above may be due to Finno-Ugric influence at some prehistoric stage, although Akkadian might be preferred as a more tangible source (e.g. *qāššu* ‘his hand’ < **qāt-šu*, *išti-šu* ‘with him’, and also as direct object of a finite verb *išabbassu* ‘he attacks him’ < **išabbat-šu*; see Riemschneider, 1988, 40-42, 135-6). Viewed from this perspective, the most that can reasonably be claimed is that the pronominal forms of prepositions in Insular Celtic are due to partial assimilation to the usage of a substrate characterised by the type of system found in various languages, including members of the Afro-Asiatic group. However, one could equally well argue for a typologically motivated tendency to assimilate the pronouns governed by preposition to those governed as direct objects by finite verbs.

3.7. As will be argued in VI.1.1-5, the oldest form of the relative clause in Insular Celtic was characterised by an uninflected enclitic particle *-*yo* that is also attested in Gaulish and was functionally similar to the general Basque relative marker *-(e)n* insofar as it covered various different case relations. Since this system must have arisen at a stage earlier than Insular Celtic, it can hardly be ascribed to the influence of an insular substrate. Apart from the prepositional relative sentence to be discussed below, it has survived virtually unchanged into Old Irish and has left unmistakable traces in Middle Welsh. Relative constructions in the Afro-Asiatic languages are quite diverse. Although particles marking relative clauses in British have sometimes been compared with those used in some Semitic and Berber languages (see Penchoen, 1973, 67-8), in the final analysis all that they have in common is a lack of inflection that need hardly be due to more than coincidence in view of the independent evolution of uninflected relative markers in Romance (e.g., French and Spanish *que*), for instance. The relative function of the British particles is likewise almost certainly secondary and relatively recent (see Schrijver, 1994, 178-9; 1997, 56 and 169-72).

The comparison between prepositional relatives in the Insular Celtic and Afro-Asiatic languages is more interesting. In classical Old Irish a fixed relative particle *-(s)a* [nas.] identical to the nom.-acc. sg. neut. definite article *a* [nas.] (or *-(s)a* [nas.] after a preposition, as in OIr. *forsa ndorus* ‘on the entrance’) is attached to the preposition. Apart from the absence of concord in number, gender and case, this construction is reminiscent of the prepositional relative sentence in German (e.g., OIr. *aníforsa:míter* ‘the thing upon which you pass judgement’, Germ. ‘das Ding, über das du urteilst’), whereas the Berber construction corresponds to the now usual English type apart from a trivial difference in the position of the preposition (e.g., *isəlli nna s ig^wət ayyul* ‘the stone that he struck the donkey with’ with rel. marker *nna* and prep. *s*; Penchoen, 1973, 68-70). In British, Semitic and Egyptian by contrast a construction with

embedded pronoun is used: e.g., MW (*GMW* 65-6) *y brenhin y kiglef... y glot a'e volyant* 'the king whose fame and praise I have heard' (lit. 'the king that I have heard his fame and his praise'), *y coedyd y foassant udunt* 'the woods that they fled into' (lit. '... into them'), *y llech yd oed yn seuyll arnei* 'the slab that he was standing on' (lit. '... on it'), Mid.Egypt. (Allen, 2000, 350-2) *ntr p' mnḥ wnnw snd.f ḥt ḥswt* 'that effective god, fear of whom is throughout foreign parts' (lit. '... that fear of him is throughout foreign parts'), *hnw ḥpr.n.k jm.f* 'the house that you grew up in' (lit. '... in it'). In Modern Irish (as opposed to Scots Gaelic) a construction of this type has largely replaced the Old Irish one discussed above: e.g., *an fear a bhfaca mé a mháthair* 'the man whose mother I saw' (lit. 'the man that I saw his mother'), *an fear a raibh mé ag caint leis* 'the man that I was speaking with' (lit. '...with him').

A couple of admittedly isolated Old Irish attestations (e.g., Sg. 26^{b7}, *ní:fail ní nád:taí mo dligeth-sa fair* 'there is nothing that my judgement does not impinge on', lit. '... on it') have prompted the following proposal regarding the age (cf. the above remarks on the earliest undifferentiated relative construction in Irish) and distribution of the two constructions in question: 'Breatnach's collection of such relatives in arguably archaic material in *Ériu* 31, 1-9, effectively demonstrates that at first the typically subject/object relative of Old Irish did duty for all case functions and there was no formally distinct prepositional relative construction. That being so, we may envisage two approaches to creating an unambiguous prepositional relative in the very late prehistory of Irish, one by shifting demonstrative *(s)a*, formally identical with the originally demonstrative Old Irish article (cf. Watkins, *Celtica* 6, 24-5) in a manner for which English, German and the Ionic dialects of ancient Greek offer good typological parallels, and the other by simply inserting the appropriate prepositional pronoun into the main clause as in the two examples just given. I suspect that this may be one of the few cases where variant usages in the Glosses probably have a base in different regional dialects, the preposition plus *-(s)a* type of apparently northern origins being rapidly absorbed into the literate register whereas the 'conjugated' preposition type of broadly southern origins was apparently confined to colloquial usage for centuries and only cropped up occasionally in the literature. The fact remains that this could happen as early as the eighth century' (McCone, 1985, 96-7).

It is thus very likely that the British and Irish relative constructions with embedded pronoun arose independently from each other and that a substrate language played no decisive role in either Ireland or Britain. It is to be stressed that the main possibilities for an uninflected relative marker in this context are quite limited, namely (1) no differentiation of case (as in Basque and probably Insular Celtic), (2) attachment to a preposition (as usually in early Irish and still in Scots Gaelic), (3) embedding of a preposition in the relative clause (as in spoken Modern English and Berber), (4)

embedding of a resumptive possessive or of a pronoun combined with a preposition in the relative clause (as in Welsh, Ancient Egyptian and Modern Irish as a rule). It is correspondingly difficult to exclude coincidental correspondences, and the various Insular Celtic constructions point to relatively late independent strategies aimed at resolving ambiguity rather than to the influence of an old substrate.

3.8. Instead of the uninflected infinitive used by many Indo-European languages every verb in an Insular Celtic language is typically associated with a verbal noun that is formed, inflected like and to a large extent used like a normal noun, governs a genitive object, may have an agent and fulfils certain characteristic syntactic functions (Schumacher, 2000, 13-31). The Insular Celtic verbal noun has been regarded as an archaism basically inherited from Proto-Indo-European (e.g. by Disterheft, 1980) but doubts have been raised (e.g. by Ziegler, 1997) and supporters of the substrate hypothesis prefer to see parallels in Ancient Egyptian, which has a highly developed verbal noun (often misleadingly termed an infinitive; Allen, 2000, 162-9). Thus Morris Jones (1900, 624-7) points to certain similar periphrastic constructions involving a verbal noun in Welsh and Egyptian, while Wagner (1959, 181) briefly discussed a ‘genitive-relative function of the verbal noun’ in Irish and Egyptian. Jeffers (1978) regards the (Insular) Celtic system of verbal nouns as an innovation (cf. Ziegler, 1997, 641-2) comparable with the Ancient Egyptian system but looks for an explanation in terms of general linguistic typology rather than substrate influence. ‘Consider the following hypothesis.....: At some point in the prehistory of Irish (or probably Celtic), nominal forms which were semantically, although not necessarily... morphologically related to those verbs were called upon to function in innovative syntactic contexts as a result of the elimination of several inherited syntactic patterns.... Once this tendency to attach specific nouns to specific verbs becomes established, productive patterns for the formation of verbal-nouns would develop.... The crucial question, however, still remains: why should such a massive restructuring affect the morphosyntactic system of a language like Irish? Consider, however, that the Celtic languages (at least the Insular Celtic languages) are the only IE languages to have undergone a typological shift toward Verb + Subject + Object (VSO) structure. Might it be possible that the expansion of nominal complementation is associated with the general shift to VSO structure?..... A perusal of descriptive grammars suggests that relationships of this kind might exist, and particularly in the case of VSO languages, there appears to be a clear proclivity toward the widespread use of nominal complement constructions of the type which characterise OIr. syntax..... Like Irish, Egyptian makes extravagant use in complement constructions of a nominal form, traditionally, but unfortunately termed an infinitive. The correspondence between Irish and Egyptian is remarkable..... While differences, of course, exist between the Ancient Egyptian infinitive and the Old Irish verbal-noun, they clearly represent grammatical categories whose functions are

essentially the same. This parallel structural feature, and the fact that both languages are VSO in structure may well be more than coincidental. Other VSO languages such as Squamish and Tahitian show complement structures of a strikingly similar type' (Jeffers, 1978, 8-9).

Notwithstanding Gagnepain's (1963) important study, further historically and typologically oriented syntactic research in this area is badly needed and here a brief discussion of a couple of relevant aspects must suffice. Meanwhile any claim that an Afro-Asiatic substrate must have contributed to the constitution and further development of the Insular Celtic verbal noun seems quite premature.

To begin with, verbal nouns are restricted neither to Insular Celtic and Afro-Asiatic languages nor indeed to VSO languages in general. For instance the basically SOV Basque and SVO Modern English both have verbal nouns with similar functions to those of their Insular Celtic and Ancient Egyptian counterparts. The genitive case is used for the object of the verbal noun in Northern Basque, whereas in Southern Basque use of the absolutive has been introduced (Trask, 1997, 244-5) in line with a trend towards the type of construction used with a finite verb that is also observable in spoken Modern Irish and Welsh. It is only to be expected that a verbal noun should express normal case relations. In a highly inflected language such as Basque case endings are naturally the chief means to this end (Zubiri, 1993, 210-14, and 2000, 543-54) but in languages with less or no inflection for case this role understandably tends to be performed by prepositions or the like (cf. Modern English *after/(up)on arriving he took off his shoes; before leaving he put them on again; these shoes are for walking in; he got blisters through/as a result of wearing tight shoes*).

Consequently it is hardly surprising that similar combinations of preposition and verbal noun should occur in Welsh, Irish and Egyptian. These in turn could readily provide a base for the creation of periphrastic constructions with the verb 'to be' (normally not overtly expressed in Ancient Egyptian) comparable to [Middle] English *he is [a/on] leaving* etc. (see Mittendorf and Poppe, 2000). The Basque verbal system, for instance, makes extensive use of periphrastic forms, including a progressive present of the type *idazten ari da* 'he is writing' ('infinitive', originally verbal noun plus locative *-n*, plus the auxiliary verbs *ari* 'engage in' and *da* 'is'; Trask, 1997, 215-6 and 237-8). Welsh employs *bot* 'to be' with *yn* (arguably 'in') and *(g)wedy* 'after', in order to express an ongoing and a completed action respectively (*GMW* 138), while Irish has a progressive construction consisting of the substantive verb and the preposition *oc* 'at' that was employed no more than optionally in Old Irish but has become compulsory in appropriate contexts in Modern Irish (*EIV* 22). Middle Egyptian makes use of *hr* 'on' (contemporaneity; more rarely *m* 'in') and *r* 'to'

(purpose) in the so-called ‘pseudoverbal’ construction (Allen, 2000, 165-6 and 175-81). These constructions do not appear to be unduly old in Welsh and especially in Irish, and the difference between the prepositions used in each speaks against Insular Celtic antiquity. The development of further constructions of this kind involving Modern Irish *tar éis* ‘after’ (perfect; Ó Dochartaigh, 1992, 46-7) and Modern Welsh *am* ‘about, for’ (purpose; King, 1993, 272) is demonstrably late and shows how easily such parallel phenomena could arise independently. Morris Jones’ assumption of substrate influence in this case is thus unconvincing.

The British languages make frequent use of a periphrastic construction entailing a verbal noun as object (or passive subject) of the verb ‘do, make’: e.g., *kyuodi a oruc a dyuot y Lynn Cuch* (Thomson, 1957, 1.8) ‘he arose and came to L.C.’, literally ‘arising (that) he did and coming to L.C.’. Morris Jones (1900, 627) draws attention to a similar periphrasis in Ancient Egyptian, but coincidence can hardly be ruled out in view of the attestation of ‘do, make’ as a semantically ‘empty’ auxiliary in other languages too (e.g., Mod. Eng. interrogative *do you like it?* or emphatic *I really do like it*, and Basque emphatic *joan egin da* ‘he has (done) gone’ with *egin* ‘done’). Although *immram moro do:génset* ‘a voyaging of the sea (that) they made’ (cf. *ro:ráiset in muir* ‘they voyaged on the sea’ in a later version; *EC* 197-8) is a possible Old Irish example, this construction is quite marginal in Irish (Ó Dochartaigh, 1992, 57-8) and so almost certainly does not go back as far as Insular Celtic. In Manx, by contrast, it has become quite frequent (Thomson, 1992, 104-5 and 116), thus demonstrating the ease with which a periphrasis consisting of ‘do, make’ plus verbal noun can come into being without obvious external influence.

Old Irish does, of course, have a periphrastic construction with verbal noun as object (or passive subject), namely the so-called ‘*figura etymologica*’ consisting of a verb plus its own verbal noun, (*GOI* 317; McCone, 1980, 23): e.g., *ní legend ro:llegus-(s)a la Petor acht is cúrsagad ro-nd:cúrsagus-(s)a* (Wb 19a6) ‘I have not instructed Peter but have reprimanded him’, literally ‘it is not a reading that I have read Peter, but a reprimanding that I have reprimanded him (with)’. A similar construction is found in Semitic and also as an archaism in Middle Egyptian: ‘Egyptian has a special construction in which a verbal noun is used as an adverbial complement after another form of the same verb: for example, ... *wbn.k wbnt hpr.k hprt* “you rise rising, you evolve evolving”’ (Allen, 2000, 171). Although it seems not to have figured in the substrate debate so far, this correspondence is rather more striking than the one involving periphrasis with ‘do, make’. That said, in both instances it is a case of a thoroughly natural expansion geared to emphasis of the verbal expression (see VII.5.5). Here too, then, coincidence can hardly be excluded, particularly when Basque also makes limited use of a comparable repetition in order to topicalise an

otherwise synthetic verbal form: e.g., *trena joan doa ala etorri dator?* ‘is the train going or coming?’, literally ‘is the train going (a) going or coming (a) coming?’, *jakin badakit* ‘I know (knowing)’ (Zubiri, 2000, 632).

If the Insular Celtic verbal noun is essentially inherited from Proto-Indo-European, it will also have existed in Proto-Celtic. If, on the other hand, it is an innovation, it may first have arisen in Insular Celtic itself. Had Celtiberian possessed a verbal noun, three complements to *litom* ‘(is) allowed’ (**nekue to [u]ertaunei litom, nekue taunei litom, necue masnai tizaunei litom**; Bot. I a 2) might be expected to have stood in the nominative rather than the dative. Meid (1993, 118, 121 and 125) describes each of them as a ‘Verbalnomen im Dativ’ but an analysis as infinitives seems preferable. On the other hand, Gaulish *molatus* (OIr. *molad*, MW *molawt* ‘praise, praising’ < **molā-tu-s*; Schumacher, 2000, 80-82) is certainly not an infinitive. This form would have to be taken as a verbal noun, if the dative/instrumental plural *mesamobi* ‘the worst (ones)’ functioned as agent, but the alternative interpretation ‘praise for the worst (ones)’ would imply no more than an ordinary abstract noun (Schumacher, 2000, 78). The evidence currently available can be accounted for in either one of two fundamentally different ways. If the Celtiberian infinitive were an innovation or an at least partially hived off part of a fully inflected paradigm, the category verbal noun would be at least as old as Proto-Celtic. If, however, Celtiberian had a true infinitive comparable to certain similar formations in Ancient Greek and Old Indic (e.g., Meid, 1993, 118-9), then there would be a distinct possibility that the verbal noun (like the uninflected relative particle *-*yo* to be discussed in chapter VI below) was first fully developed in Insular Celtic (Ziegler, 1997, 642-3) or Gallo-Insular Celtic. In the event of a node shared with Gaulish being involved, influence from a substrate language related to Basque would be thinkable, although its very morphological homogeneity can reasonably be taken as an indication that the Basque verbal noun is not particularly old (Trask, 1997, 215).

The foregoing consideration of a number of arguably relevant phenomena leads to the conclusion that there is no compelling reason for positing an Afro-Asiatic substrate that exercised powerful syntactic pressure on the Insular Celtic languages. If there were convincing extra-linguistic support for the claim that an Afro-Asiatic linguistic stratum once existed in the British Isles, one might have some justification for ascribing some of the above mentioned aspects of Insular Celtic syntax to influence from such a quarter. Since this has so far not emerged, it is a question of whether the correspondences cited above and elsewhere are sufficiently circumstantial, numerous and historically plausible to render the hypothesis of an Afro-Asiatic trigger at least probable. In the present writer’s opinion they fall well short of this goal.

3.9. Morris Jones (1900, 616) prefaces to his contribution a quotation from Schrader to the effect that ‘the notion of a ‘mixed language’ must have much more weight assigned to it than has heretofore been allowed’ and his hypothesis clearly does imply that the Insular Celtic languages are, in effect, mixed languages combining a phonology and morphology largely evolved internally from an inherited base with a syntax largely borrowed from outside. Apart from the special case of pidgin and Creole languages, which are not at issue here, ‘mixed’ languages in the sense of languages that have taken a particular part or particular parts of their grammar and/or lexicon over almost entirely from another language seem to be something of a rarity. For instance, Thomason and Kaufman (1988, 223) state of Ma’a ‘that its mostly Cushitic basic vocabulary is combined with a grammar so heavily bantuized that only a very few systematic, productive Cushitic grammatical features remain in the language’, while ‘the most striking thing about Michif structure is the split between its nominal and verbal systems: almost all nouns and most adjectives in the language, together with some of their morphology and syntax, are French in origin; but almost all verbs, with their morphology and syntax, are derived from Plains Cree’ (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988, 229) and in Mednyj Aleut ‘noun morphology and most other grammatical subsystems remained intact, but the elaborate Aleut inflectional patterns in finite verbs were replaced by Russian ones’ (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988, 234). To give a further example, the so-called ‘Media Lingua’ spoken by a small community in Ecuador is ‘essentially the product of replacing the phonological shapes of Quechua stems with Spanish forms, maintaining the rest of the Quechua structure’ (Bakker and Muyksen, 1994, 44).

It seems legitimate to ask whether there are examples of such mixing being confined to the level of syntax. ‘Ireland offers the opportunity to study how a people gradually gives up or is obliged to give up its language in favour of a second language introduced into the land by a ruling class of conquerors and propagated by force while at the same time holding on to the inner form (phonetic structure, syntax and idiom) of the basically abandoned language’ according to Wagner (1959, 112-3; cf. the more general discussion of the effects of language shift in Bechert and Wildgen, 1991, 97-8), who invokes Henry’s (1957) study of a Hiberno-English dialect in support of his theory of substrate influence. However, Greene (1966, 125) points out that syntactic influence from an Irish substrate in this case is appreciably less extensive than that posited by Wagner and others in the case of an alleged Afro-Asiatic substrate to Insular Celtic: ‘Linguists have always held widely varying opinions as to the amount of influence the so-called ‘substratum’ may have..... Celtic scholars are all too well equipped to study the problems of the substratum at first hand, and the recent work of Henry gives us a clear picture of what happened in one district of Ireland. The sounds of the substratum language are taken over, but not its phonological system, e.g. the

palatalised and non-palatalised consonants of Irish occur in the Anglo-Irish dialect, but they no longer play a morphological role. The morphology is that of English, with occasional innovations like *bees*, *does be*, corresponding to Irish *bíonn*. The syntax is influenced by Irish, but not to such an extent that the verb stands at the head of the its sentence; the vocabulary is almost completely English. There is no useful sense in which we could call this dialect ‘anglicised Irish’ but, on the other hand, it has innumerable features which are not inherited from English and which are readily explicable from Irish’ (cf. Thomason and Kaufman, 1988, 132).

Even if the theoretical possibility of purely syntactic influence is conceded, it remains very doubtful from a methodological standpoint whether syntactic factors alone can suffice in order to demonstrate substrate influence or to identify the nature of an otherwise unknown substrate language, given that it is generally more difficult to exclude coincidence on statistical grounds in the more abstract realm of syntax than in the more concrete areas of phonology, morphology and the lexicon. Accordingly a demonstration that Insular Celtic contained at least some probable Afro-Asiatic loanwords might reasonably be regarded as a prerequisite for substantiation of the substrate hypothesis in question, but so far nothing remotely convincing along these lines is on offer. For instance, one of the few concrete proposals made in this area, Adams’ (1956, 15-16) connection of the *tul-* element of Irish *tulach* (*telach* etc.) ‘hillock, mound’ with Sardinian *tulio* of alleged substrate origins and then further with Semitic *tel* ‘mound’, is based on the essential identity of just two consonants and so might easily be due to mere coincidence, even if *tulach* etc. were not manifestly a derivative of the more semantically remote OIr. *tul* (*tel* etc.) ‘protuberance, boss, forehead’. Admittedly, models of language shift producing substrate effects upon areas other than the lexicon are available (see the penultimate paragraph of 3.2 above) and anyway the historical reconstruction of Proto-Afro-Asiatic (as opposed to Proto-Semitic) is insufficiently advanced (Huehnergard, 2004,) for scientific Afro-Asiatic-Celtic etymologies to be feasible in the present state of knowledge. That said, an appreciable portion of Insular Celtic vocabulary lacks obvious Indo-European antecedents and seems likely to be derived at least in part from one or more pre-Celtic substrates. That being so, one might expect some of this to prove amenable to plausible (if inevitably less than scientific) comparison with, say, Berber or Ancient Egyptian lexemes, if an Afro-Asiatic substrate really had affected Insular Celtic significantly. Meanwhile an impartial assessment of the apparently non-Indo-European component of Insular Celtic vocabulary remains an obvious desideratum (notwithstanding valuable studies of particular small segments thereof such as those by Hamp, 1987, and Schrijver, 1997b), especially where precise or ‘near miss’ correspondences between Irish and British are concerned.

In the final analysis, certain Insular Celtic deviations from syntactic norms regarded as typically Indo-European lead to the postulation of an insular substrate language characterised by precisely these (from an Indo-European perspective) idiosyncratic features, and this alleged substrate is then invoked in order to explain their occurrence in Insular Celtic. This is patently a vicious circle. It can only be avoided by starting from various characteristics of Proto-Indo-European that can be reconstructed securely or at least with a fair degree of probability and by making due allowance for typological drift as well as for the almost certainly coincidental or typologically conditioned existence of similar phenomena elsewhere. At the end of the day, it is not known what language or languages existed in the pre-Celtic British Isles or how far it/they may have affected subsequently imported Celtic speech (cf. Eska, 1994, 33-5). Neither vocabulary nor morphology offer remotely substantial support for the presence of an Afro-Asiatic substrate there and, that being so, it seems sensible to seek other typologically and/or historically plausible explanations for a number of admittedly fairly striking syntactic similarities between the Insular Celtic and certain Afro-Asiatic languages.

CHAPTER TWO

**The Verb and its Satellites in Proto-Indo-European,
the Rise of VSO Patterns in Insular Celtic
and the Supposed Development of a Near-general Particle in Main Clauses**

1.1. In his pioneering work on word order in Old Indic prose Delbrück formulated the basic rules as follows: ‘Das Subjekt beginnt den Satz, das Verbum schliesst ihn, der Dativ, Akkusativ usw. werden in die Mitte genommen, jedoch so, dass der Akkusativ unmittelbar vor dem Verbum steht’ (1878, 13). A decade later he stated essentially the same view of what he termed ‘traditional’ word order in this material as the set of seven rules translated into English below, and now claimed that these had applied to Proto-Indo-European itself (Delbrück, 1888, 15-6).

- (a) The subject opens the sentence.
- (b) The verb closes the sentence.
- (c) The other parts of the sentence are placed in the middle.
- (d) An apposition follows its head word.
- (e) An attributive genitive and adjective precede their substantive.
- (f) A preposition precedes its verb but follows its case.
- (g) When they do not stand in a necessary connection with a specific part of the sentence, enclitic words tend to attach themselves to the initial element of the sentence.

Rules a-c and e-f would make the parent language consistently SOV in terms of Greenberg’s (1963) typological correlates and thus the diametric opposite of the Celtic language with the oldest adequate documentation, namely Old Irish. In terms of the same correlates, the latter’s word order (I.1-9) was that of a consistent right-branching VSO language, whereas its Proto-Indo-European ancestor arguably had a similarly strong preference for left-branching SOV sequences. If so, the obvious question is why and when such a far-reaching inversion of basic patterns took place, given that substratal explanations of this apparent inversion have already been called into question (I.3.5).

1.2. Delbrück, of course, also recognised the existence in Old Indic prose of ‘occasional’ or marked variants of the ‘traditional’ or unmarked order. These entailed emphatic sentence- or clause-initial position for a constituent normally placed further back. As he himself put it, ‘diese traditionelle Wortstellung wird durchkreuzt von der occasionellen Wortstellung’, the rule being ‘jeder Satzteil, der dem Sinne nach stärker betont sein soll, rückt nach vorn’ (1878, 13). Later he explicitly stated that this rule too

had applied to PIE (Delbrück, 1888, 16).

Delbrück (1888, 23) further noted that the two main positions for the negative in Old Indic prose were directly before the verb or at the head of the sentence. According to his more precise formulation of rule f above a preposition or, in modern parlance, preverb was normally placed directly before the verb it modified but was liable to be shifted on its own to the head of the sentence in ‘occasional’ order for the purpose of topicalising or focussing the verbal expression, thus occupying the position typically taken by the verb itself if unaccompanied by a preverb: ‘meist steht die Praeposition unmittelbar vor dem Verbum, häufig treten aber auch einzelne oder mehrere Wörter dazwischen... Die Praeposition nimmt in diesen Fällen diejenige Stelle ein, welche, wenn das Verbum einfach wäre, diese selbst einnehmen würde. So steht der Wendung *jīvati sá* parallel die Wendung *prá sá mīyate* (TS 2,2,2,4)... Es kann aber auch ein Verbum samt Praeposition occasionell vorgeschoben werden, z.B. *ví bhajante ha vā imām asurāh pṛthivīm* es vertheilen die Asuras diese Erde ÇB 1,2,5,3’ (1888, 45).

By focussing our attention upon the verb and its satellites of negative and preverb plus any enclitics that may be present we arrive, following Delbrück, at the symmetrical set of Old Indic and arguably Proto-Indo-European patterns in the first two columns of the table below. In his monumental *Vergleichende Syntax* Delbrück took the regularly clause-initial Old Irish verbal complex schematised in the third column to be an Insular Celtic innovation on the strength of non-initial position of the verb in Gaulish. He suggested that this hitherto occasional position had become generalised through an increasing tendency to topicalise the verbal expression in narrative: ‘Somit zeigt das Altgallische etwa die Wortstellung wie das Germanische (denn daß kein Beispiel für Anfangsstellung des Verbums vorliegt, mag wohl auf Zufall beruhen). Wir dürfen für das Vorkeltische ähnliche Zustände voraussetzen, und es ist anzunehmen, daß diese durchgängige Voranstellung des Verbums sich erst im Inselkeltischen entwickelt hat, und zwar offenbar aus der Gewohnheit, durch das Verbum in der Erzählung den Anschluß an das Vorhergehende zu suchen, etwa wie wir es im Nordischen gefunden haben’ (Delbrück, 1900, 74). Calvert Watkins (1963, 31-41) similarly observed that the standard Old Irish patterns in the third column could be straightforwardly equated with those in the central column by positing generalisation of the subtypes in the second column at the expense of what had hitherto been the normal patterns in the first (1963, 4-6) and, in the case of d and f, added the crucial refinement of an intervening leftwards ‘univerbation’ of elements previously separated in tmesis (cf. the third Old Indic example with #PVE....# at the end of the previous paragraph).

(V = verb, E = enclitic, P = preverb, N = negative)		
OInd/PIE I	OInd/PIE II	OIr.
('traditional'/unmarked)	('occasional'/marked as topic/focus)	(unmarked)
(a) #.(E)...V#	(b) #V(E)...#	(b ²) #V(E)...#
(c) #.(E)...PV#	(d) #P(E)...V#	(d ²) #P(E)V...#
(e) #.(E)...N(P)V#	(f) #N(E)...(P)V#	(f ²) #N(E)PV...#

In a recent discussion of these issues Krisch (2002) has argued that up to two topics (topic here being, in effect, Delbrück's fronted 'Satzteil, der dem Sinne nach stärker betont sein soll' above) could be placed at the head of the sentence, enclitics (1.4 below) being regularly placed after the sentence-initial first topic in such cases. Consequently topicalised V, P or N can also occur in second position after the first topic plus any enclitics (schematically #T₁(E)V...# etc.) and Krisch even entertains the possibility of expanding this scheme to allow for the fronting of a verb to third place after two topics (schematically #T₁(E)T₂V...# etc.).

1.3. Two issues must be confronted before attempting to identify the processes responsible for the transformation of assumed Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Celtic patterns into those observed in the ancient or medieval stages of various actually attested Celtic languages. Firstly, how secure is Delbrück's reconstruction of the PIE patterns and, secondly, can these be shown to have survived without significant alteration in Proto-Celtic?

Like many another scholar before and since, Delbrück tacitly assumed that, in the absence of compelling grounds to the contrary, primacy in reconstruction should be accorded to evidence from the early stages of Sanskrit. A further explicit premiss was that prose was a better guide to basic word-order patterns than verse: 'Das Altindische hat ebenso wie die anderen idg. Sprachen einen traditionellen Wortstellungs-Typus, welcher naturgemäss am besten in der ruhigen Darstellung der Prosa erkannt werden kann, weshalb auch denn in der folgenden Schilderung auf die Poesie ebensowenig Rücksicht genommen werden soll, wie dies SF 3 geschehen ist' (1888, 15). Since neither contention is self-evidently true, it is not surprising that some of his views on PIE word order were and continue to be disputed. Contemporaries such as Braune (1894) and Zimmer (1893), for instance, took the view that the ordering of major constituents in the PIE sentence had been characterised by a finely nuanced flexibility more akin to what is observed in Ancient Greek than to the relatively rigid patterns found in early Sanskrit prose. As Meillet put it, 'aucun mot n'avait dans la phrase indo-européenne une place définie et constante... C'est le grec qui garde le mieux l'usage indo-européen de mettre d'abord le mot principal' (1934/7, 365). On this view

the only ordering rule for independent words (as opposed to enclitics; see 1.4 below) was one entailing topicalisation or focus by fronting to the head of the sentence from a position somewhere further back.

The present writer's doctoral thesis (McCone, 1979) was inclined to follow Delbrück and ascribe certain divergences in the Rig Veda from the norms of Old Indic prose to an artificiality born chiefly of metrical expediency. However, in a more recent dissertation Hale (1987) has taken the alternative view that the Vedic and Gāthic Avestan poems essentially reflect an earlier Indo-Iranian, Old Indic and Old Iranian stage characterised by significantly more flexible word-order patterns than the chronologically posterior oldest extant prose in both branches. In cases where poetry and prose are both documented at more or less the same date, prose will generally be considered the better guide to normal contemporary speech and divergent patterns in verse put down to metrical and stylistic constraints or conventions. The crux for the historical linguist is then whether such deviations reflect genuine archaisms or are merely artificial creations. Unfortunately, this may prove difficult or impossible to determine in any given instance, as we shall see below (2.1) with reference to so-called 'archaic' Old Irish metrical material. Where, as often happens, the verse record is significantly older than its prose counterpart, the situation is still more complicated because syntactic discrepancies between the two can obviously be due to changes in the intervening period rather than to a difference of genre.

Delbrück's hypothesis leaves us free to compare the relatively clear-cut word-order patterns of Old Indic prose with similar ones in Hittite, Latin etc. and ascribe these to the protolanguage, as Watkins (1963) did to good effect. However, if Hale is right to derive these from a more subtly nuanced Vedic and Indo-Iranian system in which topicalisation strategies were to the fore, independent convergence would be involved here and the flexible ordering of constituents in Ancient Greek become a more valid comparandum for purposes of reconstruction. A third possibility can also be envisaged for the Vedic, Indo-Iranian and Proto-Indo-European periods, namely the coexistence of two or more registers of speech, one for normal and the other(s) for formal or poetic discourse, where metrical boundaries may function like and compete with syntactic boundaries (see, for instance, Watkins, 2002, 319-321). The former would have combined a basic SOV order with straightforward topicalisation by fronting, while the latter would have been characterised by greater mobility of constituents in line with a more finely tuned topic and focus orientation.

The statistics in the table below, compiled from a random selection of passages in the *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa*, the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* and the *Rig-Veda* (McCone, 1979, 207-8; henceforth *JB*, *ŚB* and *RV*), will give some idea of the degree of divergence

between Old Indic prose and poetry as regards basic word-order patterns. The vertical columns cover the following patterns: (i) final simple verb (#.(E)...V#), (ii) initial simple verb (#V(E)...#), (iii) preverb(s) directly preceding final verb (#.(E)...P(P₂)V#), (iv) preverb at head of sentence and verb (plus additional preverb(s), if present) at end (#P(E)...(P₂)V#), (v) preverb(s) and verb at head of sentence (#P(P₂)V(E)...# before, #PE(P₂)V...# after stroke), (vi) negative directly before final verb plus preverb(s), if present (#.(E)...N(P)V#), (vii) negative at head of sentence and verb (plus preverb(s), if present) at end (#N(E)...(P)V#), (viii) medial verb (#.(E)(...)V...#), sometimes accompanied by negative and/or preverb, (ix) negative (*JB*, *ŚB*, *RV*) or preverb (*RV* only) in positions other than those specified in (iii-vii).

	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix
JB	1238	73	670	60	10/-	65	39	134	6
ŚB	1054	39	660	26	13/-	57	45	97	11
RV	299	89	100	64	22/10	9	19	434	56

1.4. We may now turn briefly to enclitics. Wackernagel (1892) produced an impressive array of comparative evidence for Delbrück's contention (1.1g above) that in the parent language enclitic sentence connectives or particles and pronouns (in that order; Delbrück, 1900, 51-2, and Krisch, 1997, 284-292) had been mechanically attached to the accented initial element in the sentence. This rule, which was recognised even by advocates of largely 'free' PIE word order such as Meillet and is reflected in the patterns above, became known as Wackernagel's Law.

In line with his earlier argument (Wackernagel, 1877) for the PIE antiquity of the Old Indic contrast between unaccented non-initial finite verb in a main clause and its accented counterpart in a subordinate clause, Wackernagel went on to speculate that an unaccented PIE verb had occupied second position in the main clause in accordance with his law governing the placement of enclitics but remained in final position when accented in a subordinate clause. Wackernagel regarded this dichotomy as ultimately responsible for the different positions of the verb in Modern German main and subordinate clauses. Since, however, he was troubled by the lack of evidence for it outside Germanic, he wondered whether enclitic words of three or more syllables and hence many unaccented verbal forms might have been immune to his placement rule.

It does not follow from their probable non-accentuation that even mono- or di-syllabic non-initial verbs in PIE main clauses would have conformed to Wackernagel's position. In Meillet's words, 'les enclitiques sont atones; mais tous les mots atones ne

sont pas enclitiques’ (1934, 369). After all, all finite verbs in main clauses can easily be exempted by the straightforward postulate that their loss of accent in the parent language postdated the working of Wackernagel’s Law. Even the Germanic evidence is suspect, since studies such as Fourquet’s (1938) indicate that the differences in word order between main and subordinate clauses become increasingly blurred there the further back one goes. There is, then, no good empirical evidence for the conformity of even a significant minority of main-clause verbs to Wackernagel’s Law.

On the other hand, its central tenet received dramatic confirmation a little over two decades after its promulgation. This came from Hittite with its rigid placement of enclitic strings after the first word in the sentence. Equally striking was, in Watkins’ (1977, 439) words, ‘the confirmation by Hittite of virtually every assertion about word order patterns made by Berthold Delbrück’. This is apparent in a sample of over 3,700 sentences compiled from a chronologically and thematically diverse selection of Hittite texts (McCone, 1979, 80). In almost 97% of these the verb was final, while in almost 87% of 350 sentences containing a negative this (sometimes plus an indefinite, *namma*, *imma* or *manqa*) directly preceded the verb (McCone, 1979, 108-11).

There were, however, some notable discrepancies. Marked initial verbs and preverbs were at best extremely rare and the basic unmarked order of these constituents plus negative was **PNV** as in *na-at* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* ZI-ni **pa-ra-a UL** *ar-nu-ut-te-ni* ‘and you do not bring it to the gods themselves’ (*ITO* 1, 51) rather than the sequence **NPV** normal in Old Indic and other Indo-European languages. On the other hand, limited use of marked initial negatives for contrastive purposes was found in a few examples like *nu nam-ma* ^d*Hé-pa-du-uš* [DINGIR.M]EŠ *ḫa-lu-ga-an* **Ú-UL** *iš-ta-m[a-aš-ta]* **Ú-UL-ma** ^d*U-an* ^d*Šu-wa-li-ya-at-[t]a-an-na* IGI.ḪIA-*it a-uš-[ta]* ‘then Hapat did not hear the news of the gods and, indeed, she did not see the Storm-god and Suwalyattas with her eyes’ (*Ulli*. III i 23’-4’). A dative-locative, ablative and above all an Old Hittite ‘terminative’ (Starke, 1977, 172-7) may also be placed between preverb and verb as in *ša-aš* **ša-ra-a** URU-*ya pa-it* ‘he went up to the city’ (*Zal*. rev.B 17’), [*na*]-*an* EGIR-**pa** *iš-ḫi-iš-ši pi-an-zi* ‘and they give it back to its owner’ (*Laws* I §99, 57 etc.). Hittite, then, seems to reflect a phase of development where semantic univerbation of preverb and verb was less advanced than in the rest of Indogermania (see Boley, 2004, 15-23 for more Old Hittite examples). At that stage the possibility of shifting the verb or one of its satellites for marking as topic was still no more than embryonic, Boley (2004, 15) remarking that ‘in very Late Hittite univerbation is just in its infancy’. Given the distinct possibility on phonological and especially morphological grounds that Anatolian was the first branch to split off from the parent stock (e.g. Cowgill, 1975b and 1979, Lehrman, A., 1996 and 2001; but see Jasanoff, 2003, 1-29), it seems

reasonable to ascribe these features to an earlier Proto-Indo-European phase sometimes termed '(Proto-)Indo-Hittite' (Lehrman, 2001, 107 claiming that 'what I find in 2000 is that many scholars have accepted the Indo-Hittite theory in some form'). According to this scenario the verb and its satellites will not yet have undergone the closer semantic bonding between preverb and verb that resulted in the introduction of a somewhat different and more rigidly regulated positional hierarchy in the later (but not necessarily very much later, at least as far as these particular features are concerned) Proto-Indo-European from which the other attested groups can be derived.

Greenberg's (1963; see 1.1 above and I.3.5) often tentative typological correlates have been pressed into service by Lehmann in a series of articles that culminated in a book (1974) claiming quite rigid OV and associated patterns for Proto-Indo-European on the basis of highly selective and quite inadequate empirical evidence. This approach has been criticised by Watkins (1977, 438) on the eminently justified grounds that it 'elevates some of Greenberg's extremely interesting quasi-universals to the dubious status of an intellectual straitjacket, into which the facts of various Indo-European languages must be fitted willy-nilly, rightly or wrongly'. Using greater methodological refinement but even less firm evidence, Friedrich (1975) issued a counter-argument for a so-called 'trichotomization of PIE' between a basically SVO central stock epitomised by (Homeric) Greek that was 'perhaps the least subject to substratum and similar influence' (1975, 65), an SOV and a VSO type, the emergence of which could be assumed to be largely due to such influence. Friedrich's claim that Greek and Armenian provide good evidence for basic SVO order in PIE has been called into serious question by Watkins (1977, 444-50). The latter also takes issue with Lehmann regarding 'what I consider a serious misunderstanding of the nature of markedness. He equates *unmarked* with *normal* (p. 21) and *marked* with *nonnormal*, for which the unsuspecting reader can too easily read *abnormal*. But when we state that in English the "progressive" past tense *was going* is marked via à vis the unmarked *went*....., we are stating simply that... the marked member of the opposition conveys more semantic information. The marked member of the opposition specifies the presence of a particular semantic grammatical feature which the unmarked member says nothing about. But both members of the opposition... are equally *normal*. In the same way Indo-Iranian, Anatolian, Italic and numerous other branches of IE have an opposition between unmarked final position of the verb and marked initial position of the verb, in the indicative. Both manifestations are *normal* by the same token, in each tradition; they are simply semantically different. The facts are such, and the comparative method is such, that both word order patterns, marked verb-initial and unmarked verb-final, must be reconstructed for the Proto-language, Indo-European itself. That is to say that much of the typological debate about Indo-European as OV versus VO is purely and simply a pseudo-problem' (1977, 452-3).

It must be admitted that the case for basically SOV word order in Proto-Indo-European may be weakened somewhat by considerations of areal typology. Wagner (1985, 17), for instance, claims that a preference for final position of the finite verb characterises only those Indo-European languages where this might be expected on geographical grounds, ascribing verb-final structures in the early attested Semitic language, Akkadian, to the effects of Sumerian (cf. Huehnergard, 2004, 154: ‘Proto-Semitic was probably a VSO.. language. This is true of the earliest forms of most West Semitic languages... The normal SOV order of Akkadian is undoubtedly due to Sumerian influence’) and their prevalence in Hittite to imitation of Akkadian and Sumerian patterns (to which might be added that of the similarly SOV Hurrian closer to home; see Wilhelm, 2004, 95-6 and 116): ‘Ganz allgemein betrachtet ist es auffällig, dass der stereotype Satzbau des Hethitischen, mit seiner Endstellung des finiten Verbums, an die Satzstruktur des Akkadischen und Sumerischen erinnert. Dabei ist ziemlich sicher, dass nicht nur die Endstellung des akkadischen, sondern auch diejenige des hethitischen Verbums auf einer, vom Standpunkte der verwandten semitischen bzw. indogermanischen Sprachen aus gesehen sekundären Entwicklung beruht. Wenn man auch immer wieder dem uridg. Verbum Endstellung unterschreibt (cf. K. H. Schmidt, *KZ* 94, 188), so ist diese doch nur in denjenigen idg. Sprachen entwickelt, in denen man sie aus geographischen Gründen erwartet.... Im Ursemitischen Endstellung des Verbums anzunehmen, ist, sofern mir bekannt ist, noch niemandem eingefallen. Die Wortstellung des Hethitischen steht, wie diejenige des Akkadischen, im Banne von Typus 3 der Greenbergschen Wortstellungstypenlehre, d.h. des “unterordnenden” Sprachtypus im Sinne von Fincks Sprachtypologie’. A similar point is made more circumspectly by Thomason and Kaufman (1988, 208-9): ‘Participants in the ongoing controversy about the dominant word order pattern of Proto-Indo-European, for instance, often ignore the fact that some of the ancient SOV languages - notably Hittite, Old Persian, and Sanskrit - were spoken in the vicinity of non-IE SOV languages, some of which may well have exerted structural influence on their IE neighbours (e.g., Sumerian and/or Akkadian on Hittite, Dravidian on Sanskrit) before the earliest period of IE attestations. This means that evidence from SOV IE languages that were not demonstrably in contact with non-IE SOV languages should carry more weight in the comparative reconstruction; Celtiberian might be such a case’.

It may well be that the particular rigidity of verb-final SOV in Hittite prose owes at least something to sub- and/or adstrate pressures. Dravidian sub- and adstrates may likewise have contributed to the dominance of SOV patterns in Old Indic prose, although it must be emphasised that the latter operate within an almost certainly inherited system whereby the verb itself or a part of the verbal expression could be marked as topic by shifting to the head of the sentence. The frequency of verb-final

SOV in Italic cannot be discounted so easily and the case of Celtiberian (see 2.2 below) is also potentially significant, as Thomason and Kaufman recognise. Moreover, SOV patterns are by no means unattested in early Greek, Armenian etc., as demonstrated by Watkins (e.g. 1963 and 1977, *passim*). The latter has recently made the following proposition regarding the position of the verb in Pindar, ‘in many ways the most Indo-European of Greek poets’ by virtue of practising ‘the archaic genre of praise poetry’ (Watkins, 2002, 319): ‘When we factor in the equivalence of sentence or clause boundary and period or colon boundary we find a single rule that describes the position of the Verb in Pindar, including the finite verb, the participle, and the infinitive, which are all subject to this rule. The rule is very simple: *Verb forms must adjoin a syntactic or a metrical boundary, or be separated from that boundary by only a single constituent*. Where the boundary follows the verb form, V is thus either final or pre-final; where the boundary precedes the verb form, V is thus initial or post-initial. It is convenient to speak of right-adjointing (symbols R, R-1) and left-adjointing (symbols L, L-1). It is clear that R-adjunction and L-adjunction are the equivalents of Verb-final and Verb-initial respectively, the familiar Indo-European patterns: the first is more frequent and thus unmarked, the second less frequent and thus marked. Pindar shows a relatively high degree of initial focus or topicalization, particularly of finite verbs: the general ratio of R/R-1 to L/L-1 is of the order of 5:3. By far the commonest source of R-1 or L-1 placement is the *straddling* by an NP of an underlying R or L verb respectively, or the *movement* of a constituent to otherwise displace an underlying R or L verb’ (Watkins, 2002, 322).

The essential point is that undue insistence upon basic verb-final SOV (or, for that matter, verb-medial SVO) word order in PIE is questionable and it may be more profitable to focus upon the basic position of the verb and its various satellites (notably preverbs, the negative and enclitics) in relation to each other as well as upon pragmatically conditioned (by the initial topic/focus rule in 1.5 below) changes in that position.

1.5. To summarise the state of play so far, a considerable body of comparative evidence seems to have produced general scholarly agreement on two rules of PIE word order: (a) sentence-initial position was marked for topic/focus and (b) sentence enclitics were attached to the first word in the sentence in accordance with Wackernagel’s Law. Hale (1987, 70-165; 1987b) has presented evidence from the Rig Veda above all for certain refinements to the latter, arguing that it applied rigidly only to clitic sentence connectives in PIE and that sentential clitics such as pronouns originally remained within their noun or verb phrase, although they may well have been tending to gravitate towards the head of the clause or sentence as a whole by late PIE. Since the only secure Celtic reflexes of PIE enclitic pronouns so far are in Old

Irish and Medieval British, where they typically occupy second position in a clause-initial verb phrase, Celtic cannot as yet contribute to a decision on this question. At present it seems safest to describe the placement of enclitics in line with the hitherto familiar version of Wackernagel's Law.

1.6. In a section of his study entitled 'es wird dem fertigen Satz ein neues Wort oder neue Wörter nachgeschoben', Delbrück (1878, 54-5) had already introduced an element of further flexibility into his Old Indic model by pointing out that various appositions, attributes, coordinated elements and datives not essential to the grammatical structure of a sentence could be optionally placed after an otherwise final verb in Old Indic. He was not explicit about the existence of such constructions in the parent language, although his expressed doubt about the PIE antiquity of postverbal appositions might be taken to imply some hesitancy about recognising other types as well (Delbrück, 1900, 61-5). Evidence for what he termed 'amplified sentences and similar structures in the Veda' was presented by Gonda (1959), who concluded by arguing for the phenomenon's Proto-Indo-European antiquity on the strength of evidence from other Indo-European languages, particularly Old Persian and Ancient Greek. Typical enough examples are Hitt. Û 4 SAG.DU *pa-a-i* LÚ-na-ku SAL-na-ku 'and he gives four persons, man or woman' (*Laws* I §1,2), Skt. *agním ĩle puróhitam* 'I magnify Agni, the domestic priest' (*RV* 1,1,1), *ródasī hí Marútas cakriré vṛdhé* 'for the Maruts have made the two worlds for increase' (*RV* 1,85,1) and Lat. *Bituriges ad eum legatos mittunt auxilium petitum contra Carnutes* 'the Bituriges send emissaries to him to seek help against the Carnutes' (Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 8,4,2). Use of a proleptic accusative pronoun can render even an otherwise grammatically indispensable direct object appositional and hence capable of becoming a postverbal 'amplification', as in Hitt. EGIR-*pa-at* *he-e-eš-ten* an-na-al-la at-ta-al-la *ḫu-u-ḫa-da-al-la* ^{na4}KIŠIB.ḪI.A 'reopen them, the ancient fatherly, grandfatherly storehouses' (*Ulli.* III iii 50-1) or Skt. *tam eva táb^hir āhutib^hiḥ śamayitvorjaṃ lokānāṃ jayati yamaṃ devam* 'having appeased him, the god Yama, with these libations, he wins the power of the worlds' (*JB* 7, 3-4). Since a nominal subject was grammatically inessential on account of the autonomy of a finite verb's personal endings in old IE languages and PIE itself, it too could optionally be placed after the verb: for example, Hitt. *nu-za iš-ḫa-mi-iš--ki-iz-zi* ^dIŠTAR-iš 'Ishtar sings' (*Ulli.* II ii 5) or, with prolepsis and postposed object, *na-an za-aḫ-ḫi-eš-ki-iz-zi* ^dU-aš ^{na4}ku-un-ku-nu-zi-in 'the storm-god fights him, the *kunkunuzzi*-stone' (*Ulli.* III iv 9-10). In view of the remarks earlier about register, it is probably significant that postverbal amplifications occur with well above average frequency for Hittite in the metrical Song of Ullikummi.

At this point a more detailed breakdown of the Old Indic patterns with medial verb in column viii of table in 1.3 above seems worthwhile (McCone, 1979, 219). The vertical

columns comprise the following cases: (i) one (rarely more) of two or more coordinated terms precedes and the rest follow the verb, (ii) an apposition or, more rarely, attribute is placed after the verb, (iii) a dative of purpose or an infinitive follows the verb, (iv) a subject (often technically in apposition to *sa* before the verb in the Brāhmaṇas) comes after the verb, (v) a non-appositional object comes after the verb, (vi) a dative, instrumental, ablative, locative or adverb follows the verb, (vii) residual (mostly postposed absolutes in the Brāhmaṇas, usually a combination of more than one of the foregoing in the Rig-Veda).

	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
JB	13	51	29	19	10	4	8
ŚB	14	41	13	11	4	11	3
RV	14	125	7	37	59	63	128

A random selection of passages from the first six books of the Iliad and the first three of the Odyssey yielded the following crude statistics (excluding cases of tmesis) for final, initial and medial verb respectively in Ancient Greek: Iliad 403, 107, 657, Odyssey 216, 59, 314. Patterns with medial verb were then broken down into the same categories as have just been applied to Old Indic (McCone, 1979, 245). Cases in column vii involving two or more subtypes after the verb were then redistributed among i-vi as applicable, a process reflected in the bracketed figures (see Krisch, 1997, 302-5 for examples of ‘amplification’ in Homer).

	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
Iliad	25(30)	120(185)	59(80)	120(171)	75(114)	133(193)	125(7)
Odyssey	3(5)	80(107)	27(35)	52(69)	38(56)	57(94)	57(5)

1.7. According to Delbrück, then, a basic verb-final SOV structure competed in Proto-Indo-European with other patterns due to two or three main factors: automatic placement of enclitics after the first accented word in their clause, topicalisation/focus by fronting, and more doubtfully the less clearly motivated optional placement of syntactically marginal or marginalised elements after an otherwise final verb. These could generate OSV with topicalised, focussed or cliticised object, VSO with topicalised initial verb, OVS with an ‘amplified’ subject and so on. Krisch (2002, 252)

likewise posits basic clause-final position for the verb combined with fronting of a verb and/or some other constituent(s) as topic(s) (see 1.2 above) and the option of placing grammatically inessential constituents after the verb. If postverbal ‘amplifications’ are firmly incorporated into it, sometimes as a strategy for avoiding unduly long phrases before the verb and otherwise perhaps to provide a secondary topic or focus as suggested by Hale (1987, 164-5, n. 14), there is not a great deal of difference between this basic model and its rival recognising fronting of a topic/focus word and Wackernagel’s law as the only firm rules governing the arrangement of the chief constituents of a PIE sentence. After all, as Delbrück (1900, 81) himself pointed out, acceptance that initial position was marked in the case of the verb necessarily imposes some limits upon so-called ‘free’ order by implying opposition to an unmarked position further back in the sentence. For present purposes, then, patterns a, c, d, e and f in 1.2 above can, if wished, be read as entailing merely non-initial (including final) rather than specifically final verb (see 1.10 below).

The crucial fact is that, due allowance having been made for the greater frequency of patterns with medial verbs there, Homeric Greek shows a functional parallelism between sentence-initial simple verb and compound verb with initial preverb in tmesis that is virtually identical to the correlation observed by Delbrück and others in Old Indic prose (McCone, 1979, 251-8). The following typical enough examples must suffice here (see Boley, 2004, 23-69 for further examples involving preverb and verb especially in Homer and *passim*, e.g. 123-8, for additional Vedic examples;): Skt. *yā́mś ca vidmá yā́m u ca ná pravidmá* ‘both those whom we know and those whom we do not know’ (#.EV# #.ENPV#; *RV* 10, 15, 13), *áhann áhim, ánv apás tatarða, prá vakṣaṇā ab^hinat párvatānām* ‘he slew the dragon, brought up the waters, split the caverns of the mountains’ (#V.# #P.V# #P.V.#; *RV* 1,32,1 cited by Krisch, 2002, 250), *ā no yajñe b^hajata. mā no yajñād antárgata, astv evá no ’pi yajñe b^hāga iti.* ‘give us a share in the sacrifice, do not exclude us from the sacrifice, let there be a share in the sacrifice for us’ (#PE.V# #NE.PV# #VE...#; *ŚB* 1, 6, 1, 1), Hom. μηρούς τ’ ἐξέταμον, κατὰ τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν/ δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ’ αὐτῶν δ’ ὠμοθέτησαν,/ καίε δ’ ἐπὶ σχίζῃς ὁ γέρον, ἐπὶ δ’ αἶθοπα οἶνον/λεῖβε ‘they cut out the thighbones and covered (them) with fat on either side and placed raw pieces on them and the old man burned (them) on spits and poured fiery wine over (them)’ (#.EPV# #PE.V..# #.V# #VE..# #PE..V#; *Il.* 1, 460-63), τεύχεα δ’ οὐκ ἀπέδυσσε ‘but he did not take off his arms’ (#.ENPV#; *Il.* 4, 532), ὦς ἔφατ’, οὐδ’ ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἄκουσας/ βῆ δ’ ἰέναι κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων ‘so he spoke and the herald did not disobey upon hearing but went on his way among the bronze clad Achaeans’ (#.V# #NE...V.# #VE...#; *Il.* 4, 198-200). Watkins prefaces his exemplification and discussion of tmesis in Pindar (2002, 328-336) with the following remarks: ‘In my working corpus of tmesis in Pindar, a generous one in including some possible cases of adverb P, I

have 60 instances, which show four patterns with their number of tokens: PE(...)V 31, P...V 21, V(...)P 4, P||V 4. Some of these may well be adverbs rather than preverbs, but the (rule-governed) placement remains the same. Note in the first instance that in all 60 cases the placement of *both* P and V follows my rule for syntactic or metrical boundary adjunction' (2002, 328; see 1.4 above).

It appears from this that at a stage of PIE after the separation of Anatolian the first preverb alone did duty for the verbal expression as a whole for purposes of topicalisation/focus. In other words, far from reflecting the preverb's autonomy in relation to the verb at a late stage of the parent language, this type of tmesis testifies to a semantic and grammatical fusion comparable with that observed in Modern German compound verbs with separable prefix (McCone, 1979, 275).

1.8. Since the basic positional behaviour of the negative has been found above to match that of the preverb, it seems reasonable to suppose that initial negatives likewise served to mark the whole verbal expression from which they were separated, as was suggested for Indic by Gonda (1951). This is preferable to Delbrück's (1888, 23) rather contrived attempt to differentiate an initial negative applying to the sentence as a whole from a preverbal one negating the verb alone. Unmarked placement of the negative before a final or medial verb is well attested in Hittite, Indic, Greek and Latin, where the stereotyped *nolo* and *nequeo* are particularly significant, and there is no shortage of examples such as those already given for functional correlations between initial verb, preverb and negative in Homeric Greek as well as Old Indic.

Consequently we can posit the symmetrical late Proto-Indo-European scheme in 1.2 above with negative, preverb and verb normally gravitating towards the end or at least the middle of the sentence as in the column on the left. Topicalisation/focus of the verbal expression was then realised by shifting negative, preverb or verb in that order of preference to the head of the sentence as in the central column.

1.9. Needless to say, there were circumstances where the initial position of these elements was due not to marking but to the mechanics of supporting enclitics in minimal sentences of the type illustrated by the following Hittite examples: *a-ku-wa-ra-aš* 'let him die' (#VE#; *Tel.* 4,20), *ar-ḫa-wa pár-ku-nu-um-mi* 'I pardon completely' (#PEV#; *Tel.* 2,42), *li-e-ya-aš-kán ú-e-iḫ-ta-ri* 'let him not turn back' (#NEV#; *ITO* 3,20). Sometimes such minimal nuclei would come to stand at the head of longer sentences as a result of postverbal amplifications as in *Ulli.* III iii 50-51, II ii 5 or III iv 9-10 above (1.6) and it has been argued (McCone, 1979b) that the expanding use of amplified sentences in the Luwian branch of Anatolian culminated in the tendency of Lycian towards a clause-initial verbal complex. There is no *prima*

facie objection to a similar explanation of the regular location of such nuclei at the head of the clause in Old Irish observed in the right hand column of the basic scheme given 1.2 above.

However, there is another possibility, namely univerbation of the marked types with initial negative or preverb in tmesis in order to bring the whole verbal expression together at the head of the sentence, the solution preferred by Watkins (1963, 39-41). As has been seen, Delbrück pointed out that this type sometimes occurs in Vedic and the Brāhmaṇas, where it is a relatively infrequent and almost certainly innovatory variant of the marked tmesis pattern, e.g. *sá vái tístḥann anvāha, anvāha hy etát* ‘he recites standing, for he recites thus’ (#...PV##PVE..#; *SB* 1,4,2,18; cf. the statistics in 1.3 above). The same phenomenon was quite common in Homeric Greek, e.g. *ἐκ δ’ ἄγαγε κλισίης Βρισηίδα καλλιπάρηον, δῶκε δ’ ἄγειν* ‘and he brought fair-cheeked Briseis out of the hut and gave her to be taken’ (#PEV...##VE..#; *Il.* 1, 346-7), *ὣς ἔφατ’, οὐδ’ ἀπίθησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη/ βῆ δὲ κατ’ Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων αἴξασα* ‘so he spoke and the bright-eyed goddess Athene did not disobey but went flying down from the peaks of Olympus’ (#.V##NEV..##VE...#; *Il.* 2, 166-7). Univerbations of this type (but, if so, with E between P and V as in Homer and Old Irish rather than after PV as often in Old Indic) may have already been a (presumably no more than sporadic) possibility in Proto-Indo-European. Regardless of whether a basic PIE core (however slight) or separate post-PIE univerbations are posited, it would be easy enough to envisage increasing progress towards the ultimately consistent univerbation of these marked types in the prehistory of Irish (with E remaining between preverb and verb as in Homer). However, it is less clear why these should then have become the normal unmarked patterns observable in Old Irish and at this point we need to consider attested word order patterns in Celtic as a whole. As we shall see, this is an area where a number of significant developments have taken place in the thirty years or so since Watkins produced his celebrated study.

1.10. Modification of the verbal action by a so-called ‘preverb’, which could often also modify an appropriate case form of a noun as a preposition or postposition and on occasion function as a more or less independent adverb (see, for instance, Wackernagel, 1926, 165-220), is so well established in the older (and some later) attested stages of the main branches of Indo-European that the existence of this phenomenon in Proto-Indo-European can scarcely be doubted (see 1.1-4/7/9 above). Due allowance being made for some variations in suffixation (presumably due at least in part to origins as petrified case forms of old nouns), a number of specific forms may be reconstructed for PIE itself in this function on the strength of obvious cognates in various daughter languages (see, for instance, the convenient lists in Delbrück, 1893, 666 and 734, or Burrow, 1955, 285-6, or *KPV* 82-4). That said, this process of verbal

composition seems to have been productive in most branches with the result that the basic inventory of preverbs/prepositions might undergo significant changes and many new compounds consisting of a (sometimes new) preverb plus a verbal root be created at later stages in the various daughter languages. This is doubtless a major reason for the quite limited number of fixed combinations of a given preverb with a given verbal root that can be ascribed to the protolanguage with any confidence (see the detailed discussions of individual preverbs/prepositions in Delbrück, 1893, 666-752 *passim*). Another was probably the considerable flexibility and semantic transparency with which preverb(s) and verb might be combined in the parent language, notwithstanding the fact that such combinations would seem to have functioned as a single grammatical unit in the later stages thereof (see 1.7 above). All that really matters for present purposes, however, is the fact that a grammatical category P(reverb) and its basic positional behaviour may be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European with a large measure of confidence.

The practical and methodological difficulties just alluded to become a good deal more serious where combinations of two or more preverbs with a verbal root are concerned. Wackernagel (1926, 228) noted that this phenomenon was found in all three IE languages with which he was primarily concerned (namely Greek, Latin and German) and that parallels between Homeric Greek, Vedic Sanskrit and Old Irish usage indicated that the possibility of combining at least two or even three preverbs with a verb was inherited from PIE itself: ‘Besonders bemerkenswert ist aber, dass Homer hier gar nicht zurückhaltend ist; er liefert sogar nicht wenige Beispiele von Verbindung eines Verbums mit drei Präpositionen, dem Maximum, das im Griechischen erreichbar ist, z. B. ὑπεκπρόρέω “darunterweg hervorfließen”. Das ist nicht auffällig; Homer geht in dieser Freiheit mit dem Altindischen, auch schon dem des Veda, zusammen; (übrigens auch mit dem Altirischen, das sogar bis auf fünf Präverbien verbinden kann); er hält also einfach indogermanisches Erbgut fest’. Wackernagel (1926, 228) was, of course, also aware of the evidence that instances of verbal composition involving more than one preverb show an overall increase in the recorded histories of Greek, Latin and German(ic), to say nothing of Sanskrit, and that a major contributing factor was the addition of a preverb to preexisting compounds increasingly perceived as single units in order to lend them some further semantic nuance: ‘Die Neigung, mehr als eine Präposition mit dem Verbum zu verbinden, nimmt im ganzen zu, weil man sich immer komplizierter und schärfer ausdrücken liebte, weil einfache Komposita sich leicht allmählich abnutzten oder einheitlichen Begriff bekamen und endlich auch wohl weil man lange Wörter immer weniger scheute’. This brings us to the nub of the matter: how far do such compounds in various IE languages (including Old Irish) directly or indirectly continue a PIE process of combining two or three preverbs with a verbal root and how far are they so-called

‘decompounds’ produced in the separate prehistories or histories of various daughter languages by what might perhaps be more appropriately termed ‘recomposition’ of older one- and two-preverb compounds. If a process inherited at least in part from PIE is posited, the further question arises as to whether any rules governing the position of various preverbs in relation to each other can be identified.

There seem to be no obvious cases of identical combinations of two or three virtually identical preverbs in two or more different daughter languages, even if identity of the verbal root too is not insisted upon, but this is scarcely probative as negative evidence for reasons given above. Wackernagel (1926, 228) is doubtless right to follow Collitz in arguing for the iterative reduplication of **pro* and perhaps some other preverbs/prepositions in PIE on the strength of a comparison of Homeric Greek προπροκυλινδόμενος ‘keeping rolling before’ (*Il.* 22, 221; lit. ‘rolling before (and) before’) with a similar use of *prapra* as well as certain other preverbs/prepositions in Vedic Sanskrit (see *RV pra-pra-jan-* ‘be born again and again’ etc. in Monier-Williams, 1899), especially since the provision of further support by Hittite *parā parā* ‘on and on’ (see Friedrich, 1952-66, 158). Nevertheless, this special case entailing the repetition of one and the same preverb hardly constitutes good evidence for the possibility of combining two or more different preverbs with a verb in the ancestral protolanguage.

As far as basic position is concerned, multiple preverbs seem, as might be expected, to be placed together directly before a non-initial finite verb as a rule, due allowance being made for the tendency of certain elements such as the negative to come between preverb(s) and verb in Anatolian (see 1.4 above): e.g., OHitt. *ta-at a-ap-pa ša-ra-a le-e ú-e-ez-zi* ‘let it not come back up’ (#CEPPNV#; *KP* III, 12-13), OInd. *Índram, sak^hāyo, ánu sám rab^had^hvam* ‘o friends, seize Indra successively’ (#...PPV#; *RV* 10, 103, 6), Gk. ἀλλ’ οὐ ὁί χάρις ἀμφὶ περιστέφεται ἐπέεσσιν ‘but grace does not crown his words around’ (C#NE.PPV.#; *Od.* 8, 175), OInd. *tám sá mátsya upanvā pupluve* ‘the fish swam up along to him’ (#...PPPV#; *ŚB* 1, 8, 1, 5), ἤμιόνους μὲν ὑπεκπρο-έλυσαν ἀπήνης ‘they loosed the mules out forth from under the wagon’ (#.EPPPV.#; *Od.* 6, 88). Delbrück (1893, 650-1) contrasts the occasional location of two preverbs together in tmesis at the head of the sentence in Greek, as in ὑπέκ κακότητα φύγοιμεν ‘let us flee away from evil’ (#PP.V#; *Od.* 9, 489), with the Old Indic tendency to place just one preverb in initial position and leave the other directly before the verb, as in *ápāsmāt préyāt* ‘let him go forth away from him’ (#P.PV#; *RV* 10, 117, 4). Hittite offers some support for the Greek type, as in *pí-ra-an kat-ta-ma la-aḥ-ḥu-ur-nu-zi [nam-ma[?] da-i-ir]* ‘but before it they [moreover] put] a sacrificial table’ (#PPE.[.V]#; *Ent.* III 48’-49’;). On the other hand, Old Indic usage receives significant corroboration from the standard Old Irish pattern #P(E):P₂(P_{3,4})V....# with

enclitic elements such as infix pronouns regularly inserted between an initial first preverb and any further preverb(s). Greek practice here is easy enough to explain in terms of an observed tendency to treat combinations such as ὑπέκ ‘out from under’ as an indivisible single unit (e.g. as preposition plus gen. at *Il.* 13, 89, *Il.* 15, 628 etc.). Chantraine (1963, 145-6) duly notes that, apart from ἀμφὶ περὶ above, all ‘compound’ prepositions or preverbs in Homer have ἐξ or πρό as a second element that merely serves to complete the idea expressed by the first, as in the case of παρεξ ‘along, the length of, beyond’, ὑπέκ itself, διέκ ‘out through’ or διαπρό ‘on(wards) through’ in διαπρό δὲ εἴσατο χαλκός ‘the bronze pressed on through’ (*Il.* 5, 538; #PPEV.#). Sporadic Hittite instances of double initial preverbs can presumably be accounted for by a similar tendency to perceive them as quasi-compounds. Given that the fusion of originally discrete constituents seems a good deal more likely than the reverse process, Old Indic and Old Irish practice has the better claim to reflect PIE usage, particularly since it conforms to the obviously inherited rule that the first constituent of the verbal expression did duty for the rest as far as fronting for topic was concerned.

If sequences of two or even three preverbs were a feature of PIE as Wackernagel and others were inclined to think, the patterns in 1.2 above might be reformulated as follows in the light of the discussion the basic positional behaviour of the constituents concerned in this and some preceding sections.

(‘traditional’/unmarked)

(‘occasional’/marked as topic or focus)

(a) #.(E)(.)V(..)#

(b) #V(E)...#

(c) #.(E)(.)P(P₂₋₃)V(..)#

(d) #P(E)(.)(P₂₋₃)V(..)#

(e) #.(E)(.)N(P₁₋₃)V(..)#

(f) #N(E)(.)(P₁₋₃)V(..)#

1.11. In Hittite just three instances of *appa šara* and one each of *appa arḫa* and *kattan šara* were found in a sample of some 200 clauses containing preverb(s) plus finite verb drawn from older texts (McCone, 1979, 128-9). After excluding seven instances of *app(an)anda* (either a compound of the two preverbs *appa(n)* and *anda* or simply an extension of *appan* alone; see Tischler, 1977, 41-3) and two of similar *araḫzanda* (in relation to *araḫza*; Tischler, 1977, 52) from the statistics on grounds of uncertain analysis, that leaves some 185 undoubted instances of a single preverb. A larger sample of 460 instances garnered from later texts (McCone, 1979, 130-1) yielded 37 examples of two preverbs with a verb (*appa para* 1, *appan arḫa* 4, *appan šara* 1, *awan arḫa* 7, *ištarna arḫa* 1, *kattan appa* 1, *kattan arḫa* 3, *kattan šara* 1, *piran arḫa* 5, *piran katta* 4, *piran para* 7, *piran šara* 1, *šer arḫa* 1) versus 405 of just one (again excluding *appanda* 15, *araḫzanda* 1 and *paranda* 2). The Hittite sample thus provided no instances of more than two preverbs in combination, while two-preverb

combinations constituted under 3% of the total in the earlier texts used but a rather higher 8.5% or so in the later ones. From this it appears that the deployment of no more than one preverb was the overwhelming norm at all stages of Hittite but that there was some increase in the proportion of two-preverb combinations in the course of its recorded history. As far as the position of preverbs in relation to each other is concerned, *arḥa*, *para* and *šara* display a clear tendency to follow others such as *piran*, *appa(n)* and *katta(n)* (see also the relevant entries in Friedrich, 1952-66).

Delbrück (1888, 434) emphasised the frequency with which two preverbs were combined with a verb in Old Indic, particularly where prose was concerned, and speculated that authors may have exercised considerable individual freedom in the creation of many such compounds: ‘Nichts ist häufiger, namentlich in P[rosa], als die Verbindung zweier Präpositionen mit einem Verbum. Es scheint, dass dabei eine verhältnissmässig grosse Freiheit des einzelnen Schriftstellers obwaltete’. The latter point was prompted by a further observation (Delbrück, 1888, 434-5) that rather few specific combinations occurred in both the Rig Veda and early prose, namely *i* ‘go’ with *ab^hi + ā*, *úd + ā*, *úpa + ā*, *sám + ā*, *ab^hi + úd*, *ab^hi + úpa*, *ánu + parā*, *anu + prá*, *ví + prá*, or *ab^hi + sám*; *kar* ‘make’ with *úd + ā*, *úpa + ā* or *sám + ā*; *gam* ‘go’ with *anu + ā*; *gā* ‘go’ with *ab^hi + úd*; *car* ‘move’ with *ánu + sám*; *tan* ‘spread’ with *anu + ā*; *dā* ‘give’ with *sám + ā*; *d^hā* ‘put’ with *ab^hi + sám*; *d^hāv* ‘run’ with *anu + prá*; *b^hū* ‘be(come)’ with *anu + prá* or *ab^hi + sám*; *yam* ‘sustain’ with *sám + prá*; *yā* ‘go’ with *úpa + prá*; *vart* ‘turn’ with *úpa + ā*, *pári + ā*, *ví + ā* or *ab^hi + ní*; *sarj* ‘discharge’ with *úpa + áva*; *st^hā* ‘stand’ with *ab^hi + prá*; *har* ‘carry’ with *sám + ā*. It is striking that nearly half of these combinations have *ā* as the second preverb. Turning to combinations of three preverbs with a verb, Delbrück (1888, 435) admits to having found no certain examples in the Rig Veda and only two (*anu-sam-prá-yāhi* and *upa-sam-pārā-nayat*) in the poetic sections of the Atharva Veda. He goes on (1888, 436-7) to give 39 examples found in the early prose material consulted, no less than 30 of them with *ā* as third preverb, before concluding with some ten obvious instances of recomposition (in this case the prefixing of a further preverb to a preexisting two-preverb compound treated as a single unit; see 1.10 above) from the same prose sources: for instance, ‘*vyā har* heisst wohl eigentlich auseinandernehmen (die Silben), dann sprechen. Vor dieses Simplex tritt *ánu* und es entsteht die Bedeutung (nachreden) schmähen, verfluchen; mit *ápa* (von der Ordnung) weg, abweichend, unpassend reden ÇB; mit *ab^hi* aussprechen, hersagen’ (Delbrück, 1888, 437). According to Burrow (1955, 286) ‘the development of the full system of verbal composition is largely a parallel development in the various languages’ of the IE family and Sanskrit practice overall may be described as follows: ‘More than one prefix can be combined with a verb (as in Greek etc.). Combinations of two are common, of three, not unusual, but more than three are very rarely found. There are no particular rules as to the order in

which they may appear, but the prefix \bar{a} is practically never separated from the verb'. A few exceptions notwithstanding, Delbrück (1888, 437-9) posits certain positional hierarchies in the earlier language, noting that $p\acute{a}r\bar{a}$, \bar{a} and $\acute{a}va$ almost invariably stand directly before the verb whereas ab^hi , $\acute{a}d^hi$ and $\acute{a}nu$ (and to a lesser extent $\acute{u}pa$ and $pr\acute{a}ti$) display an equally marked converse tendency to stand before other preverbs.

The compounding of one to three preverbs with a verb was clearly very productive within Sanskrit. Two-preverb compounds are already quite well attested as early as the Rig Veda but become significantly commoner in Brāhmanic prose and later (e.g. various $pra-ṇi-$ compounds recorded by Monier-Williams, 1899, from epic and subsequent sources), while the occurrence of three preverbs seems to have increased from virtual non-existence in the Rig Veda to reasonable frequency in Brāhmanic prose and beyond. Moreover, there is a strikingly high incidence of \bar{a} at the end of two- and especially three-preverb sequences. It thus seems unlikely that chains of three preverbs were inherited into Indic from an earlier stage, a view corroborated by their absence from the oldest Iranian records. Two-preverb compounds also appear to be a good deal less common in Old Iranian than in Old Indic: Meillet/Benveniste (1931, 144) states that their second preverb is invariably \bar{a} in Old Persian, citing $av\bar{a}janiya$ ($ava + \bar{a} + \text{root } jan-$ 'kill') and $patiy\bar{a}baram$ ($pati + \bar{a} + \text{root } bar-$ 'bear') as examples, while a perusal of the Avestan verbs listed in the first part of Kellens (1984, 13- 81) yielded only Gāthic $para-aora-$ + root $mruc-$'s'enfoncer' (p. 13) and more recent $auua-\bar{a}-$ + $rud-$ 'retenir' (p. 30), $ni-us-$ + $sri-$ 'se pencher, fournir' (p. 31) alongside a considerable number of single-preverb compounds. It thus seems doubtful whether, with the probable exception of $-\bar{a}-$ on a limited scale, the combination of one preverb with another was an established feature even as far back as Indo-Iranian, let alone Proto-Indo-European. That said, the respective claims of the more extensive Old Indic and more restricted Old Iranian deployment of two (in Old Indic also three) preverbs in composition with a verbal root to PIE antiquity cannot be properly adjudicated without reference to the earliest adequately attested usage in other branches, particular significance attaching to Ancient Greek and Old Irish in this respect.

Schwyzler/Debrunner (1959, 428) regards the addition of a second preverb to a combination of preverb plus verb on occasion in Greek as a possibility inherited from PIE, whether the same preverb as in vestigial Homeric $\pi\rho-\pi\rho-\kappa\upsilon\lambda\iota\nu\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (*Il.* 22, 221 and *Od.* 17, 525; see 1.10 above) or a different one as in $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma-\alpha\nu\alpha-\beta\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\iota$ 'might go up into' (*Il.* 8, 291), $\epsilon\acute{\xi}-\alpha\nu\alpha-\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$ 'having gone up out' (*Il.* 24, 97), $\epsilon\acute{\xi}-\alpha\pi-\epsilon\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ 'disembarked, went out from' (*Od.* 12, 306), $\epsilon\acute{\sigma}-\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha-\beta\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ 'going down into' (*Od.* 24, 222) The form $\epsilon\acute{\xi}-\upsilon\pi-\alpha\nu-\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$ 'rose up out from' (*Il.* 2, 267) is given as an example of a three-preverb compound along with a note (Schwyzer/Debrunner, 1959, 428, n. 4) that combinations of three preverbs are also found in Old Indic, Latin and

Old Irish but that at least some of these are without doubt relatively recent creations within their separate histories and prehistories. As far as Greek is concerned, it is argued (Schwyzer/Debrunner, 1959, 428) that ἐξυπανέστη is a decompound of ὑπανέστη ‘stood/rose up from’, itself the result of recomposition of ἀνέστη ‘stood, rose up’, while examples such as ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι (*Od.* 12, 113 and 20, 43) or παρεκπροφύγησιν (*Il.* 23, 314) seem better analysed as decompounds of προφεύγειν (e.g. *Il.* 11, 340 and 6, 6, 502) formed by prefixing the already discussed (1.10) compound prepositions/preverbs παρὲκ and ὑπέκ to it. A similar analysis may be applied to examples such as already cited (1.10) ὑπεκ-προρέει (*Od.* 6, 87) and ὑπεκ-προθέει (*Il.* 9, 506) in relation to προ-ρέειν (e.g. *Il.* 21, 260 and *Od.* 5, 444) and προ-θέειν (e.g. *Il.* 10, 362 and *Od.* 11, 515) respectively, while in the absence of a corresponding *προλύειν the already cited (1.10 above) ὑπεκπρο-έλυσαν (*Od.* 6, 88) is most plausibly analysed as a direct compound of ὑπεκπρο- extrapolated from verbs such as the above with simple λύειν, particularly in view of the occurrence of ὑπεκπρορέει in the immediately preceding line. Even the above examples of ‘genuine’ two-preverb compounds in Homer according to Schwyzer/Debrunner can be accounted for equally straightforwardly as decompounds of ἀνα-βαίνειν ‘go up’, ἀπο-βαίνειν ‘disembark’, κατα-βαίνειν ‘go down, descend’ respectively. The most cursory glance at various two- and three-preverb sequences in a standard dictionary such as Liddell and Scott (1996) suffices to show how these proliferated in post-Homeric Greek, and similar processes of recompounding are seen to have been at work in Modern German: Schwyzer/Debrunner (1959, 428) cites *ab-bekommen*, *ab-verdienen* and *ver-bleiben* (based on an earlier compound, OHG *bi-līban*) and Paul (1992) gives plenty of further examples of complex adverbs such as *heran*, *herauf*, *heraus*, *herbei* and *vorüber* that began to be used as verbal prefixes in the relatively recent history of German.

In the final analysis and with the probable exception of isolated προπρο- (1.10 above), Homeric Greek offers no good evidence for the simultaneous combination of two or three separate preverbs with a verb in accordance with a pattern arguably inherited from Proto-Indo-European. Homeric compounds of this type seem rather to be due to the combination of already compounded prepositions/adverbs such as ὑπέκ and διαπρό (1.10) with a simple verb, to recomposition by prefixing a further preverb to an already existing compound verb, or to a combination of the two.

In Latin too the incidence of multi-preverb compounds demonstrably increases within the language’s recorded history but even so the use of two preverbs remains quite uncommon and sequences of three or more as seen in *co-ad-im-plere* ‘fill up together’ are a great rarity (see Hofmann/Szantyr, 1965, 284). The role of recomposition is generally obvious (e.g. *ad-im-plere* ‘fill up’, *im-plere* ‘fill (up)’), even in the case of

the few early attestations of two-preverb compounds such as *com-promesise* ‘to have given a joint undertaking’ (*SC de Bacchanalibus*; Ernout, 1947, 59, l. 14), which is almost certainly a decompound of *pro-mittere* ‘undertake, promise’. Latin, then, also fails to offer serious support for an inherited pattern of multi-preverb composition.

The evidence considered so far makes it quite unlikely that combinations of three preverbs were a feature of Proto-Indo-European itself. Two-preverb sequences in Hittite seem to be infrequent in the earlier attested stages of the language and to have evolved in a similar manner to the Greek ὑπεκ type through the addition of one of a strictly limited set of preverbs/prepositions/adverbs to certain other members of the same class. PIE inheritance seems unlikely except in the quite specific **pro-pro* type involving the doubling of a given preverb to express iterativity. Since recomposition of older single-preverb units can be plausibly invoked to account for the earliest attested two-preverb compound verbs in Greek as well as Latin and the relative frequency of two preverbs in Old Indic is not matched in early Iranian sources, it seems quite possible that the combination of two different preverbs with a verb was at most a marginal phenomenon in PIE itself. The Old Irish and Insular Celtic evidence is potentially crucial since, if it should transpire that a significant proportion of multi-preverb compounds there reflects older patterns of simultaneous composition, this might be taken to corroborate the status of the Old Indic system as essentially inherited from PIE. If, on the other hand, successive stages of recomposition should be found to be primarily responsible for the numerous multi-preverb compounds of Old Irish, it would be hard to resist the conclusion that PIE did not combine two or more different preverbs to any appreciable extent and that the patterns given in 1.2 above were paramount. Further discussion of this issue will be deferred until IV.1-4.

2.1. Watkins (1963, 31-6) drew attention to verb-final patterns with and without tmesis that coexisted with more normal Old Irish sentence-initial equivalents in the arcane alliterative milieu of so-called *rosc* or *retoiric* with which early Irish legal and saga texts were often interspersed. The examples of this below are contrasted with the corresponding patterns (in brackets) expected in normal Old Irish prose and it is to be noted that the verb is not invariably clause-final in these constructions but, as the last example shows, may be ‘amplified’ in the manner defined in 1.6 above.

(a) ‘Tmesis I’: #PE.V# *ro-da: slúagaib -sert* ‘who has arrayed them in hosts’

(McCone, 1986, 29 (xv): *ro-da:sert slúagaib*)

(b) ‘Bergin’s construction’: #.PV# *fri angel n-acallastar* ‘he conversed with an angel’

(LU 1148; *ad:gládistar fri angel*)

(c) ‘Tmesis II’: #CE.V# *no-m: Choimmdiu -coíma* ‘may the Lord preserve me’

(*Thes.* II, 290.11; *no-m:choíma Coimdiu*)

#NE.V# *na-d n-Ádam n-anacht* ‘which did not protect Adam’

(McCone, 1986, 29 (xiv): *na-d:n-anacht Ádam*)

#NE.PV.# *nert na-d: cláen -coicert Coimdiu*

#CN.PV..# *co-na: forcraid -forbair for fuilechair fer*

‘strength which the Lord did not judge wicked so that increase does not grow on the blood-letting of men’ (McCone, 1986, 29 (vii); *nert na-d:coicert Coimdiu cláen cona:forbair forcraid for fuilechair fer*)

Watkins (1963, 34-5) stated of the type with final simple or compound verb in accordance with Delbrück’s unmarked pattern that ‘Bergin’s construction excludes an enclitic and is never relative’. Conversely, an initial preverb in tmesis almost as regularly incorporates an enclitic pronoun or relative marker (McCone, 1979c, 19; 1985b, 267).

Until the early eighties the most widely held scholarly opinion was that this unrhymed alliterative material was the detritus of an archaic pre-Christian oral tradition. Although Binchy (e.g. 1972) was its chief architect, Ó Corráin (1986, 483-4) has furnished the most eloquent recent exposition of this basic approach: ‘From the beginning of legal documentation (fifth to sixth centuries), this customary law was preserved, expounded, and elaborated in different law schools by a tightly knit professional caste of poet-jurists, the lineal descendants of the druids described by the Greco-Roman writers. The teaching of the schools was entirely oral: law was transmitted in the form of gnomic maxims and verse (*roscada*) composed in meters that indicate the flowering of a long tradition. Ireland escaped romanization, but Latin learning came peacefully with Christianity in the fifth century - if not earlier. As a result, the secular learning of the law schools came to be written down from the late sixth century. The lawyers - who only slowly and reluctantly separated themselves from the poets (*filid*) - clung to an archaic and hieratic concept of social order not only because of their natural conservatism but perhaps also because society changed so quickly in the sixth and seventh centuries that they no longer had any empathy with it’.

Passages of *rosc* would thus have been composed orally well before they found their way into written texts and might reflect a state of the language considerably older than that of, say, the early eighth-century Würzburg Glosses. Even then the tmesis and Bergin patterns were presumably stereotyped archaisms: ‘The nearly universal presence of alliteration between the verb in final position and the preceding word testifies to the quasi-rigid character of both of these constructions. Both constructions are preserved only by virtue of having themselves become features of poetic language

rather than living examples of ordinary language' (Watkins, 1963, 34). That being so, verb-final patterns could presumably have disappeared from normal speech several centuries before the Old Irish written record of the seventh to ninth centuries A.D. came into being.

Wagner (1967) took the contrary position that tmesis and Bergin's construction were entirely artificial features of poetic diction rather than petrified archaisms. Mac Coisdealbha (1998) compromised between this and Watkins' approach by arguing that, after disappearing from ordinary use, a genuinely archaic verb-final stratum had been contaminated by the copular clefting constructions that are such a prominent feature of Old, Middle and Modern Irish. Greene's (1977) important contribution on 'Archaic Irish' clarified a number of issues from a purely descriptive standpoint while eschewing speculation on Indo-European roots or the lack of them. The present writer (McCone, 1979c, 12, n. 43) opted for MacCoisdealbha's compromise and accepted the validity of Watkins' genetic comparison of the tmesis and basic Bergin constructions with similar verb-final structures in Vedic Sanskrit and elsewhere.

However, recent work on Old Irish *rosc* and *retoiric* tends rather to favour Wagner's interpretation, albeit not decisively. The turning point came when Breatnach (1984) dealt a serious blow to previous orthodoxy regarding this material by demonstrating conclusively that two *roscs* in the notoriously difficult legal text *Bretha Nemed* were closely based upon Latin passages in the eighth-century *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*. Ironically, Ó Corráin had already signalled his conversion to this new approach in an article jointly authored with Breatnach and Breen (1984) before the remarks cited above finally saw publication. Subsequent studies by a number of scholars (e.g. McCone, 1986; Breatnach, 1986 and 1989; Corthals, 1989) have now shown the indebtedness of further passages of this type in legal and saga material to ecclesiastical sources and Breatnach himself (1989b) has argued cogently that the *rosc* poem *Amra Senáin* was composed towards the end of the ninth century. The patently Christian content of the examples in a-c above is, then, by no means unusual and there can be no doubt that compositions of this type were being produced in a literate monastic milieu in the eighth and ninth centuries. While this does not necessarily exclude the survival of some ancient preliterate material in this genre, it must be said, notwithstanding Charles-Edwards' (1993, 3-12) unsupported claims to the contrary, that this has yet to be convincingly identified and that as such *rosc* or *retoiric* is neither oral nor archaic in character. Indeed, on current evidence it seems quite possible that key features of this arcane high style was first developed in the Christian period by the monastically oriented class of literate poets known as *filid* (Thurneysen, 1921, 54; McCone, 1990, 35-46)

If so, one is bound to share Wagner's scepticism as to whether SOV patterns and correlates such as preposed genitives and adjectives in this material reflect more than poetic licence for the sake of producing the requisite alliterations and/or final cadences. As has been pointed out elsewhere (McCone, 1989, 82-4), these deviant patterns can be generated from their standard Old Irish counterparts by simple rules of inversion or, in the case of the verb, of displacement of the stressed portion towards the rear of the sentence. Given the monastic environment in which this consciously rhetorical material was being produced, Latin word-order patterns seem a likely enough model for a number of these divergences from standard Old Irish usage. Tmesis cannot, of course, be so explained but the rule for compound verbs here is basically the same as that governing their imperatives in normal Old Irish: prototonic forms except where an infix was present, in which case a deuterotonic form was required and the proclitic portion had to be retained at the head of the sentence.

Isaac (1993, 6-13) has argued recently that the strong preference for such VSO correlates as prepositions, postposed adjectives and postposed genitives shared by British and Old Irish points to a common ancestor characterised by these same features and a basic VSO word order that is still directly observable in Old Irish and probably underlies Middle Welsh. If Insular Celtic was a basically verb-initial language, it is hard to envisage SOV patterns already supplanted at that stage surviving for a thousand years or so as features of high style in an oral tradition before being adapted to literary *rosc* or *retoiric*.

It is typical of the difficulties besetting syntactic reconstructions linked to typological considerations that Isaac's argument can be inverted on the grounds that, if Insular Celtic had been primarily SOV and VSO patterns had first become dominant in the separate prehistories of Irish and British, typological correlates such as prepositions and postposed adjectives or genitives could have come about independently in the wake of these developments. If so, it does not follow ineluctably from the basic Irish and British ordering of constituents that their common ancestor was likewise predominately VSO.

However, there is a stronger argument for an essentially VSO Insular Celtic. Alternations such as that between the proclitic preposition/conjunction OIr. *amal*, MCor. *avel*, MW *ual* 'like, as' < IC **amali-* (< PC **samali-*) and the stressed adjective OIr. *samail*, MCor. *haval*, MW *hauail* 'like(ness)' < IC **samali-* reflect an Irish and British loss of initial *s* that was demonstrably confined to proclitics. This is obviously too circumstantial a development to have occurred independently in each and so must be at least as old as Insular Celtic. Consequently the precise correspondence between OIr. *it* and MW *ynt* 'they are' < IC **inti* (< PC **senti*) proves

that the copula, which was the only unstressed finite verb in Old Irish, had already become a proclitic before the end of the Insular Celtic phase, as does the application of the Insular Celtic sound law changing unstressed *esi* > *isi* to its 2sg. (see III.1.5.2). Since the basic rule (see I.3.6 above and 2.4 below) clearly entailed loss of stress by the generally lighter first constituent of syntactically close juxtapositions such as preverb + verb, negative etc. + verb, preposition + head noun, it follows that copula + predicate had already become the normal unmarked order of these elements when this proclisis took place. This arrangement was innovatory on the evidence of old IE languages such as Hittite and Sanskrit that **h₁es-* had conformed to the same accentual and positional rules as other finite verbs in Proto-Indo-European and thus tended, unless fronted as topic, to stand at or near the end of the clause after its predicate as in Hitt. *^mŠi-pa-LÚ-iš-ma am-mu-ug IGI-an-da i-da-lu-uš ku-id e-eš-ta* ‘but because S. was hostile towards me’ (*Hatt.* IV 5-6), Skt. *tvám hí ratnad^hā ási* ‘for you are generous’ (*RV* 1, 15,3), Gk. *ὁμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε* ‘for you are goddesses’ (*Il.* 2, 485) or Lat. *lotiumque ad omnes res salubre est* ‘and urine is beneficial for all things’ (Cato, *De Agri Cultura* CLVI).

The obvious explanation for the invariably clause-initial position of the copula (plus any preverbal particle(s) that might be present) is that this came about as part of the conversion of this hitherto marked slot for topic into the regular unmarked position for all verbs in the prehistory of Old Irish. If so, this development must have taken place before the copula underwent proclisis and loss of *s-* in the 3pl., i.e. some time before the end of the Insular Celtic period. Thus, say, **sindās tówtās mātīs sénti* > **sinti mātīs sindās tōtās* > **inti mātīs indās tōtās* > OIr. *it maithi inna túatha* ‘the kingdoms are good’. In that case Insular Celtic was in all probability already a consistently verb-initial language as Isaac surmised and verb-final patterns like those illustrated in a-c at the beginning of this section would have disappeared from ordinary use a millennium or more before the Old Irish period. While their survival in formal or poetic registers only for such a long period cannot be definitely discounted (cf. Eska, 1994, 32-3), this is nevertheless an uncomfortable assumption and serious doubts inevitably arise as to the reliability of the Old Irish tmesis and Bergin’s constructions as evidence for the erstwhile normality of verb-final SOV sequences in Celtic.

2.2. Fortunately, losses on this front have been more than compensated for by the discovery in 1970 of the first extensive text in a Continental Celtic language, namely the Botorrita Bronze, which has been the object of many studies since it was published some thirty years ago. Whatever about the precise interpretation of this Celtiberian inscription, there is general agreement about its firmly SOV character and marked preference for clause-final verbs. This is amply illustrated by Eska (1994, 17-21), for instance, and Eichner (1989, 35) counted sixteen final as against only three non-final

verbs (a-c below).

- (a) *iom asekati ambitinkounei* (A5-6; #.PV.#?)
 (b) *Tokoitei ios urantiomue auzeti aratimue* (A10; #...V.#)
 (c) *somei enitouzei iste ankios iste esankios uze areitena Sarnikiei Akainakubos nebintor* (A8-10; #....NV#)
 (d) *uta oskues boustomue koruinomue makasimue ailamue ambitiseti* (A4-5; #.....PV#)
 (e) *tirikantam berkunetakam Tocoitoskue Sarnikiokue sua kombalkez nelitom nekue to [u]ertaunei litom, nekue taunei litom, nekue masnai tizaunei litom* (#...NPred#, #NE..Pred# x3)

Of these c is best taken as sentence-final with Meid (1993, 59-63), a almost certainly involves a final dative despite the claim by Eska (1994, 18-19) that the verb here is in pragmatically conditioned clause-initial position, and b displays the placement of the second of two nouns coordinated by *-ue* ‘or’ after the verb. Both a and b, then, constitute classic instances of amplification in Gonda’s sense (cf. Meid, 1997, 400-1). Preverbs likewise appear fused with their verbs at the end of the sentence as in d (see Eska, 1994, 11) but as yet no certain cases of tmesis have surfaced in Celtiberian. On the other hand, the relevant clauses in c and e present us with two positions of the negative, namely right in front of a final verb or predicate, a position not found in Old Irish *rosc* or *retoiric*, or in initial position separated from the predicate as anaphoric topic.

In short, this piece of Celtiberian prose conforms quite faithfully to and thus corroborates Delbrück’s Proto-Indo-European model. If this connection is granted, it follows that the intervening Proto-Celtic too was fundamentally SOV and verb-final (so too Meid, 1997, 398) and that the verb-initial VSO patterns normal in Old Irish do indeed represent a major shift within Celtic itself (Meid, 1997, 397-8).

2.3. We thus have two more or less polar types and this brings us to Gaulish and British with their alleged flexibility and/or penchant for the intermediate SVO pattern:, e.g., Gaul. *Licnos Contextos ieuru Anualonnacu canecosedlon* ‘LC dedicated a c. to A’ (LG 96-7), *Iccauros Oppianicnos ieuru Brigindoni cantalon* ‘I son of O dedicated a song to B’ (LG 96), MW *Dewi differwys y eglwysseu* ‘David defended his churches’ (Hendr. 205.1). Not surprisingly, adherents of the Gallo-British hypothesis have tended to see a genetic connection here. Lewis (1942) maintained that Gaulish was a language with so-called ‘free’ word order and that traces of similar variability survived in early Welsh poetry. Koch (1985) by contrast has argued for a basic SVO structure subject to modification through clefting or the relegation of a nominal subject to

postverbal position by another topicalised element as in the *Ateknati Trutikni karnitu artuaš Koisis Trutiknos* ‘K son of T set up the stones (*artuaš*) of A son of T’ on the Todi bilingual (e.g. Meid, 1992, 12-15). Clear traces of this system can, he suggests, be found in early Welsh poetry. In a subsequent discussion Koch (1987, 169) has made essentially the same claim more explicitly: ‘It is clear that at the early literary period the predominance of the VSO pattern in Old Irish and Old Welsh was, relatively speaking, a recent occurrence. In Continental Celtic VSO examples are rare to non-existent. As reflected in its remains, the favourite order of Gaulish was V-medial, specifically V-second. In the Cynfeirdd poetry, V-medial and V-final orders comprise a sizeable proportion of the total.... In Old Breton prose, V-medial sentences are quite prevalent and are the norm in later Cornish and Breton. A case can be made out... that British had been a V-second language - with patterns much like those observable in Gaulish’. This was duly done in a paper in which, among other things, stray relics of an erstwhile verb-second norm in prehistoric Irish were seen in examples (Carney, 1979, 432-3) from allegedly archaic alliterative Leinster poetry (Koch, 1991, 4) such as *srethaib slúag soi Crimthann* ‘with lines of hosts C turned’ (DatVS; cleft *sois*) or *coscrad cing cét catha(e)* ‘the victorious (one) goes to a hundred battles’ (SVO; pendens *cingid*, cleft *cinges*). Koch (1991, 15-17) also sought to shore up the case for non-cleft medial verb patterns with the remarkable claim that in the frequent Middle Welsh type *gwr a’th gar* ‘a man (who) loves [thee]’ with fronted subject or object the relative particle *a* was an old *o*-stem nominative singular ending (< **gwurá-ttu gara(d)* < **wirós-tu karat*) protected from loss by the effects of a following enclitic and then somehow cut adrift and generalised as a particle, whence *gwr a gar* instead of **gwr car* ‘a man loves’ (< **wirós karat*) and so on.

Mac Cana (1991) has made some telling criticisms of Koch’s approach, suggesting that he underestimates the frequency of verb-initial patterns in early Welsh poetry and that most of the verb-second types in question are either pendens constructions or metrically motivated extensions thereof. Koch’s basic thesis is open to a number of further serious criticisms. To begin with, this Old Irish type only occurs a few times in a very restricted corpus of alliterative poetry, where it is only distinguished by the dependent form of the verb from pendens or cleft constructions such as *móraib frassaib folcais domain dem-dad* ‘with great showers he bathed the earth’s dark colour’ from the same body of verse and can simply be regarded as a variant of Bergin’s construction with medial verb (already discussed above) as opposed to the more widespread verb-final type. This is may well no more than an artificial poetic device since, in Carney’s (1979, 434) words, ‘it is easy to see how, within the framework of Old or Archaic Irish, displacement of the verb from its normal position could lead to the use of conjunct or prototonic forms. Absolute or deuterotonic forms were used when the verb stood in first position in the sentence; when preceded by

particles such as *ní* or *co*, the verb, in second place, was conjunct or prototonic. This... was generalized as “when anything precedes the verb it is conjunct or prototonic”. We must remember that, as was pointed out earlier, so-called ‘archaic’ Irish mostly displays the same basically VSO patterns as classical Old Irish.

Secondly, a number of patterns different from those above are attested in Gaulish and the at least very closely related Lepontic (‘an archaic dialect of Gaulish’ according to Eska, 1994, 21), notably Lep. *Uvamokozis Plialethu Uvltiauiopos Ariuonepos sites tetu* (SDat.OV; Lejeune, 1971, 96-111) and *Pelkui pruiam Teu karite išos kalite palam* (Dat.OSV, SVO; Lejeune, 1971, 88-96), Gaul. *Bratronos Nantonin<os> Epađatextorigi Leucullo suiorebe logitou* (SDat.SDat.V with gapping?; LG 105-6) and *Buscilla sosio legasit in Alixie Magalu* (SOVLoc.Dat.; LG 136-7). Most of these would, of course, fit Delbrück’s model and match the attested patterns of Botorrita quite straightforwardly. Eska (1994, 21-4) argues for at least some survival of SOV patterns in Lepontic and Gaulish, although ‘the overwhelmingly dominant configuration of the Gaulish clause.. is SVO’ (1994, 23). Occasional instances of initial verb such as *buetid ollon* ‘let it become large’ and *regu-c cambion* ‘(may?) I straighten the crooked’ on the Chamalières inscription are presumably due to emphasis (Meid, 1997, 404) as topic or focus. Meid (1997, 405) argues for pragmatically conditioned flexibility of word order in Gaulish with residual final, emphatic initial and normal medial position of a finite verb in its clause. In the final analysis we do not yet have enough reliable evidence to make firm statements about Gaulish word order (cf. Meid, 1997, 399-400), particularly when it is remembered that at least six hundred years separate the earliest Lepontic from the latest Transalpine Gaulish fragments. That being so, it is methodologically unsound to lay the British evidence upon a procrustean bed of questionable assumptions about Gaulish patterns.

Once more we are confronted with the respective claims of verse and prose. The orthodox date of c. 600 A.D. for at least part of the *Gododdin*, which Koch (e.g. 1988, 17-20) firmly supports, is predicated on the assumption that it was composed orally at about the same time as the events it purports to describe. Clearly this is no more than wishful thinking and would be like dating the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to whatever part of the later second millennium B.C. an archaeologist chose to ascribe the relevant sack of Troy. There is no good reason, linguistic or otherwise, to place composition of the *Gododdin* and other early Welsh *cynfeirdd* poetry before the ninth or tenth century A.D. (see Greene, 1971). It would then be more or less contemporary with the small Old Welsh prose corpus to which evidential primacy is accorded by Arwyn Watkins (1987) and Mac Cana (1973, 94), both of whom point to the good evidence that it provides for a basically VSO word order accompanied by optional pendens constructions and topicalisations by clefting with or without the copula (see I.2.1

above).

2.4. To sum up the argument so far, Proto-Celtic would seem to have inherited the patterns with a broadly SOV core (as qualified above) ascribed by Delbrück to Proto-Indo-European without significant change. This system was apparently preserved more or less intact by Celtiberian but may eventually have given way in Gaulish to a dominant SVO order subject to interference from a fronting rule for topic inherited via Proto-Celtic from Proto-Indo-European, while in Insular Celtic topicalisation of constituents by shifting them to initial position within the clause had to be abandoned as hitherto marked VSO patterns became normal (cf. Meid, 1997, 398). Thereafter a system of copula clefting arose and optional postverbal amplifications of SOV patterns gave way to likewise optional pendens constructions preposed to VSO patterns. This state of affairs is still observable in Old Irish and Old Welsh prose, where both fronted types seem to provide emphatic or contrastive focus. However, in Middle Welsh, Breton and Cornish the second type of fronting became the norm as part of a shift from a predicate/subject arrangement with optional fronting for focus to a topic/comment system with near-obligatory placement of at least one major constituent before the finite verb (see I.2.2 and Meid, 1997, 398-9).

One can only speculate as to the precise mechanism(s) whereby an initial verbal complex became the norm in Insular Celtic. One perfectly legitimate approach (in effect, adopted by Delbrück as cited in 1.2 above and I.3.5) is to point to the demonstrable fact that originally marked forms can on occasion displace their originally unmarked counterparts. A typical enough instance is the shift of a synthetic present to a future in Welsh and Scots Gaelic owing to the usurpation of general present functions by an originally progressive periphrastic construction (e.g. *W (y)dwy(f) i (y)n mynd* ‘I am going, I go’ versus *(mi/fe) a(f) i* ‘I shall go’), and the tendency to generalise sentence structures with preposed elements originally marked for topic/focus in Middle Welsh, Cornish and Breton (see I.2.2) is particularly relevant in this connection.

Nevertheless, more specific conditioning factors are also worth entertaining, given that this particular development is rather unusual within the Indo-European family. A significant role may well have been played by the factors discussed in 1.9 above, namely postverbal amplification and above all, as suggested by Watkins, by so-called ‘univerbation’ of the rest of the verbal expression with a negative or preverb at the head of the sentence. However, as long as initial N, P or V in that order were only conditioned by topicalisation/focus of the verbal expression as a whole (see 1.2 and 1.7-8 above), they seem likely to have constituted no more than a statistically small minority in relation to positions further back in the sentence. Consequently it is

tempting to invoke intervening developments that would have rendered some or all of the initial variants more frequent, thus paving the way for the subsequent generalisation of patterns based upon them.

Enclitic sentence connectives and object pronouns would seem to have obeyed Wackernagel's Law in PIE but, where appropriate, an enclitic connective or the like could instead be attached to a particular word in the sentence as in the Latin type *senatus populus-que Romanus* 'the Roman senate and people' (e.g. Delbrück, 1988, 471). Since there is no trace of this second possibility in Old Irish or British (as opposed to, say, Celtiberian with *boustom-ue koruinom-ue makasim-ue ailam-ue* and *Tokoitos-kue Sarnikio-kue* in 2.2c/d above), one might well argue that only the sentential type (including object pronouns) was retained in Insular Celtic. The present writer has made the further suggestion (McCone, 1979c, 11-16, and 1985b, 266-9) that a rule arose requiring the attachment of such enclitics to part of the syntactically central verbal expression, whether N (or some other C as defined in I.1.2/5), P or V, to the exclusion of any other constituent such as a topicalised initial noun. This would have resulted in the following modification of the patterns given in 1.10 above, those to the right (b, d, f) significantly no longer being conditioned pragmatically by marking of the verbal expression but quite automatically by the presence of an enclitic, with the probable result that #V...#, #P(..)(P₂₋₃)V(..)# and #NE(..)(P₁₋₃)V(..)# lost their topic/focus function and fell into disuse. Application of univerbation to d and f would have then have resulted in the patterns to the right of the arrows.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| (a) #(..)V(..)# | (b) #VE...# | | |
| (c) #(..)P(P ₂₋₃)V(..)# | (d) #PE(..)(P ₂₋₃)V(..)# | > | #PE(P ₂₋₃)V(...)# |
| (e) #(..)N(P ₁₋₃)V(..)# | (f) #NE(..)(P ₁₋₃)V(..)# | > | #NE(P ₁₋₃)V(...)# |

The crucial corollary would be that an initial verbal complex first arose in Insular Celtic when an enclitic was present, whereas the creation of a corresponding (a) #V(..)#, (c) #P(P₂₋₃)V(..)# and (e) #N(P₁₋₃)V(..)# was a later development entailing the extrapolation of new initial forms without enclitic by simply emptying the enclitic slot of existing initial forms containing enclitics. The posited restriction on the placement of enclitics was, of course, no more than a projection of the usage actually observable in Old Irish and Old or Middle Welsh (see I.1.9 and I.2.1) back to a shared Insular Celtic stage but obviously begged a 'chicken or egg' type of question as to whether the restriction on enclitics triggered the generalisation of an initial verbal complex or *vice versa*.

Eska (1994, 8-9) summarises this basic line of argument as follows: 'WATKINS attributed the development of VSO configuration to a generalisation of the

proto-Indo-European marked configuration, which was largely motivated by VENDRYES' restriction (1911-1912; amended by DILLON 1943), whereby possible hosts for second-position clitics (most importantly, and in practice, principally pronominal objects) were limited to simplex verbs, the first preverb of compound verbs, and certain other components of the verbal complex (conventionally called conjunct particles, among which are included negators, certain conjunctions, and the interrogative particles). This had the effect of pinning simplex verbs and the first preverb of compound verbs to clause-initial position whenever a clitic pronominal object or relative pronoun was present in the clause, which, of course, one would expect to occur in the majority of clauses within a given discourse.... Sometime thereafter semantic/morphological univerbation shifted the verbal base of compound verbs leftwards (and changes in stress relationships would eventually lead to the formation of the verbal complex as a single phonological word). Finally, simple and compound verbs not hosting a pronominal clitic also moved to the head of the clause on the model of those which did, resulting in a generalised verb-initial configuration of the clause'. Eska (1994, 32) himself duly concludes 'that it was VENDRYES' Restriction... which was largely responsible for the generalisation of a verb-fronting rule in Insular Celtic, and that VENDRYES' Restriction should be described, at least synchronically, as characterised by a feature which required the verb to host clitic pronominal objects syntactically'. However, his contention (Eska, 1994, 25-28) that this restriction goes back as far as a 'nuclear Celtic' phase shared by Insular Celtic and Gaulish to the exclusion of Celtiberian (Eska, 1994, 13-14) is based upon examples that are too few and too doubtful to justify such a bold conclusion.

Support for the chronological priority of the restriction on enclitics was sought in the fact that it also applied to the arguably (but probably not) archaic 'Bergin' and 'tmesis' constructions involving non-initial verbs in certain Old Irish literary genres (see the examples and discussion in 2.1 above). A combination of this scenario with the continuing application of Wackernagel's Law would have resulted in an alternation between #NE...(P)V#, PE...(P)V# and #VE....# on the one hand and #...(N)(P[P])V# on the other that no longer had anything to do with marking for topic but was automatically conditioned by the presence or absence of an enclitic or enclitics in second position. Given the frequent occurrence of enclitics, the former set was probably at least as common as the latter and the same will have been true of an initial in relation to a non-initial verbal complex, once univerbation to #NE(P)V...# and #PE(P)V...# had taken place. All that is then required to reach the stage attested in Old Irish (I.1.9) and Old Welsh (I.2.1) is generalisation of the initial variants even where no enclitic was present to yield #N(E)(P)V...#, #P(E)(P)V...# and #V(E)...#. This development could be plausibly ascribed to natural pressure towards a single basic position for the verb coupled with an equally understandable desire to keep enclitic

connectives such as **k^we* ‘and’, **de* ‘and, but’ or relative **(y)o* (see VI.1.2-4) as close to the beginning of their clause or sentence as possible (cf. Watkins, 1963, 40).

An alternative avenue is presented by a consideration of C(onjunct particles) in general and N(egatives) in particular. It is unclear how many members of this class in Old Irish (see I.1.2-3) had direct Insular Celtic antecedents. In the almost certain event that *no* is cognate with the initial connective *nu* ‘now, and’ in Hittite as argued cogently by Watkins (1963, 13-16), a regularly initial *##*nu(E)...(P?)V#* will have existed in Insular Celtic, various restrictions having then presumably been placed upon its use (see *GOI* 348 and I.1.6-7) in the long intervening period between this and Old Irish. Insular Celtic interrogatives such as **k^wuss* ‘how far?’ (< **k^wuts*; see McCone, 1993b, on the corresponding indefinite) underlying OIr. *co* ‘how (far)?’ and the **k^wis* or **k^wē* (< **k^wei*) underlying OIr. *ci* and *ce*, *cía* (I.1.2; MW leniting *pwy* < **k^wē*, OIr. *ce*, *cía* apparently < **k^wēs* with *-s* acquired by analogy from nom. sg. **k^wis*; see *GOI* 282) should also normally have occupied a stressed initial position reserved for the topic or focus of the sentence (a feature that presumably accounts for the PIE opposition between accented interrogative **k^his*, **k^hid* and the corresponding unaccented indefinite **k^his*, **k^hid* (see III.3.2). In this respect it is worth noting that ‘the question words of Rigvedic Sanskrit show a strong tendency to occupy the first position in their clause (Delbrück, 1888: 24)’ (Hale, 1987b, 38). A pattern *##C(E)...(P.)V#* thus presumably existed in Insular Celtic and this brings us to the behaviour of the negative.

Watkins (1963, 39-40) has argued cogently that a deuterotonic pattern such as OIr. *do(-s):beir* ‘gives (them)’ arose from *##*to(-sus)-béret...#* < *##*tó(-sus)-béret...#* by a rule destressing the first of two closely connected stressed elements such as copula plus predicate (2.1 above) or preposition plus noun (I.3.6), and that the contrast between this and the likes of prototonic *-tabair* < **-tó-beret* with single stress was due to univerbation of ‘tmesis’ *##*tó(-sus)...béret#* having taken place after the application of single initial stress to contiguous preverb(s) plus verb in *##...tó-beret#* and so on. The invariable proclisis of OIr. negative(s) (I.1.2) seen in *ní(-s):beir*, *ní(-s):tabair* etc. with *##N(E)(P.)V...#* is then most straightforwardly derived by similar univerbation from a generalised ‘tmesis’ type *##N(E)...(P.)V#* in or before Insular Celtic that can be subsumed under the already discussed *##C(E)...(P.)V#* likewise univerbated to *##C(E)(P.)V...#* (e.g. OIr. *no-s:beir...*, *cía:tabair...?*). If so, however, this would be an innovation not only in relation to PIE (with topicalised *##N(E)...(P)V#* versus *##(E)...N(P)V#* according to 1.2 above) but also in relation to Proto-Celtic on the evidence of Celtiberian *##...NV#* and *##NE...#* in 2.2c/e above (cf. apparent instances of *N(P.)V* and *N..V* in Gaulish; *LG* 146 and 162). The question, then, is how this might have come about.

Given that N, if present, was the element fronted in order to topicalise or focus the verbal expression as a whole (see 1.8 and 1.2), #N(E)...(P)V# was presumably rather more frequent in relation to #.(E)...(P)V# than either #V(E)...# or #P(E)...V# in relation to #.(E)...V# and #.(E)...(P)V# respectively. This contention is borne out by the statistics for Old Indic in the table in 1.3 above. To this may be added evidence for an automatic topic or focus position of the negative (as well as various interrogative elements) supplied by two non-Indo-European languages known to the present writer. Although unrelated to each other, Basque and Hungarian (on which latter see Rounds, 2001, 254-265), have similar systems of focus whereby the constituent so treated is placed directly before the finite verb, such placement being automatic in the case of an interrogative or a negative: e.g. Hungarian (*én*) *tanár vagyok* ‘I am a teacher’, (*én*) *itt vagyok* ‘I am here’ but *én vagyok tanár* ‘I am a teacher’, *én vagyok itt* ‘I am here’ in response to actual or implied *ki tanár?* ‘who (is) a teacher?’, *ki van itt?* ‘who is here?’ (Rounds and Sólyom, 2002, 32-3), Basque *Jon irakaslea da* ‘John is a teacher’, *Jon hemen dago* ‘John is here’, *Jon Bilbon ikusi dut* ‘I have seen John in Bilbao’ but *Jon da irakaslea* ‘John is a teacher’, *Jon dago hemen* ‘John is here’, *Jon ikusi dut Bilbon* ‘I have seen John in Bilbao’ in response to actual or implied *nor da irakaslea?* ‘who is a teacher?’, *nor dago hemen?* ‘who is here?’, *nor ikusi duzu Bilbon?* ‘whom have you seen in Bilbao?’ (Zubiri, 2000, 623-32). As just mentioned, the negative regularly stands directly before the verb, attracting a finite auxiliary in Basque (Zubiri, 2000, 632-5) and like any other focussed element displacing a pre-or coverb (such as *be* ‘into’) in Hungarian: e.g., Hungarian (*én*) *nem vagyok tanár* ‘I am not a teacher’, *nem megyek be a szobába* ‘I am not going into the room’ (declarative *bemegyek a szobába* ‘I am going into the room’ or, in response to *hova megy?* ‘where are you going?’ or the like, *a szobába megyek be*; Rounds and Sólyom, 2002, 127-8), Basque *Jon ez da irakaslea* ‘John is not a teacher’, *Jon ez dago hemen* ‘John is not here’, *ez dut Jon Bilbon ikusi* ‘I have not seen John in Bilbao’.

A combination of statistical considerations with the typological plausibility of automatic topicalisation/focus of a negative thus makes invariable #N(E)...(P)V# subsequently univerbated to #N(E)(P)V...# an eminently reasonable postulate for Insular Celtic. If this is conceded, #C(E)(P)V...# (including #N(E)(P)V...#) becomes a likely trigger for generalisation of an initial verbal complex, with or without a prior rule restricting the attachment of enclitics to part of the verbal expression. In this respect attention is again to be drawn to attraction of the verb by the negative (usually placed after an overt subject or otherwise at the beginning of a main clause) and clause-initial interrogatives in Basque, which can be seen in various examples above and further illustrated by *Jon atso ikusi nuen* ‘I saw John yesterday’ versus *noiz ikusi zenuen Jon?* ‘when did you see John?’ and *ez nuen Jon atso ikusi* ‘I didn’t see John yesterday’ or *orain etxera doa* ‘(s)he is going home now’ versus *nora doa orain?*

‘where is (s)he going now?’ and *ez doa etxera orain* ‘(s)he isn’t going home now’.

Eska (1994, 11-12) doubts whether tmesis of P(E) and V survived long enough in Celtic to play the role envisaged above, but his analysis of Celtiberian *iom asekati* as containing unverbated initial PV is far from convincing (see 2.2 above) and anyway would prove nothing with regard to Insular Celtic. In his view (Eska, 1994, 30) ‘the ability of preverbs to serve as hosts to infixes is a secondary development adopted after the model of **to*, which is the most ubiquitous of preverbs in Insular Celtic, but originally was a sentential connective (cf. OHitt. *ta*)’. If so, #PE(P₂₋₃)V(...)# in the right-hand column above would presumably be a replacement of #P(P₂₋₃)VE(...)# beside #P(P₂₋₃)V(...)# on the analogy of #CE(P₁₋₃)V(...)# beside #C(P₁₋₃)V(...)# (where C = **to* in the first instance). This, however, is not only needlessly uneconomical in view of the good comparative evidence for #P(E)(.)V(..)# as a feature of Proto-Indo-European (see 1.7 above) but also depends upon the functionally problematical equation of the Insular Celtic preverb **to* with the Old Hittite sentence connective *ta* advocated by Dillon (1962) and Watkins (1963, 13-14) but questioned in IV.1.3c below.

3.1. It seems reasonable to seek a connection between the just discussed rise of unmarked VSO patterns and the much discussed problem of the Insular Celtic verb’s development of certain morphological peculiarities, notably the absolute versus conjunct inflectional dichotomy in simple verbs (I.1.2-3) and the lack of historically regular lenition after the proclitic (or pretonic) first preverb of basically initial deuterotonic compound verbs (I.1.4). The latter contrasts with the expected mutation not only after a corresponding preposition in proclisis before a noun but also in the corresponding non-initial prototonic form and crucially even in the deuterotonic form after an initial preverb plus enclitic: e.g., deut. *do:claid* ‘digs up’ < **to-kládet* versus prot. *-to-chlaid* < **tó-χladēθ* < **tó-kladet* and deut. plus infix *d-a:chlaid* ‘digs it up’ < **t-e-χladēθ* < **to-e(d)-kládet* or deut. *fo:tlen* ‘removes’ < **wo-tlinat* versus prot. *-fo-thlann* < **wó-θlinaθ* < **wó-tlinat* and prep. + noun *fo thalam* ‘under (the) earth’ < **wo θálamon* < **wo tálamon*. Furthermore, elements such as *as* ‘out of’ < **eks* or *con* ‘with’ < **kom* with an old final consonant or cluster normally liable to loss at the end of a word duly lose this as proclitic prepositions but surprisingly retain it as pretonic preverbs, as can be seen by contrasting the first preverbs of the deuterotonic verbal forms *con:beir* ‘conceives’ and *as:beir* ‘says’ with the corresponding prepositions in the phrases *co céill* /co ge:L’/ ‘with sense’ and *a abail* /a haβΘL’/ ‘out of an apple tree’. A third problem is presented by the unstressed or enclitic object pronouns suffixed to independent simple verbs under certain circumstances but otherwise infixes by attachment to a conjunct particle or a pretonic preverb (I.1.6) in accordance with Wackernagel’s Law dictating second position in the sentence after

what in PIE terms would have been the initial stressed constituent. A pretonic preverb with old final vowel again fails to lenite a number of these as expected in a main clause, whereas the pronouns themselves generally do cause historically regular mutation of what follows. Thus *do-s:mbeir* ‘brings her/it(f.)’ < **to-sim:beret* displays historically regular nasalisation after the pronoun but resistance of *-s-* to expected loss by lenition via /h/ (whence, say, devoicing of *b* to *p* prior to loss in prototonic *-imp-ai* versus deuterotonic *imm:soí* ‘turns round’ < **imb:soí*). By contrast, the enclitic sentence connective **k^we* ‘and’ seen in *na-cha:ta-bair* ‘which does not bring her/it(f.)’ < **ne-χ^we-hin:to-bereh* < **ne-k^we-sim:to-beret* ‘and (s)he does not bring’ not only causes the expected loss of *-s-* but itself undergoes historically regular lenition to *ch* after negative *ne*.

Features such as these have led a number of scholars, most comprehensively and notably Boling (1972) and Cowgill (1975) respectively, to posit the generalisation of a consonant-final enclitic particle such as **es* in Insular Celtic declarative main clauses lacking an enclitic connective such as **k^we* ‘and’ or **de* ‘and, but’. Since such an element would have conformed to Wackernagel’s Law, it should have been attached to an initial simple verb but otherwise to a regularly initial conjunct particle or to the first preverb of an independent compound verb just like *E* in the patterns in I.1.9. Hence *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ < **béret-es* with the predicted absolute ending versus *do:beir* ‘brings’ < *#*to-(e)s-béret* and *as:beir* ‘says’ < *#*eχs-es-béret...#* with the predicted conjunct ending as well as historically regular non-lenition or retained final consonant respectively on the part of the pretonic preverb. Moreover, since a sentential enclitic of this type would normally precede an enclitic pronoun as in the case of **ne-k^we-sim* above, the presence of this particle would account for the otherwise problematical non-lenition of various suffixed and infixated pronouns as in the case of *beirth-ius...#* ‘bears them’ < **béret-es-sus* or *do-s:beir* ‘brings them’ < **to-(e)s-sus-béret*. The panoply of this putative particle’s applications may be summarised as follows in relation to the patterns in I.1.9.

#V-es(-E)(A) ...#	e.g. <i>#*beret-es...#</i>	>	<i>#beirid(-som)...#</i>
	e.g. <i>#*beret-es-sus...#</i>	>	<i>#beirthius(-som)...#</i>
#P-es(-E):V(A) ...#	e.g. <i>#*to-’s kladet...#</i>	>	<i>#do:claid(-si)...#</i>
	e.g. <i>#*to-’s-sin kladet...#</i>	>	<i>#do-s:claid(-si)...#</i>
#P-es(-E):P ₂ (P ₃₋₄)V(A)...#	e.g. <i>#*eχs-es in-gabit...#</i>	>	<i>#as:in-gaib(-side)...#</i>
	e.g. <i>#*eχs-de-sus in-gabit...#</i>	>	<i>#-a-ta:ingaib(-sidi)...#</i>
#C-es(-E):V(A) ...#	e.g. <i>#*nu-’s-tu karāt...#</i>	>	<i>#no-t:chara(-su)...#</i>
#no-(e)s-E:V(A)...#	e.g. <i>#*nu-’s-mu beret...#</i>	>	<i>#no-m:beir(-se)...#</i>

3.2. At first sight, an enclitic **es* generalised in main clauses in the manner just

described looks like a veritable panacea for the various formal problems documented in 3.1 but first impressions can prove deceptive, as will emerge in 3.3 below. That said, the first question to be addressed is the thorny one of the putative particle's identity.

(a) Dillon (1943; cf. *VKG* II 343 and *GOI* 361-3) proposed a 3sg. nom. masc. enclitic anaphoric pronoun **es* (or **is*) cognate with the Hittite (en)clitic animate subject pronoun *aš* seen in *n-aš:aki* 'he dies' etc. If so, this form must somehow have been generalised in Insular Celtic to all three genders and persons as well as to the plural from the singular. This hypothetical development might be compared with the generalisation of an originally 3sg. masc. personal pronoun as a verbal particle *fe* in Modern Southern Welsh (see I.2.2), although it must be remembered that the neuter otherwise most prone to evolve into some sort of adverb or particle (see Boling's thesis in b below) had been lost in the British branch but retained in Old Irish from Insular Celtic and beyond. A fatal blow has been dealt to this anyway improbable approach by Garrett's (1996) conclusive demonstration that there simply was no PIE enclitic **es* or **is* for Celtic to inherit. To begin with, 'the Indo-European proto-language is traditionally assumed to have had accusative and dative pronouns positioned by Wackernagel's Law, but no corresponding subject pronouns (Brugmann 1911:392-95). This reconstruction is based on the agreement of the most archaic Indo-European languages outside Anatolian and is bolstered by a well-known functional consideration. Languages like the archaic Indo-European languages do not "need" overt unemphatic subject pronouns, since their inflected verbs already express most of the information such pronouns would convey. Verbal subject agreement and clitic object pronouns in other words play complementary functional roles. Yet the Anatolian languages innovated a set of clitic subject pronouns while retaining a robust verbal agreement system' (Garrett, 1996, 85). The innovation in question is linked to the existence in Hittite of 'two intransitive verb classes: an unaccusative class of verbs whose subjects are or come to be in a state or location; and an unergative class. Comparable split intransitivity systems are well attested cross-linguistically. Hittite unaccusative verbs select the perfect auxiliary "be".... and other verbs select the perfect auxiliary "have". This too is typologically commonplace, and the Hittite auxiliary system is unrelated to similar systems elsewhere. More striking is the effect of unaccusativity on clitic distribution. Unaccusative verbs require subject clitics in the appropriate morphological and pragmatic contexts, whereas unergative and transitive verbs do not permit them' (Garrett, 1996, 125; cf. García Castillero, 2001/2, 260-1). It would thus be necessary to suppose that an enclitic nominative anaphoric pronoun for which there is no tangible evidence outside Anatolian was created in Celtic for no obvious reason and that the masc. sg. form thereof was then quite improbably generalised, regardless of the person, gender or number referred to. Cowgill (1975, 54

and 56; so too Boling, 1972, 84) understandably discounted a 3sg. m. enclitic pronoun **es* or **is* as the source of his particle.

Dunkel (2004, 127) has suggested that Insular Celtic enclitic **(e)s* might be ‘a very conservative feature of these dialects’ by virtue of continuing an early PIE ‘resultative’ particle **es* posited by him in what he terms an ‘unabashedly speculative study’ (2004, 117). Even if the case for this PIE particle were accepted, its survival as a fully functional enclitic in Celtic would be hard to envisage, while its apparent absence from Continental Celtic but virtual generalisation in Insular Celtic main clauses would be highly problematical, not least because of a serious discrepancy in the latter between allegedly more or less general main-clause **(e)s* and its supposedly original resultative sense.

(b) In what remains the fullest exposition of the range of problems that a generalised particle can be invoked to solve, Boling (1972, 80-81) opted for **ed*, a petrified neuter singular demonstrative also found as an enclitic sentence particle *íd* in Old Indic. This, of course, is a far less problematical postulate than the foregoing from a syntactic and semantic point of view, especially since the subsequent appearance of Gaulish *buetid* and *de-uor-buetid* with what looks very much like *-(i)d* suffixed to a 3sg. *buet(i)* (see III.3.2). That said, insuperable formal difficulties beset **ed* (see Schrijver, 1997, 51-63 on the PIE pronominal stem **e-/i-* and generalisation of the *e-* variant thereof in Celtic with the result that inherited **id* became **ed*) and compelling grounds for rejecting its candidature are provided by the Old Irish 3sg. neut. sg. infixed pronoun *-a-*. This undoubtedly goes back to a preform **ed* but causes lenition (e.g. *d-a:chlaid* ‘digs it (n.) up’) on account of early reduction to **e* by loss of final *-d* (III.3.2). Clearly Boling’s particle should have undergone the same development, in which case it would have lost its principal *raison d’être*, namely the prevention of lenition. Boling’s suggestion (in a letter referred to by Cowgill, 1975, 56) that the particle might have behaved differently from the identical or near-identical pronoun with regard to phonologically regular loss of final *-d* in early Insular Celtic is nothing short of desperate. It comes up against the further problem (confronted and unconvincingly resolved by Boling, 1972, 85-6) that, if a form like relative *do-d:chlaid...* ‘who digs it(n.) up’ with 3sg. neut. class C infixed pronoun < **to-ǰ-e:χlaǰeθ* < **to-d(e)-e(d):kladet...* retained its *-d- /ǰ/* within the enclitic chain, it is difficult to see how a main-clause sequence **to-(i)d-e(d):kladet* containing Boling’s putative particle **ed* would have lost it to yield Old Irish *d-a:chlaid* with 3sg. neut. class A infixed pronoun rather than **do-d:chlaid*. Cowgill (1975, 55-6), then, rightly rejected Boling’s proposal after subjecting it to telling criticism along the above lines.

As far as methodology is concerned, it is patently absurd to attempt to solve perceived

historical phonological irregularities by invoking an otherwise invisible element that must then itself be supposed to have behaved in a phonologically irregular manner in order to explain some of the very anomalies that prompted its postulation in the first place. As we shall see, this fatal flaw attaches to all of the candidates proposed to date. It now seems to be generally agreed that the only remotely feasible shape for the proposed particle is a proximate **es* or **is*, at least as far as Old Irish is concerned. However, it has proved far more difficult, not to say impossible, to identify a viable source for it that does not call for unreasonable assumptions about certain aspects of Insular Celtic historical phonology.

(c) Cowgill (1975, 56-7) took a decisive step forward by postulating an early apocope of *-i* in Insular Celtic. Prior to this adherents of a general main-clause particle had been obliged to suppose that this had been, in effect, added to secondary endings throughout (e.g. OIr. 3sg. pres. **be(i)rid* < **beret-es* in 3.1 above) even in categories characterised by primary endings in PIE (e.g. Skt. 3sg. pres. *b^harati* < **b^hereti*; see III.1.1). This feature was then taken to be an archaism and related to the limited survival of so-called ‘injunctives’ without primary *-i* in Vedic Sanskrit. Nevertheless, it was difficult to see how a normal PIE primary/secondary opposition that applied fully even to Anatolian (see 1.4/7 above) could have failed to be developed by the precursor of Celtic or, if it did, why such non-distinctive forms as present injunctives should have prevailed over, say, present indicatives with distinctive primary endings rather than *vice versa* as in the other Indo-European sub-families. Cowgill’s hypothesis of early loss of final **-i* in Insular Celtic solved these problems at a stroke by deriving, say, OIr. 3sg. conj. pres. *-beir* < **beret* < **b^her-e-ti* (cf. Lat. *regit* ‘rules, directs’ < **reget* < **reg-e-ti* and so on) with a perfectly normal primary ending and *t*-pret. *-bert* < *s*-aor. **b^hēr-s-t* with a perfectly normal secondary ending in PIE terms. He was thus able to produce the first coherent explanation of the absolute/conjunct dichotomy in Insular Celtic that took as its starting point the standard PIE system of primary and secondary endings. As indicated in 3.1 above, absolute endings were then supposed to have been differentiated from conjunct counterparts by the addition of an enclitic particle of the shape *e/i*c to any declarative main-clause verb in Insular Celtic after the apocope, the continuing application of Wackernagel’s Law resulting in initial simple **beret-es*, **birt-es* (> OIr. 3sg. abs. pres. *berid*, *t*-pret. *birt*) etc. but otherwise C-*es*:(P)V or P-*es*:(P)V and so on with, say, conjunct *-beir*, *-bert* < **-beret*, **-birt*. Indeed, the posited particle seemed to Cowgill to have such formidable formal explanatory power when applied to a range of otherwise problematical features of the Old Irish verbal complex that the question of its function, semantics and basic identity was almost incidental: ‘True, I cannot now give a sure etymology for it, but I do not believe that that is sufficient reason for setting up ad hoc exceptions to well-established sound laws and ad hoc deletions of obligatory morphologic elements in order to explain the clear

testimony of our data' (Cowgill, 1975, 56). Nevertheless, the question of origins could hardly be ignored completely.

Cowgill (1975, 66-7 and 1975c, 32) himself was hesitantly inclined to favour an asseverative enclitic particle *es(s)* 'it is (so)' deriving from apocopated 3sg. copula **est* < **esti* that was generalised in declarative main clauses and consequently absent from imperatives (Cowgill, 1975, 65 and 1975c, 30-32) such as 2sg. *tochlaid* 'dig (up)!' < **tó-klade* (prototonic as opposed to 3sg. pres. ind. *do:claid* 'he digs (up)' allegedly < **to-es:kládet*) or 3pl. *tiagat* 'let them go' < **têgont* (as opposed to 3pl. pres. ind. *#tiag(a)it...#* 'they go' allegedly < **têgont-es*). This etymology has been accepted quite firmly by Kortlandt, (1979, 51-2 and 1994, 62) and with even greater conviction by Kim, who remarks (2002, 151) that 'the particle in question can only be the 3sg. copula **esti*'.

However, a problem is surely then posed by the need to posit this particle's presence in subjunctive forms that are every bit as non-declarative as the imperative, particularly in the light of Cowgill's (1975b, 32) claim that 'it would have been excluded from all or most subordinate clauses', which were the subjunctive's chief domain. This difficulty is particularly acute in general or future conditionals with *ma* 'if' plus an independent verb (i.e. with absolute endings if simple and in the deuterotonic form if compound, both resulting from the presence of a particle according to Cowgill and others) such as *ar-a:n-etatham-ni fochrici ma no-s:comalnammar* 'on account of which wh shall obtain rewards if we (should) fulfil them' (*Thes.* II 247.23-4, Cambrai Homily; cf. the general conditional from the same source in I.1.3 above). Containing as it does a patently non-declarative subjunctive, a hypothetical 'if' clause of this type seems a strange context indeed in which to employ a particle meaning 'it is (so)'.

Clearly one cannot have one's cake and eat it by excluding a supposedly asseverative particle from the imperative as a non-indicative mood but positing its presence in a subjunctive mood that was by definition non-asseverative (see now McQuillan, 2002). If so, the morphological features allegedly conditioned by the particle, notably a separate set of absolute endings and deuterotonic verbal forms, can only have been spread by analogy from the indicative to the subjunctive after the asseverative particle or its reflex had lost its basic meaning. In that case Kortlandt (1994, 61-2) is hoist by his own petard when making the following declaration: 'I cannot accept any theory which builds on an analogical differentiation between absolute and conjunct endings. If there was any interaction between the two sets of forms, the only result can have been the replacement of one by the other, as indeed happened in later Irish. The distinction between absolute and conjunct endings must originally have been motivated semantically, as morphological distinctions always are. After the loss of the

semantic element there can have been no such thing as the massive spread of a redundant morphological category'. In fact, loss of an inflectional distinction between absolute and conjunct endings was only more or less completed in Irish some thousand years after the beginning of the Old Irish period and the inherited distinction in endings still survives in erstwhile pres. but now fut. *beiridh* 'will bear' versus *cha bheir* 'will not bear' etc. in Scots Gaelic. Be that as it may, a subjunctive with conjunct endings would presumably have provided an excellent trigger for the elimination of 'a redundant morphological distinction' between absolute and conjunct inflection, as Kortlandt (1979, 35; cf. 1994, 62) terms it with some justice, instead of itself adopting it from the indicative by functionally unmotivated analogy.

A further difficulty, particularly for Kim's (2002, 107-8) invocation of a clefting construction comparable with the Sanskrit type *asty atra kāṃcid gām paśyasi* 'is it [that] you see here a certain cow?' (cf. Cowgill, 1975, 68, n. 22), resides in the fact that the actual copula only occupies Wackernagel position after a conjunct particle and is otherwise clause-initial, as in OIr. *ní maith in fer* 'the man is not good' < #**nīs matis...#* < #**ne-est(i) matis...#* but *is maith in fer* 'the man is good' < (for Cowgill) #**esti-(e)s(t) matis...#*.

As if this were not enough, virtually intractable formal obstacles also stand in the way of Cowgill's tentative proposal. The 3sg. copula forms of Irish (*is*) and British (e.g. MW *ys*) point unambiguously to the reconstruction of an Insular Celtic **issi* or the like that probably owes its vocalism to influence from the adjacent 2sg. and/or 3pl. but ultimately continues **essi* < **esti* by well attested Insular Celtic assimilation of *-st-* to *-ss-* (see McCone, 1995, 126). Since Cowgill (1985, 113) places generalisation of the particle before apocope of **-i*, this absolute form might be expected to derive from **esti-(e)st(i)* 'it is, it is (so)' and similarly OIr. 1sg. *am* < **emmi-(e)st(i)* 'I am, it is (so)', 3pl. *it* (MW *ynt*) < *(*s*)*inti-(e)st(i)* 'they are, it is (so)', which can then be supposed to have developed to **essi-s* > **essi-h* and so on like neg. **nīsti* > **nīst* > **nīss* > **nīs* > **nīh* > OIr. *ní* (non-leniting and prefixing /h-/ to a vowel). If so, the particle would also, surely, still have been unapocopated **esti* when placed after an initial preverb and this is enormously problematical in view of the undeniable fact that intervocalic *-ss-* from *-st-* was still retained as *-s(-)* in Old Irish, Old Welsh etc. It is thus impossible to incorporate Cowgill's particle straightforwardly into a derivation of, say, *d-a:chlaid* 'digs it (n.) up' (otherwise the perfectly regular outcome of **to-e(d):kladet* after the well-known early Insular Celtic loss of *-d*; e.g. McCone, 2003, 175-6), since the outcome should then have been **do-s:chlaid* < **to-(e)ssi-(e)(d):kladet*.

Even the arbitrary assumption that 'enclitic **esti* can well have been apocopated in

advance of other verbs' (Cowgill, 1975, 67) fails to improve matters significantly, since **ess-ess* (or **essi-(e)s(s)* if a non-enclitic initial copula was not yet apocopated) still yields OIr. *is*, MW *ys* etc. with retained *s* < intervocalic *-ss-* so that **do-s:chlaid* would still be the expected outcome of **to-(e)ss-e(d):kladet*. One might argue that apocopated **ess* had already become **es* subsequently lenited to **eh* by the time it was generalised as a particle in Insular Celtic main clauses (presumably after apocope of **-i*) but the fatal flaw remains because, if it had already been so simplified by the time of its alleged generalisation as a particle in main clauses, the combination with the third person singular copula itself would then have been **es-es*, which would then have undergone a development $> *eh-eh > *e-e(h) > *e$ and so could not possibly have yielded the attested Irish and British forms. Lenition of **-s(s)-* to *-h-* is required in order to generate an Old Irish form such as *d-a:chlaid* < **to-h-e:kladet* < **to-(e)s(s)-e(d):kladet*, but it is then necessary to assume that one and the same form had behaved differently as a 3sg. copula and as an affirmative particle i.e. in a historically regular manner in the former case but irregularly in the latter. That being so, this candidate is as unacceptable methodologically as the **ed* proposed by Boling (1972) and demolished by Cowgill (1975, 55-6) to such good effect, not least on the basis of doubts 'that morphosyntactic categories as such are normally part of the conditioning factors of sound changes' (Cowgill, 1975, 56).

The perforce *ad hoc* solution actually proposed by Cowgill ('**-s-t-* in 2. sg. like in **esiās tegas > a tech* 'her house', 1985, 117; see also Schrijver, 1997, 150) was that, once the particle had been incorporated into the verbal complex, a word boundary nevertheless occurred between it and a following enclitic with the result that **ess* uniquely became **es*, **eh* and so on within the enclitic chain by auslaut developments normal in the absence of a following enclitic. This proposal would, for instance, yield OIr. *do-t:beir* 'brings you' < **to-'h-tu:vereh* < **to-(e)s(s)-tu:beret* rather than the **do-s:beir* that would have arisen from the normal internal development of *-s-t-* to *-ss-* and similarly *beirth-iut* 'bears you' < **bereθ-e(h)-tu* < **beret-es-tu* rather than otherwise expected **beirth-ius*. Kortlandt's (1979, 36) alternative suggestion that the treatment here is due to the incorporation of a particle after Insular Celtic **-st-* > **-ss-* is untenable because certain British reflexes such as MW/MC *gwest* 'night's stay, sleeping, lodging, feast' (also OB *guest-* 'feast-') versus OIr. *fe(i)ss* 'spending the night, sleeping, feast' < **wes-(s)tā*, show that *st* was not invariably assimilated to *ss* in Insular Celtic. Schrijver (1995, 399-414) accounts for this puzzling situation by positing Ins. Celt. *-st-* > *-ss-* but *-sst-* > *-st-* (generally retained in British but > *-s(s)-* in Irish). However that may be, the crucial point for present purposes is that any *st* retained from Insular Celtic was subsequently assimilated to *ss* in Irish so that **to-(e)s(s)-tu* would still have become Prim. Ir. **to-ssu* > OIr. **do-s:* not **do-t:*.

Regardless, then, of whether a highly problematical anaphoric pronoun **es* or a scarcely less difficult enclitic **es(s)* ‘(it) is’ is invoked, it is necessary to accept the following extraordinary proposition: whereas a word boundary between the enclitic particle **es(s)* and a following enclitic in the chain rendered the former liable to auslaut rather than inlaut developments, there was no such boundary between **es(s)* itself and an initial preverb or verb with the result that the latter underwent the regular inlaut developments to be expected before a clitic attachment. However counter-intuitive, this discrepancy must be invoked in order to ‘explain’ forms such as the following: OIr. *as:beir* ‘says’ < **ess-eh:bereh* and not **a:beir* < **e(h)-e(h):bereh* with the same development as seen in preposition *a* ‘out of’ < **e(h)* < **ess* < **exs*; *is* ‘is’ < **iss-eh* and not **i* < **i(h)-e(h)*; *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ < *be(i)rith* < **bereθ-eh* < **beret-es* and not **bere* < **bere(h)-eh* as in conj. *-beir* < **bereh* < **bereθ* < **beret*; *beirthiut* ‘bears you’ above instead of **be(i)ret* < **bere(h)-e(h)-tu*. However, lack of a word boundary between preverb and particle should have resulted in OIr. *com:* < **kom-es* rather than actually attested *con:*, a difficulty that can admittedly be overcome by means of the *ad hoc* proposition that the particle was not generalised until final *-m* had become *-n* (so Schrijver, 1997, 150-1) in Insular Celtic or perhaps Gallo-Insular Celtic

In order to generate quite a few actually attested forms, then, currently available versions of the theory (except Kim’s; see d below) require acceptance of the curious notion that the putative enclitic particle produced word-internal rather than word-final developments on the boundary between it and a preceding major constituent (P or V) while itself undergoing word-final rather than expected word-internal developments on the boundary between it and another enclitic. This absurdly arbitrary proposition must surely be dismissed as a classic case of wanting to have one’s cake and eat it. Watkins (1963, 40) simply claimed that a ‘juncture’ after pretonic preverbs in main clauses impeded lenition of what followed them but this was hardly acceptable as a historical explanation unless some reason could be given for the emergence of this feature (McCone, 1979, 12-13). That, of course, is precisely what the particle theory seeks to do. Since, however, it can only make any progress towards this objective by positing an equally unexplained word boundary or ‘juncture’ between the alleged enclitic particle and a further enclitic, it turns out to make no significant advance upon Watkins’ position. Indeed, if a boundary or juncture must be accepted without a satisfactory explanation of how or why it arose, Occam’s razor clearly makes it preferable to swallow this without more ado rather than with the pointless additional incubus of an anyway problematical particle.

(d) Kim (2002) seems to envisage **(e)sti* as a particle undergoing regular inlaut developments (notably retention of **-i*) when followed by a further enclitic and then,

unlike the originally identical 3sg. pres. copula, early simplification of intervocalic *-ss-* > *-s-*, whence *-h-* > *-Ø-* as normal: ‘note that intervocalic **st* would have become **ss* in the prehistory of OIr.: cf. *is* ‘is’ < **esti* < **h₂esti*.... If the resulting geminate was simplified to **s* in pretonic position - certainly a very plausible and phonetically natural development - early enough, this new **s* could have participated in the weakening of intervocalic **s* > **h*’. Since, however, the independent copula is proclitic and had almost certainly become so by the same development as that leading to initial pretonic preverbs and proclitic conjunct particles (see 2.1 above), it too would have become **esi* > **ehi* etc. by this rule. Since this clearly did not happen, Kim’s position is rendered untenable and the only emergency exit available would be an *ad hoc* assumption of the type already criticised above, namely that **(e)ssi* behaved differently as particle and as 3sg. pres. copula just as Boling’s **ed* would perforce have done as particle and 3sg. neut. enclitic pronoun. Moreover, even if this special development of a particle **(e)ssi-* were granted, Kim’s (2002, 160) **ro-ssi-me/-te*, **ro-ssi-sus* etc. (*ro* as a typical vowel-final preverb + 1/2 sg., 3pl. enclitic object pronoun respectively) could not possibly have yielded OIr. *ro-m(m)/-t*, *ro-s* etc. as he claims, but would surely have resulted in *ra-m/-d*, *ra* < **rē-μ/-θ*, **rē* < **roi-μ/-θ*, **roi(h)* < **rohi-μe/-θe/-huh* (cf. Schrijver, 1997, 150, and 3sg. m./n. **ro-s(s)-en* > **ro-h-en* > **roe(n)* > OIr. *ra* according to Kim himself, 2002, 164).

The fundamental problem is that, if the vowel of an **(e)ssi*, **(e)ti* or the like generalised in main clauses were retained before a following enclitic as one would expect, it would not only regularly have lenited the initial consonant of a following object pronoun but would also have left no significant context (given that class C in relative clauses almost certainly contained **de* prefixed to the pronoun; Watkins, 1963, 26-8) in which the actually attested unlenited forms could have arisen. Kim’s own (2002, 163) derivation of OIr. *ro-m(m)/-t/-s* etc. from his chosen preforms via allegedly normal Prim. Ir. syncope of **rohi-μe/-θe/-huh* > **roh-μe/-θe/-huh* is impossible because this was undoubtedly preceded by the Prim. Ir. apocope, which would have yielded dissyllabic **rohi-μ/-θ/-h* no longer liable to syncope. Moreover, even if an utterly implausible special early syncope before the apocope were posited here, **roh-μe/-θe/-huh* still could hardly have yielded **ro-m/-t/-s* as Kim supposes rather than **ro-μ/-θ/-Ø* by later loss of *-h(-)* (see Kim, 2002, 164, n. 24 for justified doubts as to whether **ro-ssus* < **ro-sisus* is chronologically feasible), since this was typically preceded by devoicing but not by delentition on the clear evidence of forms like *degaid* ‘(seeking) after’ < **de-hy’iθ* < **de* + **sagiti-*, *fochaid* ‘trying, tribulation’ < **wo-hy’iθ* < **wo* + **sagiti-*, *fothae* ‘foundation’ < **wo-hǫ’e* < **wo-sodyom* (cf. Lat. *sub-sidium*). Although these are by no means the only problems confronting Kim’s account (see V.1.3), they surely suffice to demonstrate that **esti*, **eti* or the like cannot function at all without the crutch of the already criticised assumption that they

were subject to auslaut rather than inlaut developments in combination with a further enclitic.

3.3. Having disposed of primary **-i* by apocope, Cowgill (1975) deduced that its striking formal compatibility with a number of Old Irish absolute endings was chimerical and that it could not have been responsible for differentiating them from the corresponding conjunct endings in Insular Celtic. Quite simply, if OIr. pres. ind. 3sg. conj. *-beir* ‘bears’ derived from **-bereti* via regularly apocopated **beret*, the corresponding absolute *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ could not come directly from **bereti* and must rather be the result of adding an as yet unspecified monosyllabic element beginning with a front vowel *e* or *i* to already apocopated present **beret*, unmodified preterite **birt* and so on as at the end of 3.1 above. Be that as it may, Cowgill’s article marks a watershed in the discussion of the problems at issue and, one way or the other, has constituted a pivot on which subsequent contributions have turned. It constitutes the basis of Kim’s (2002) approach to the Old Irish class A and B infixed pronouns and proposed modifications of a more radical nature have tended to fall under one or other of the following broad headings.

(a) **Acceptance of the asseverative particle **es(s)* but rejection of the Insular Celtic apocope of *-i*** (Kortlandt, 1979, 1982 and 1994). Kortlandt’s solution was based on the view, also entertained by some other scholars (notably Watkins, 1969), that two largely different sets of endings used with thematic and athematic verbs were inherited from PIE into Celtic. He then supposed that the generally reconstructed athematic endings and his own particular reconstructions of the peculiar thematic endings were ultimately reorganised into the Insular Celtic conjunct and absolute endings with the help of Cowgill’s particle. Cowgill (1985, 109-110) delivered the following verdict: ‘Kortlandt... accepts the particle **-(e)s* but rejects loss of **-i*, replacing it with his view that Proto-Indo-European thematic verbs had personal endings very different from those of athematic verbs, and supposes that the Irish 3rd sg. absolute ending /*δ*’/ represents generalization of the PIE athematic form, while the conjunct ending (in effect zero) represents generalization of the PIE thematic form. McCone, *Ériu* 33, 18-23, has very ably shown that the analogic leveling required by Kortlandt’s view, in which thematic verbs adopt the athematic ending when followed by **-(e)s* and athematic verbs adopt the thematic ending when not followed by **-(e)s*, is altogether unlikely; McCone has also cast well-justified doubt on Kortlandt’s evidence from outside Celtic for a PIE difference between thematic and athematic endings outside the 1st sg. primary active. In the paper which I presented this morning, published in the *Akten* of this Fachtagung [Cowgill, 1985b], I have tried to show even more definitively that there is no good evidence anywhere for a PIE difference between thematic and athematic endings (outside the one case of the 1st sg. primary

active). For Celtic, see that paper, and note especially that as Meid has shown, *Études Celtiques* 13, 1972, 346-352, some Old Irish thematic 3rd sg. conjunct presents of roots ending in dental stops actually contain a relic of the **t* of the ending, i.e. the PIE thematic ending preceded by *-e-*, e.g. *tadbat* ‘shows’ < Prim. Ir. **t-ad-wēd-et.* These and other equally major difficulties confronting Kortlandt’s view will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter (esp. III.1.3.1 and III.1.7)

(b) Acceptance of the Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* but rejection of the particle (McCone, 1979, 1979c, 1982, and 1985b; Sims-Williams, 1984; Koch, 1987; Isaac, 1993 and 2000). The opinions of Koch and Isaac are considered briefly in 3.5 below. The linchpin of the present writer’s argument was the effect exercised upon the position of the verbal complex in Insular Celtic (see 2.4 above) by a hypothesised restriction on the placement of enclitics (termed ‘Vendryes’ restriction’ and accorded a particularly prominent role by Sims-Williams, 1984, 167-9 and 175-9) in combination with pressures towards univerbation. This approach was criticised as follows by Cowgill (1985, 110-111): ‘This involves him in a whole host of complicated analogic explanations, which I cannot deal with fully here. Limiting myself to the main points, I find first that his explanation of the difference between absolute *beirid* and conjunct *·beir* is nearly as unlikely as Kortlandt’s. McCone thinks the absolute forms were originally those found before enclitics in clause initial, and the conjunct forms were those that occurred not before enclitics. At one time verbs occurred in clause initial only if followed by enclitics; when verbs not followed by enclitics came to be used clause-initial, these new clause-initial verbs took the pre-enclitic shape, rather than the shape already existing of verbs elsewhere in the clause not followed by enclitics. But there is no evidence for a period when verbs could occur clause-initial only if followed by an enclitic; and even if we grant that there was such a period, the more natural way of creating clause-initial verbs not followed by an enclitic was to use the already existing shape of non-initial verbs not followed by enclitics. McCone’s explanation for the lack of lenition in deuterotonic verb compounds with preverbs originally ending in a vowel is also weak. Here also he posits a prehistoric word-order pattern for which there is no other evidence, according to which both preverb and verb proper of compound verbs were clause-final unless there was an enclitic, in which case preverb plus enclitic were clause-initial and the verb proper was clause-final. It is much more likely that clause-initial was an allowed position for preverbs, whether followed by an enclitic or not, all the way from PIE to Old Irish. There is also no real evidence for a time when the verb proper of a compound verb could not appear second in its clause, immediately after the preverb (or preverb plus enclitic). And even granted the prehistoric word-order changes which McCone envisions, it is quite arbitrary to suppose, as he does, that indicatives and subjunctives of compound verbs without enclitic adopted the deuterotonic accent

pattern so as not to differ in accentuation from the forms with enclitics, while imperatives without enclitics adopted prototonic accent so as to be maximally different from the present indicatives - inter alia, if the Irish of that time had really been striving to rationalize accent patterns, they would have done something about the forms after conjunct particles, so as to obviate alternations of the type *do·sluindi* ‘denies’, *ní·díltai* ‘does not deny’. (This indeed was done in Middle Irish, with the replacement in all but the most frequent verbs of *do·sluindi* etc. by *díltaid* etc., the alternation between absolute and conjunct endings being, evidently, much easier to manage than that between proto- and deuterotonic accentuation). The complex interplay of analogic remodellings and levelings which McCone needs to get the attested shapes of pretonic preverbs and infixes is quite unnecessary, once one admits the particle *-(e)s after pretonic preverbs and sets up the Primitive Irish infixes in their correct shapes, especially the 1st and 2nd plurals **nos*, *vos*’.

These and other issues will be reserved for detailed discussion in chapters III and IV below, which will offer a somewhat modified version of the hypothesis advanced a couple of decades ago by the present writer. Among other things this will seek to remedy one obvious defect of the earlier version, namely the need to ascribe its final stage, the generalisation of initial verbs without attached enclitic (see 2.4 above), to ‘parallel innovation in two similar languages in contact’ (McCone, 1979, 21) after the separation of Irish and British. This deficiency is even more evident in Sims-Williams’ contribution (see III.1.6.2 for further discussion and III.1.7 for a similar objection to Kortlandt’s account): ‘The Brittonic evidence does not require us to reconstruct a double system of inflexion for Common Celtic or for a hypothetical Celtic dialect such as ‘Insular Celtic’ or ‘northwestern Celtic’, nor even to invoke (with McCone 1979: 21) contact between Irish and British. I hope to show that the Brittonic and Irish systems may be independent results of various shared structural features, such as the infixation and suffixation of particles and pronouns (especially, I shall argue, proleptic object pronouns), and various shared syntactical tendencies which are far from peculiarly Insular Celtic - tendencies, for instance, towards the univerbation of compound verbs and towards VSO word-order’ (Sims-Williams, 1984, 147). Since the processes envisaged were relatively complex and hardly inevitable, considerations of economy provide strong grounds for preferring a hypothesis entailing their basic completion just once during a shared ancestral phase over alternatives relying to a greater or lesser extent upon the coincidence of independent parallel developments or the like.

(c) Acceptance of both apocope and particle in principle but an attempt to find a better candidate for the latter in the shape of **et(i)* ‘and’ (Schrijver, 1994, and 1997, 131-82, followed by Schumacher, 1999, 461-2, and *KPV* 97-114). This

proposal has been subjected to some telling criticisms by Kim (2002, 155-6) and will be discussed in detail in chapter V below. Suffice it to say here by way of anticipation that in this case reasonably apposite semantics must be purchased at the unacceptably high price of even more formal difficulties than usual, some of them shared with **es* etc. above and others, including its securely inferred status in Celtic and Indo-European as a stressed initial connective and not an enclitic, peculiar to **eti* itself.

3.4.1. Since the grounds for the *ad hoc* postulate of a generalised main-clause particle are simply and solely to provide a blanket explanation for a range of phonetic problems, it must stand or fall by its efficiency in this area. On inspection it creates at least as many problems as it purports to solve, as the discussion in 3.2 above should have demonstrated (see also McCone, 1979c, 2-10; 1985b, 262-5). It remains to note a particularly serious problem, namely the late seventh-century elision of the pretonic preverbs *to*, *fo* and *ro* before a stressed vowel. A straightforward approach to the evidence (McCone, 1979c, 4-10) indicates that independent prototonic forms of compound verbs with *to*, *ro* or *fo* followed by a vowel must be due to a typologically natural elision of the preverb's vowel not long before pretonic *to* became *do* around 700 AD (McCone, 1979c, 5 and 7-8): e.g., *to:ic* > OIr. *t'ic* 'comes', *to:air-chain* > *t'air-chain* 'prophesies', *ro:ic* > *r'ic* 'reaches', *fo:á-caib* > *f'á-caib* 'leaves'. This elision would, however, have been blocked in main clauses if these had contained the particle's predicted outcome *-h-* between a proclitic and a following vowel (e.g., **/to híg'/* < **to-(e)s(...)inket*). Consequently the elided prototonic forms in question constitute proof positive that main clauses cannot have contained any such element and the onus is firmly upon adherents of a particle to come up with an explanation of what for them is a serious anomaly.

Cowgill (1985, 111 and 118) could do no better than suggest that forms like *tic* 'comes' might be due to the absence of his main-clause particle in circumstances that he could not specify with confidence. Kortlandt's (1982, 76-7, and 1994, 63-4) approach was to claim that early internal loss of *-h-* between vowels also applied across a word boundary and that analogical restoration after the prevocalic elision of *to*, *ro* and *fo* was responsible for the regular presence of /h/ < *-s*. For instance, instead of being the direct outcome of a derivation < **ehyāh* < **esyās*, the *h-* prefixed to a vowel by OIr. non-leniting *a* 'her' (as opposed to leniting *a* 'his' < **ehya* < **esyō*) would perforce be due to analogical influence from a form such as *a* 'out of' (unlen. C-, hV-) < **eh* < **es(s)* < **exs* with a later *-h*. This is not only breathtakingly uneconomical but is also close to impossible in the light of forms such as OIr. *int én* 'the bird' < **ind hēn* < **inda heθna* < **indos etnos*, OIr. *int súil* 'the eye' < **ind hūl'* < **indā hūli(h)* < **indā sūlis*, OIr. *-impai* 'turns' < **imb-how'* < **æmbi-howeh* <

**ambi-sowet*. The synchronically irregular voiceless stop of these and other forms cannot possibly be due to analogy and must, therefore, be the result of devoicing by an *-h-* present at the time of the Primitive Irish apocope (in the case of the first two examples) and the subsequent syncope (in the case of the third), which are usually dated to c. 500 AD and c. 550 AD respectively. Even in the most unlikely event that this *-h-* been lost and then restored by analogy before the apocope, as Kortlandt's chronology demands, it would still have impeded the appreciably later elision responsible for independent *tic* etc. Otherwise loss of *h* on such boundaries between vowels à la Kortlandt could only have occurred in the century or so between the roughly mid-sixth-century syncope and the late seventh-century elision, only for *h* to be restored by analogy in numerous contexts almost immediately afterwards.

Schrijver (1997, 123, n. 1) voices different doubts from the above about the viability of Kortlandt's approach and then seeks (1997, 122-9 and 151) to provide the evanescent particle with an alternative but equally makeshift life-support system along the lines adumbrated by Cowgill, namely by identifying conditions under which his **et(i)* 'and' might have been omitted in main clauses. His first suggestion is that independent forms such as *tic* 'comes, arrives', *ric* 'reaches' and *fácaib* 'leaves' might be accounted for by the incompatibility of his particle with their 'telic' nature on the entirely *ad hoc* assumption that '**eti* denoted that the verb formed part of a sequence of actions of which one action was completed (or broken off) before the next took place' (Schrijver, 1997, 125), a formulation that would seem to imply no more than an incompatibility between **eti* and a preceding non-telic verb. Be that as it may, there is no remotely obvious reason why a telic verb as such should not be combined with a connective 'and, after that' or the like as in the case of eminently reasonable sequences involving that most telic of verbs 'to die' such as 'he was playing football and died suddenly', 'he fell ill and (after that) died' or 'he died and (after that) went to heaven'. The high proportion of examples involving *tic* and *ric* need be due to no more than their status as the two commonest verbs of this shape (and, indeed, as two of the commonest verbs in Old Irish) but anyway the arbitrary exclusion of 'telic' verbs from the total in Würzburg (see the tables in Schrijver, 1997, 123-4) accounts for no more than 10 examples and there remain no less than 16 cases involving non-telic verbs such as *tairchain* 'prophesies'. 14 of these (beside 20 deuterotonic forms of such verbs in the same environment) fall victim to the quite different but equally *ad hoc* claim that precursors of frequently occurring Old Irish elements such as *nó* 'or', *ed ón* 'that is' (surely a literate creation corresponding to Latin *id est*) and *tra* 'then' originally precluded the particle and so were contracted at what for him was a relatively early prehistoric stage (Schrijver, 1997, 122). Even so, there remain a couple of examples that cannot be explained with the help of these convolutions (Schrijver, 1997, 126-8). Moreover, unlike the above explanation by means of elision,

none of these speculations accounts for the restriction of these protonic forms specifically to compounds with an initial preverb *to*, *ro* or *fo* followed by a vowel as opposed to a consonant. If they had any substance whatever, one would expect to find at least some independent prototonic forms of differently shaped telic verbs such as the extremely common *do:beir* ‘gives, brings, takes’, *ad:cí* ‘sees’ or the quite well attested *do:lugi* ‘forgives’, not to mention a sprinkling of independent prototonic forms of compound verbs, whether telic or atelic, with a consonant-initial tonic portion after *nó*, *.i.* or *tra*. Needless to say, these are nowhere to be seen in Old Irish.

Here, then, we have yet another instance where a perfectly straightforward and economical explanation of an Old Irish phenomenon, in this case the utterly commonplace elision of one vowel before another to account for prototonic forms like *tic* ‘comes’ in main and leniting relative clauses, has to be abandoned in favour of something far more complicated and problematical for one reason alone, namely dogmatic insistence upon a near general main-clause particle. Since all available or conceivable versions of this approach are obliged to play fast and loose in varying degrees with phonetics, semantics and syntax, it is surely necessary to conclude that an enclitic particle **es(si)*, **et(i)* or the like is a mere phantom.

It remains to note that, expressed as a percentage (but omitting % for clarity of presentation), the proportion of independent prototonic/deuterotonic active (passive) forms of verbs with *do* < *to* followed by a stressed vowel in Wb. and Ml. is as follows (McCone, 1979, 6):

Leniting rel. clause: Wb. 87.5 (80) / 12.5 (20); Ml. 54 (28.5) / 46 (71.5)

Main clause: Wb. 58.3 (19.2) / 41.7 (80.8); Ml. 9.5 (90.5) / 90.5 (90)

Three obvious points emerge from these statistics: (i) there is an increase, typically quite massive, in the proportion of deuterotonic forms such as *do:adbat* ‘shows’ to independent prototonic forms such as *tadbat* ‘shows’ between Wb. and Ml., (ii) the prototonic type *tadbat* ‘who shows, which (s)he shows’ generally constitutes a higher proportion in leniting relative than in main clauses, and (iii) the deuterotonic type *do:adbadar* ‘(which) is shown’ generally scores better in the passive than in the active.

Each of these features can be accounted for quite straightforwardly (McCone, 1979, 7-10). Point (i) clearly indicates that the rapidly spreading deuterotonic forms were innovatory and hence analogical to the standard pattern seen in the non-imperative forms of the great majority of compound verbs with invariably deuterotonic independent *do:claid* (len. rel. *do:chlaid*) etc. Wb. would thus seem to be not far removed from a stage when only prototonic forms were found in both main and leniting relative clauses as a result of a regular elision of the vowel of *to* before another stressed vowel. This is to be dated around the end of the seventh century because it

must have preceded *t- > d-* before an unstressed vowel (*RChron.* 132-3) and no elided forms are attested in Early Old Irish sources, which show still unelided *tú:ercómlássat* ‘they have put together’, (Wb. 7a7, ‘prima manus’), *tu:asilbiu* ‘I set forth’ (*Thes.* I, 3, 8; Palatine no. 68), *tu:esmot* ‘who shed’ (*Thes.* II, 247, 19; Cambrai Homily). Since the first of these looks distinctly telic, it might be expected to be contracted on Schrijver’s account. So too might the third by virtue of standing in a relative clause without a supposed main-clause particle, but Schrijver’s complex account of relative markers (see VI.2.2-3) is invoked in order to explain it away: ‘uncontracted *tu:esmot* ‘who pour forth’ in the Cambrai Homily cannot be used as a counterargument against a prehistoric date for the contraction because it has a non-neuter subject (not object) antecedent and hence reflects **tu i̇ o eks-sem*, which in our theory regularly resulted in an uncontracted OIr. form’ (Schrijver, 1997, 122). Point (ii) can be ascribed to the fact that the new deuterotonic forms had hiatus between pretonic preverb and the stressed initial vowel of the rest of verb in leniting relative clauses but acquired a convenient hiatus filling /h/ in main clauses in accordance with the marked tendency of non-lenition of a consonant (as in *do:claid* etc.) to correlate with /h-/ before a vowel (e.g. OIr. *a tech* /a tɛχ/ ‘her house’ < **eah teyah* < **esyās tegos*, *a (h)ech* /a heχ/ ‘her horse’ < **eah eχ^wah* < **esyās ekwos*; see 3.4.2 below on a possible additional factor in an arguable opposition between proclitic main-clause /ro h-/ and leniting relative /ro/ by the time of the elision and subsequently). As for point (iii), new deuterotonic forms were particularly favoured in third-person passives because these were invariably deuterotonic in the first- and second-person owing to the obligatory presence of an infixed pronoun (see III.1.8.1 and *EIV* 80), as in *do-m:ucthar* ‘I can be/have been brought’.

3.4.2. A further point that seems not to have figured in the debate so far is that the subject occasionally and the object frequently undergoes lenition after a finite verb in main clauses in both Irish and Welsh. ‘In later OIr. and MIIr. there are numerous instances of the len. of the object: *togluaset chombart* ‘they abort offspring’ *Thes.* II 235.5... Len. of the subj. is much rarer: *ní taet chomsuidigud friu* ‘there is not composition with them’ (“comp. comes not to them”) Sg. 197a4’ (*LP* 138). Breatnach (1994, 237-8) gives over twenty examples from the corpus of Middle Irish texts used by him and puts matters thus: ‘Examples of lenition of the verb’s object are abundant in MIIr., e.g.. *at-chū churach* ‘I see a boat’ LL 12641.. This is not, of course, a MIIr. innovation; it is found very frequently in OIr. (see Hessen, 1914), and is still to be found in Classical ModIr.’ (my translation of the original Modern Irish). It is to be emphasised that orthographically unambiguous instances of this phenomenon undoubtedly represent a mere fraction of its overall occurrence in Old and Middle Irish texts for the simple reason that lenition is only consistently indicated in spelling there in the case of *c* and *t* (and inconsistently the case of *s* and *f*, lenition of *p* being

consistently spelled but inconsistently applied owing to the fact that it only occurred initially in loanwords; see *RChron.* 26-32 and 137).

With regard to British, ‘in ModW the subject usually has the radical when it immediately follows its verb, whereas the object is invariably lenited. Lenition, therefore, serves to distinguish between subject and object. In the MIW period this ‘law’ had not yet been evolved, and thus there is considerable variation’ (*GMW* 17). Lenition of the subject (or predicate) is usual in Middle Welsh after a number of forms of the verb ‘to be’ (*LP* 138-9), as in *gwaeth uu drafferth y deu hynny* ‘worse was the plight of those two’ (*GMW* 18), and ‘with other verbs it commonly occurs after the 3sg. imperf. and plup.: *Ny uynhei Gaswallawn y lad ynteu* ‘Caswallawn did not wish to slay him’ but ‘in other cases it is not common’ (*GMW* 18). One interesting rule is that ‘when a pl. verb precedes a pl. subject in early poetry, the subject is lenited: *Yn Aber Cuawc yt ganant gogeu* ‘In Aber Cuawc cuckoos sing’..... *ymgetwynt Gymry* ‘the Welsh will return’ (’ (*GMW* 18). On the other hand, ‘in MW lenition of the object is usual, especially when it is separated from the verb: *y kynhelis Benigeiduran Uranwen* ‘Benidgeidfran supported Branwen’.. *yd adnabydy uoes y llys*’, although ‘in many cases.. the radical is kept, especially after the 3 sing. pres. ind., the 3 sing. pret., and the 3sg. pres. subj.:... *y gosodes petwar swydawc yn y lys* ‘he set twenty-four officers in his court’ (*GMW* 18; cf. *LP* 139-140). To this may be added the need to invoke verbal endings with a final vowel prior to the operation of lenition in order to account for the lenited forms of personal pronouns (notably 1sg. (*u*)*i*, *uy* ‘I, me’, 2sg. *di*, *dy* ‘you’ versus independent *mi*, *ti*; *GMW* 49-51 and 57-8) almost invariably used as subject or object of the verb in the minority of instances where the personal ending or an infixed pronoun was not deemed sufficient in Middle Welsh (see IV.4.1-3).

The obvious conclusion is that this quite circumstantial phenomenon has its roots in an earlier Insular Celtic phase of development shared by Irish and British (see III.3.1-3), in which case it seems difficult to avoid the inference that there were a substantial number of main-clause verbal forms ending in a vowel at that stage. Given that lenition was most prone to occur across the word boundary in close syntactic groups such as noun plus adjective or preposition plus noun, its appreciably greater frequency with a verb’s object than with its subject in both Irish and Welsh may be due to the fact that the former was directly governed by the verb as part of a sentence’s predicate whereas the latter was not (cf. Carnie and Guilfoyle, 2000,). Middle Welsh lenition of the subject (or predicate) after forms of the verb ‘to be’ above all can be put down to a significant nucleus involving the proclitic copula, since lenition appears to have been especially consistent after vowel-final proclitics such as prepositions, the article and possessive pronouns.

In the likely event that in Insular Celtic main clauses a vowel-final verb form lenited a following object as a rule and a following subject no more than sporadically unless the verb in question was a form of the proclitic copula, a considerable difficulty confronts the hypothesis that all non-imperative independent simple verbs had somehow acquired a lenition blocking particle **es* or the like in main clauses. Since the vast majority of conjunct forms typical of compound and dependent simple verbs also ended in a consonant that impeded lenition (see the reconstructions in III.1.5.1), the verbal forms capable of generating the lenition in question will have been few and far between on any version of the particle hypothesis: basically, the imperative, the thematic 1sg. conj., about half of the conjunct suffixless preterite paradigm and arguably the conjunct forms of those categories (imperfect, past subjunctive and conditional) characterised by the historically obscure imperfect endings. This must surely be regarded as an implausibly narrow starting point, if one is obliged by a putative particle to rule out the possibility of historically regular lenition after any indicative or subjunctive active forms (except the thematic 1sg. conj. act. and the conj. sg. plus perhaps the conj. 2pl. of the suffixless preterite) as well as after virtually all deponent forms.

If, on the other hand, the particle is dispensed with in line with the proposal made in III.1.5.1, this meagre nucleus expands quite dramatically to include virtually all active absolute endings, endowed as they now become with a final vowel capable of causing lenition. The upshot would be an Insular Celtic system in which virtually all non-deponent active independent simple verbs as well as the small minority of forms of dependent or compound verbs just noted lenited a following object generally and a following subject on occasion, especially where the proclitic copula was involved. Elsewhere, of course, non-lenition would have been the rule, thus leaving plenty of instances (probably a majority, statistically speaking) where a following object was not mutated. Once the loss of final syllables in the separate prehistories of Irish and British had turned the conditioning of initial mutations into an exclusively grammatical one no longer largely predictable in terms of the shape of a preceding word, a situation would arise in which lenition of the object (or, to a lesser extent, the subject) occurred after some verb forms but not others according to no obvious overall pattern. This state of affairs would be likely to engender considerable confusion, with lenition spreading after forms that previously did not cause it (including optional lenition of the object when not directly following the verb in the case of Middle Welsh) and *vice versa*, the upshot being the position actually observable in Old/Middle Irish and Middle Welsh.

3.4.3. Sims-Williams (1984, 141) conveniently summarises Thurneysen's rather different approach to the apparent spread of postvocalic **-s* after various preverbal

proclitics from that envisaged by adherents of a particle: ‘in 1897 Thurneysen argued that Old Irish *ní* ‘not’ was derived from a Celtic **nīs* (replacing IE **ne*), and equated it with the negative of the copula..., *ní* ‘is not’ < **nīs* < **nēst* < **ne-est(i)*. By 1907 he had developed the hypothesis that the **-s* seen in the reconstructed negative particle **nīs* spread by analogy not only to other particles ending in vowels, such as the ‘perfective’ (etc.) **(p)ro* and untranslatable **nu*, but also to the preverbs of compound verbs like the **to* of *do:bbeir*.

‘is not’	<i>ní</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*nīs</i> < <i>*nēst(i)</i>	
‘not’	<i>ní</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*nīs</i> ↓ ← <i>*ne</i>	cf. Welsh <i>ny</i> + spirant mutation
particles	<i>ro</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*ros</i> ↓ ← <i>*(p)ro</i>	cf. Welsh <i>ry</i> + spirant mutation
	<i>no</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*nus</i> ← <i>*nu</i>	
preverbs	<i>do</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*tos</i> ↓ ← <i>*to</i>	cf. Welsh <i>dy</i> + spirant mutation
	<i>fo</i> (<i>h-</i>) < <i>*wos</i> ← <i>*wo</i>	cf. Welsh <i>go</i> + spirant mutation

Thurneysen’s explanation seemed neatly to explain the non-lenition... in Old Irish *do:bbeir* ‘gives’, *do:ceil* ‘conceals’, etc., and the Middle Welsh non-lenition of mediae, exemplified by *dybrys* ‘hastens’ (a compound of *brys*), and spirant mutation of tenues, exemplified by *gochel* ‘conceals’ (a compound of *cel*). Analogical spread of **-s* or its later reflex **-h* along the above lines through the proclitic system seems a good deal less problematical in formal terms than the invocation of a general enclitic particle **es* < **essi* or the like, although it cannot directly explain the retained final consonant of pretonic preverbs such as OIr. *as* contrasting with the corresponding preposition *a* ‘out of’ < **eh* < **es(s)* < **exs*. This, however, is hardly an insuperable difficulty (see IV.3.3). Apart from the possibility of deriving an OIr. 1sg. abs. like *biru* < **berūs* regularly, there is little to be gained by Thurneysen’s (1913, 29-30) later suggestion that this **-s* then became attached to the endings of simple verbs as a result of further analogical spread. This would be most plausible in the case of the proclitic copula, where an analogical form such as 3sg. **essi-s* would serve to explain the lack of main-clause lenition after OIr. *is*, but again this or a particle are hardly the only possibilities (see III.1.2.1) and, on the whole, it is rather a large jump from uninflected proclitics to typically stressed inflected forms of verbs.

Needless to say, analogical spread of *-s* or its reflex */-h/* to pretonic preverbs prior to the late seventh-century elision of a final vowel thereof before another stressed vowel is ruled out for the same reasons advanced against a general main-clause enclitic particle in 3.4.1 above. In Sims-Williams’ (1984, 143-4) opinion ‘McCone has made a convincing case against the **s* in ***tos-beret(i)* > DT *do:bbeir*, but goes too far in also rejecting the reconstruction **ros* for the ‘perfective’ particle *ro* (*h-*). It is surely significant that forms like *ro:ucc* ‘has brought’ are hardly ever elided to ***r’ucc*,

whereas the preverb *ro* in *ro·icc* ‘reaches’ is often elided, giving *r’icc* (McCone 1979[c]: 7; but note *ructha* Ml 102d7, *rucad* Sg 174a1....). I would therefore suggest the following modification of Thurneysen’s original suggestion regarding particles and preverbs: in environments in which the negative particle took the form **nīs* rather than **ne*, other syntactically comparable elements (*not* preverbs) with vocalic auslaut adopted **-s* by analogy. This has the advantage of explaining the /h/ after *ro* and *no...* directly, without recourse to analogy, and so providing an obvious starting point for any analogical spread of /h/ to position after preverbs like *ro*, *do* and *fo*. Furthermore, the supposition that particles like *ro* contained **-s* explains the unlenited form of following infixed pronouns, for example *-m-* [m] < **-s-me-* and 3pl. *-s-* < **-s-sūs*, and provides a much broader base for the spread of these pronominal forms to the preverbs than the negative **nīs* can on its own provide. In general, the fact that *ro* functioned both as a particle and a preverb will have played an important part in the levelling of mutations after the two categories.’

This suggestion that **-s* may have undergone strictly limited analogical spread from negative **nīs* to other proclitics with a grammatical as opposed to a lexical function has considerable attractions as a means of accounting for the regular non-elision of invariably proclitic *no* before a vowel or for the contrast between the similar non-elision of *ro* as a resultative/potential augment (see I.1.5 and IV.2.1-3) when proclitic and its elision as a proclitic preverb. If so, the non-occurrence of elision in main clauses will also have impeded it in leniting relative clauses, where there was no /h/. Moreover, the problem of permissible elision of *ro:uc(-)* to *ruc(-)* ‘can bear, has borne’ disappears with the realisation that it is an old causative (‘make to reach, bear (to)’) of *ro:ic/(-)ric* ‘reaches’ that was incorporated into the system of augmentation at a rather late prehistoric stage (McCone, 1999, 355-360). That said, possessive pronouns such as *mo* ‘my’ and *do* ‘your’ < *to* may be elided (like the preverbs *fo*, *ro* and *do* < *to*) to *m’*, *t’* before a stressed vowel (*GOI* 277) prior to the voicing of *d-* to *t-* before an unstressed vowel, whereas prepositions such as *do*, *fo* regularly retained their vowel in Old Irish. This clearly indicates that grammatical function could play a role in determining the deployment or non-deployment of elision before a stressed vowel in Early Old Irish, and this means that the different patterns seen with *ro* as a lexical preverb and *ro* as a grammatical augment may be explained without recourse to /-h/ < **-s* after the latter as opposed to the former.

On the whole, it is easier to envisage the analogical spread of main-clause **-s* from invariably proclitic **nīs* to invariably proclitic **nu* (> **nus*) than to *ro* for the simple reason that the latter cooccurred with non-proclitic *ro*. If so, *ro* might be assumed to have acquired **-s* or **-h* in proclisis at a later stage than **nu-s* > **nu-h* and then, after the elision discussed in 3.4.1, to have helped to mediate the transfer of /-h/ to lexical

preverbs displaying a similar alternation between proclisis and location in the stressed portion of the verb. As things stand, no reason is given for the interpretation of **nīs* as **nī-s* with a final element that might then be spread to other vowel-final proclitics with a grammatical function. However, it seems reasonable enough to posit that, while inherited plain neg. **ne* and originally copula **nīh* were still in more or less free variation before non-imperative verbs (imperatives, of course, retained **ne* > OIr. *na*, subsequently *ná*), the former was remodelled from the latter to **nī*. If so, the *-s* could spread somewhat when both were still in use according to the straightforward proportion **nī* : **nī-s* = **nu* : x (x = **nu-s*) and perhaps similarly with the augment = **ro* : x (x = **ro-s*). Thereafter the more strongly characterised main-clause proclitic forms with *-s* will have eventually ousted counterparts without it.

3.5. Koch (1987) has propounded a tortuously complex prosodic explanation of the main points at issue that is based upon two equally questionable main premises: (a) that the probable Proto-Indo-European opposition between unstressed non-initial finite verb in main clauses and stressed finite verb elsewhere survived well into Celtic and (b) that gemination took place over the juncture between a final stressed vowel and the initial consonant of a following enclitic. Hence deut. *fo:tlen* /fo 'tlen/ 'removes' < **wó-ttlinat* and *fo-m:thlen* /fom 'θlen/ 'removes me' < **wó-mme tlinat* (old main clause), prot. *-fothlan(n)* 'removes' /'woθlən/ < **wo tlinat* (old subordinate clause).

There are a number of rather obvious objections to this. For instance, whether in main or subordinate clauses, Old Irish deuterotonic compounds with non-leniting unstressed initial preverb and stressed verb have to be derived from a PIE main clause pattern with accented preverb and unaccented verb, whereas initially stressed prototonic compounds with a stressed first preverb mutating an unstressed verb as expected must continue a PIE subordinate clause pattern with unaccented preverb and accented verb. As if this major inconvenience were not enough, sequences such as *na-chat*: /naxad/ and *do-dat*: /dođad/ are also the reverse of what Koch's rules predict as far as lenited and unlenited segments are concerned: thus *no-da-t:beir* 'who bears thee' as opposed to **no-ta-d* /notađ/ < **nú dde tu beret* 'and he bears thee' à la Koch and *na-cha-t:beir* 'who bears thee not' as opposed to **na-ca-d* /nakađ/ < **né kk^we tu beret* à la Koch. It remains to note in passing that Koch's (1987, 175-6) rejection of the present writer's concept of 'enclitic deletion' (see 2.4 above) as a plausible device for generating identity between corresponding verbal forms with and without attached enclitic(s) is rendered quite inconsistent by his own use of this very process, albeit with the new label 'vacant Wackernagel's position' (Koch, 1987, 162).

Isaac (1993, 22) defines pretonic conjunct particles or preverbs as lighter than a following verb and an initial verb as lighter than a following noun. He then (1993,

23-7) posits a mutation-impeding phrasal juncture ([] below) between the initial ‘light’ element and the rest of the sentence, including enclitic infixes and suffixed pronouns: (V[]E...) *ithith -us...* > *itius...* ‘eats it’ (f.), (P[]EV...) *fo -s-didmat...* ‘they will suffer it’ (f.), (N[]EPPV...) *ní -m-tho-r-gaíth....* ‘has not deceived me’. Although he does not discuss this, Isaac’s framework presumably requires a juncture between enclitic connective and enclitic pronoun (NE[]EV...) in order to account for the mutation pattern seen in *na-cha -t-beir....* ‘who bears thee not’, *nacham(m):* /naxam/, *dodom(m):* /doðom/ and so on. This, however, would be quite incompatible with lenition of the initial of the 3sg. f. or 3pl. infixes and suffixed pronouns seen in a class B or C constellation like *a-ta:beir* ‘mentions them’ < **ey-de-huh bereh* < **exs-de-sus beret*. Moreover, whether Koch’s gemination rule or Isaac’s phrasal juncture is invoked, the second plural clitic pronoun in *do-b:beir* ‘brings you’ < **to-f:beir* < **to-hwih beret* (MW *-ch* < *-hwih* < **-swis*) etc. can only be accounted for if it lacked the initial *s-* of its stressed counterpart, an arbitrary assumption flatly contradicted by the British form. If further proof of the historical unacceptability of this selectively inferred and singularly counter-intuitive ‘juncture’ were needed, it is supplied by the apocope patterns underlying *itiu-s* < **iteti-sus*, *fo-s:* < **wo-sus*, *ní-m:* < **nīs-me*, *nacha-t:* < **ne-k^we-tu*, *do-do-m:* < **to-de-mu*, *a-ta:* < **exs-de-sus*, *do-b:* < *to-swis* above etc., which clearly show groups of sentence-initial element plus following enclitic(s) functioning in normal IE fashion as a single prosodic unit separate from a likewise apocopated following verb or noun such as *-beir* ‘carries’ < **beret*.

CHAPTER THREE

Absolute and Conjunct Inflection

1.1. As has already been pointed out (I.1-6/9), Old Irish is a rather consistent VSO language in which the verb plus certain optional adjuncts regularly stands at the beginning of its clause. If the verb in question is simple and independent (i.e. not preceded by a so-called ‘conjunct particle’ such as the negative *ní* ‘not’) in conformity with the scheme #V*(E)...# (I.1.5/9), it typically displays absolute endings as illustrated by pres. ind. 3sg. #*be(i)rid*...# ‘bears’, 3pl. #*ber(a)it*...# ‘bear’. These are formally compatible with the PIE primary set by virtue of being derivable from earlier #**ber-e-ti*...# and #**ber-o-nti*...# respectively without the slightest difficulty as far as the historical phonology of the intervening stages is concerned. By contrast, dependent simple verbs (C:V) and all verbs compounded with a preverb or preverbs (independent P:(P)V, dependent C:P(P)V; X stands for proclitic C or P below) take conjunct endings according to the scheme #X:(P)V...# as illustrated by pres. ind. 3sg. #*ní:beir*...#, 3pl. #*ní:berat*...# ‘do(es) not bear’ (#C:V...#), 3sg. #*do:beir*...#, 3pl. #*do:berat*...# ‘give(s)’ and 3sg. #*ní:ta-bair*...#, 3pl. #*ní:tai-bret*...# ‘do(es) not give’. These forms are compatible with the PIE secondary set in that they can be taken to derive regularly from earlier 3sg. #X:(P)**ber-e-t*...# and 3pl. #X:(P)**ber-o-nt*...#. However, although this derivation may seem formally unimpeachable, it runs up against the serious functional problem that the evidence of other IE languages militates against the possibility of secondary endings in the present indicative. In Old Irish preterite formations based upon a PIE *s*-aorist a similar approach is beset by the same problem in reverse, in that a *t*-preterite 3sg. conjunct such as that seen in #*ní:bert*...# ‘did not bear’, #*do:bert*...# ‘gave’ or #*ní:tu-bart*...# ‘did not give’ derives without difficulty from #X:(P)*bir(-s)-t*...# with expected secondary endings whereas the corresponding absolute seen in #*birt*...# ‘carried’ < #**bir(s)-ti* would have a primary ending impossible with a past tense from a general PIE standpoint.

The basic issue is thus clear: whereas reconstruction based upon other branches, including Anatolian (arguably the earliest offshoot; see II.1.4/7 and Jasanoff as cited in 1.3.1 below), points clearly to a PIE system with primary endings in the present and secondary endings in the past (aorist and imperfect) indicative, regardless of the verb’s position in the sentence, Insular Celtic seems to oppose reflexes of primary endings with initial verbs to reflexes of secondary endings with non-initial verbs, regardless of the verb’s tense or mood. In comparing these two systems, we are confronted by a rather frustrating combination of a good measure of formal compatibility with a glaring functional discrepancy. This situation can be represented schematically as follows with the help of 3sg. forms.

	PIE	Insular Celtic
Pres. Ind. (initial)	#* <i>b^her-e-ti</i> (E)(...)# (prim.)	#* <i>ber-e-ti</i> (E)(...)# (abs.)
(non-initial)	#.(E)(.)* <i>b^her-e-ti</i> (.)# (prim.)	#.(E)* <i>ber-e-t</i> (...)# (conj.)
Aor. Ind. (initial)	#* <i>b^hēr-s-t</i> (E)(...)# (sec.)	#* <i>bir(-s)-ti</i> (E)(...)# (abs.)
(non-initial)	#.(E)(.)* <i>b^hēr-s-t</i> (.)#(sec.)	#.(E)* <i>bir(-s)-t</i> (...)# (conj.)

This problem has notoriously generated more debate in print than any other issue of historical Celtic grammar and a reasonably detailed account of the history of the controversy to date can be gleaned from a combination of the introductory sections of Meid (1963, 10-52), Cowgill (1975, 40-56) and Sims-Williams (1984, 138-146) supplemented by Schrijver (1997, 146-158), Isaac (2001, 150-152) and Schumacher (*KPV* 94-6). Here it will suffice to draw attention to a number of central issues.

1.2.1. One approach was to posit that Celtic had somehow failed to participate in the full development of the PIE system of primary versus secondary endings seen in the other branches. However, despite a number of ingenious attempts (notably by Meid, 1963, 99-107, and Watkins, 1963, 41-9) to justify some such scenario, it was difficult to see how so remarkable an archaism in this area was possible (cf. Rix, 1967, 265-7), particularly in view of the prominence of a primary/secondary inflectional opposition as a correlate of present/past tense in Anatolian as mentioned in 1.1. Moreover, Cowgill (1985, 112) voiced scepticism as to extent of the formal compatibility often claimed, arguing that ‘deriving Irish absolute endings from PIE primary and Irish conjunct endings from PIE secondary doesn’t account for the majority of Old Irish forms; viz.

secondary	sg.1 * <i>bherom</i>	>	OIr. §·ber, not ·biur
	2 * <i>bheres</i>	>	§·beir, not ·bir (no good evidence for *-es > *-is)
	3 * <i>bheret</i>	>	Celt. §·bere; but Prim. Ir. was *beret (Meid EC 13, 346ff.); cf. also A I ·cara, A II ·leici from Prim. Ir. *carāt, *lēggīt, not §*carā, §*lēggī
	pl. 1 * <i>bheromo(s)</i>	>	OIr. ·beram OK
	2 * <i>bherete(s)</i>	>	·berid OK
	3 * <i>bheront</i>	>	·berat ? no other Irish evidence for outcome of *-nt; no other IE language preserves *-t of *-nt.

primary	sg. 1 *bherō	> OIr. §biur, not biru
	sg. 2 *bheresi	> §bir, not biri (cf. tig < *tegesi)
	sg. 3 *bhereti	> berid seems OK; but is ‘is’ does not lenite
	pl. 1 *bheromos	> §beram, not bermai (“-mosi” is found elsewhere only in part of Indo-Iranian, and ammi ‘we are’ does not lenite)
	2 *bherete(s)	> §berid, not beirthe.
	3 *bheronti	> ber(a)it seems OK; but it ‘they are’ does not lenite

i.e., the only forms fully explained (1st and 2nd pl. conj. ·beram, ·berid) are those where PIE primary and secondary endings were minimally if at all different, and gave the same results in Old Irish’.

Doubts about the 3sg. and 3pl. absolute on the strength of non-lenition after the copula in main clauses are relatively easy to assuage. The copula resembled pretonic preverbs in being placed in proclisis before a stressed component, in this case a noun or adjective predicate rather than the remainder of the verbal predicate (see Ahlqvist, 1977). There was thus an obvious correlation between the likes of *is:carae(-som)* ‘he is a friend’ and *as:congair(-som)* ‘he proclaims’. This view is corroborated by the deployment in Old Irish of infixed rather than suffixed pronouns with the copula, notably the non-suffixable ‘class C’ *-id* in the 3sg., as in *iss-id:n-aithrech* ‘he repents’, lit. ‘it is regret(table) to him’ at *Ml. 90d12* (see *GOI* 269), to which may be added *as-dom:moo airli/cumachtu* ‘which is greater than counsel/power to me’ (*EC* 121, §6, and 147-9), i.e. ‘which is beyond my counsel/power’, with an unsuffixable 1sg. class C infixed pronoun in a relative clause, and *bes-da nessam* ‘which may be nearest to them’ (*Bechbretha* §§2, 3, 9, 18, 20) with likewise unsuffixable relative 3pl. class C. Since a functional contrast between non-lenition and lenition after the pretonic preverb distinguished the likes of *as:congair* from relative *as:chongair* (see I.1.7 and VI.1.2), it is surely easy enough to envisage the analogical replacement of, say, main-clause **is:charae* by *is:carae* (and so on with the other independent forms of the copula) as the counterpart of relative *as:charae* ‘who is a friend’ in conformity with the system obtaining after other proclitics. This development was presumably encouraged by historically regular non-lenition after the 3sg. negative form *ní* ‘is not’ < **nīh* < **nīs(s)* < **nīst* in main clauses, whence *ní:carae* ‘he is not a friend’ etc. This time, regardless of whether a particle is invoked along the lines of II.3.1 or not, it was the turn of the relative form *nad* ‘which is not’ < **neðeh* < **ne-d(e)-est* to acquire synchronically normal lenition on the model of the relative negative *nad* < **neðe* < **ne-de* ‘which not’ used with other verbs, whence *nad:charae* ‘who is not a friend’

for **nad:carae*. The 3sg. and 3pl. abs. can, then, be awarded an unequivocal OK, and Cowgill himself (1975, 53) expresses serious reservations about his caveat with regard to the 3pl. conjunct: ‘To be sure, this is not a strong argument against this derivation, since Greek, Germanic, and Slavic all show evidence that the dental stop of **-nt* was still present in their ancestor dialects after they had begun their independent prehistories’.

1.2.2. It must be conceded that **-mosi* is unlikely to have existed in PIE, which probably had a synchronically anomalous opposition between primary **-mos/*-més* (rather like **(o)s* vs. **-és* in the gen. sg. of athematic nouns) and secondary **-me(m)/-mé(m)* (cf. Szemerényi, 1989, 249, and Cowgill, 1985b, 107-8). That said, the Indo-Iranian evidence shows how easily **-mos* or **-mes* could be generalised (as also in Arcadian and Doric dialects of Greek with prim./sec. 1pl. -μες) and then reinterpreted as a secondary ending by creating a new primary **-mosi* or **-mesi* on the model of secondary -Ø versus primary **-i* at other crucial points in the system (notably the athematic 1sg. and the 2sg., 3sg. and 3pl.), while in Hittite one finds a similarly motivated analogical creation of 1pl. primary *-m/ueni* corresponding to secondary *-m/uen* (< PIE **-mem* like Aeolic and Ionic-Attic Greek prim./sec. -μεν). So obvious an analogy could surely have happened independently in Celtic (cf. the them. 1sg. *-umi* in Gaulish and *-if* < **-ūmi* in British through conflation of them. **-ū* < **-ō* with athem. **-mi*, which quite certainly arose independently of virtually the same process underlying the creation of them. 1sg. *-āmi* in Indo-Iranian; McCone, 1991, 102-3 and 119-20). In that case the OIr. 1pl. *bermai* can be plausibly derived from a Proto-Celtic primary ending **-mosi* (> **-mohi* > **-moï* > **-moi* > **-mī* > OIr. *-mi*; McCone, 1982, 27 in conjunction with the relative chronology on pp. 24-5 of the same, and *RChron.* 131-2; **-mesi* > OIr. *-mi* would be even easier formally in line with **-tesi* > OIr. *-thi* in the next paragraph but hard to square with the undoubted **ber-o-mos* underlying 1pl. conj. *-beram* etc.).

The PIE 2pl. was probably **-te/*-té* undifferentiated as to primary versus secondary as in Ancient Greek (Szemerényi, 1989, 249) but possibly this was a secondary ending opposed to primary **-th₁e/*-th₁é* as arguably implied by Indo-Iranian (Beekes, 1995, 232). This matter is of no consequence here, as both would have fallen together as **-te* in the prehistory of Celtic and, for that matter, Italic. It seems perfectly reasonable to posit analogical remodelling of this first to **-tes* in Proto-Celtic, as in Italic, under the influence of 1pl. **-mos* and then the creation of 2pl. primary **-tesi* on the model of 2sg. primary **-si* versus secondary **-s*. It has been argued elsewhere (McCone, 1995, 123-7; see V.2.3) that the independent pres. ind. 2pl. *adi* of the Old Irish copula is the phonetically regular outcome of Insular Celtic **e-tisi* < **e-tesi*, there being (*pace* Cowgill above) good evidence for *es* > *is* in Insular Celtic before a vowel (see 1.5.2

below on this and the systemically motivated new 2pl. abs. *-the* in other verbs respectively). Moreover, a Celtic 2pl. ending *-tesi* is now in all probability attested directly in Gaulish on lines 2-3 of the Châteaubleu tile (see the text in Lambert, 1998/2000, 71) where *Iexsetesi sue* looks very much like a 2pl. *s*-fut. or subj. verb followed by a 2pl. subject pronoun *sue(s)* (see Schrijver, 1998/2000, 136, on loss of *-s* in this late Gaulish inscription; OIr. *sí*, redup. *sib* < **(swi-)swis*, MW *chwi* < **swīs* < **swēs*). It is followed by *mili Iegumi* on line 4, which consists of a 1sg. subject pronoun *mī* corresponding to MW *mi* < **mī* < **mē* (versus OIr. *mé* < **me*; cf. the short/long vowel variation in Gaul. *sue(s)*, Ir. **swis* versus Brit. **swīs*) plus 1sg. pres. ind. of the same verb. The precise meaning of the verb is immaterial here, probably something like ‘you may/will say’ contrasting with ‘I say’. On line 5 *sui r[ex]etesi* looks like a similar combination of 2pl. pronoun, this time apparently *sui(s)* with a long vowel, with a 2pl. verb, while the strange form *[belia]ssusete* on lines 7 (followed directly by *sue* on 8), 9, 10 and 11 also looks very like a 2pl. and may well be imperative. This positive evidence for Proto-Celtic 2pl. prim. **-tesi* versus sec. **-tes* makes it hard to resist the case for a corresponding opposition (quite likely triggered by the 2pl.) between prim. **-mosi* (non-lenition after the OIr. copula’s 1pl. *ammi* having already been dealt with above) and sec. **-mos* in the 1pl.

One may, then, agree with Cowgill that straightforward derivation of the singular conjunct endings of Old Irish from the corresponding PIE secondary endings à la Meid or Watkins is problematical. In particular, ‘in preserving final **-t* in **karāt* but losing final **-d* in **id* → **ed* > **e* ‘it’, Celtic would have preserved a difference between voiced and voiceless final stops that is observable nowhere else in Indo-European. Everywhere else, everything is as if at the phonetic level there was no contrast between voiced and voiceless final stops, regardless of what the underlying morphophonemes may have been. Thus in Sanskrit the pronoun *tāt* from “**tód*” exhibits exactly the same gamut of sandhi forms as does the verb *ábharat* from “**ebheret*” (Cowgill, 1975, 52). Crucially, however, no insuperable difficulties confront the derivation of the Old Irish absolute endings from the PIE primary endings, once due allowance is made for some readily motivated analogy with parallels elsewhere in the Proto-Celtic 1 and 2pl. The 2sg. abs. *biri* can be regarded as the perfectly regular outcome of **biriyi* < **berisi* < **beresi* by the same rules as the one just applied to 2pl. cop. *adi* < **e-θiyi* < **e-tisi* < **e-tesi*. These and the alleged problem with dat. sg. *tig* ‘house’ < **tegesi* will be examined in greater detail below (1.5.2). That leaves the OIr. 1sg. abs. *biru* (*GOI*’s BI, *EIV*’s S1 class), which indeed can hardly be derived directly from **berū* but can surely have been based upon 2sg. *biri* under the analogical influence of the other OIr. strong present class (*GOI*’s BII, *EIV*’s S2 class; see *EIV* 25) with an inherited thematic primary 1sg. **-ū* < **-ō* as illustrated by abs. 1sg. *gaibiu* vs. 2sg. *gaibi*, which are the perfectly regular outcomes of inherited **gaβiyu* < **gab(i)yū* and **gaβiyi* < **gabisi*

(< *gabyesi) respectively (see McCone, 1982, 13-14, and *RChron.* 49).

1.3.1. All in all, then, the following set of primary and secondary endings may be ascribed to Proto-Celtic with some confidence.

	Primary	Secondary
1sg.	*-ū/*-mi (them./athem.)	*-m
2sg.	*-si	*-s
3sg.	*-ti	*-t/*-d
1pl.	*-mosi	*-mos
2pl.	*-tesi	*-tes
3pl.	*-nti	*-nt

The variants in the sec. 3sg. reflect the probability that in Proto-Celtic as in Italic (or earlier and possibly even in PIE itself; Szemerényi, 1973, 55-63) final *-t* had been neutralised after a vowel by voicing to *-d* (cf. McCone, 1981, for a typologically similar postvocalic voicing phenomenon in Early Old Irish), reflexes of which as a secondary ending are possibly to be found in Celtiberian (see Villar, 1995, 30-33, and 1995b, 17-19; *KPV* 760-5 offers a more sceptical appraisal of the relevant forms). If so, this *-d* (probably already [ð] in Proto-Celtic; *RChron.* 81-7) should have been lost early in Insular Celtic (see II.3.2b above and 3.2 below). This is presumably the mechanism that would have generated (Insular) Celtic **bere* from a PIE 3sg. **b^heret* with secondary endings on Cowgill's list in 1.2.1 above, the assumption being that such a form would either have already been realised as [*b^hered] in the parent language or else become **bered* (probably > [*bereð]) in Proto- or even Italo-Celtic. However, it seems quite improbable from a phonotactic standpoint that such voicing would have taken place after the *-s-* suffix of the *s*-preterite and proof positive on this point is provided as far as Celtic is concerned by Insular Celtic *t*-preterite forms such as OIr. 3sg. conj. *-bert*/bert/ 'bore' < **ber-s-t* (or rather **bir-s-t* according to McCone, 1991, 67-8, root vocalism being irrelevant for present purposes) in line with Watkins' (1962, 156-174) definitive derivation of this category from the PIE *s*-aorist. This restriction is duly recognised by Cowgill's (1975, 58) rule that 'all Indo-European final postvocalic dental stops, voiced or not, were lost in Common Celtic', although it now seems (3.1-3 below) that their complete loss after a vowel was confined to Insular Celtic along the lines just indicated and was not as early as Proto-Celtic.

Most scholars seem to be agreed that, except in the primary 1sg., thematic verbs simply added the same personal endings as those used by athematic verbs to the thematic vowel *-e/o- in PIE, the primary paradigm then being 1sg. *-ō (or *-o-h₂ <

older **-e/o-h₂e* according to Jasanoff, 1998, 301, n.5; but see Dunkel, 2002, 89-90), 2sg. **-e-si*, 3sg. **-e-ti*, 1pl. **-o-mos*, 2pl. **-e-t(h₁)e*, 3pl. **-o-nti*. However, some have ‘argued that a handful of apparently divergent forms in some other branches can be derived more easily from special IE thematic primary forms such as 2sg. **-ei* and 3sg. **-et* (Meillet, 1937, 227-8) or **-e* (Watkins 1969a, conveniently summarised in 1969b, 6-7) and that forms like **-e-si* and **-e-ti* are so easy to ascribe to influence from universally accepted primary athematic 1sg. **-mi*, 2sg. **-si*, 3sg. **-ti*, 1pl. **-mos*, 2pl. **-t(h₁)e*, 3pl. **-nti* that they could have replaced the original set by independent parallel developments in the branches in question at a post-IE date’ (McCone, 1982, 19), obvious cases in point being ‘Indo-Iranian, Germanic and, *pace* Kortlandt (1979, 38), Italic’ (McCone, 1982, 18). Kortlandt’s views on Italic have been objected to by the present writer as follows: ‘The traditional, and correct, doctrine is that Italic 3sg. **-d* reflects secondary **-t*, while **-t* derives from **-ti* by apocope. This **-d/*-t* dichotomy, is reflected in Osco-Umbrian and Old Latin, but Latin later generalized *-t*. Kortlandt rejects apocope and suggests instead that Italic inherited thematic primary 2sg. **-ei*, 3sg. **-e* versus athematic **-si*, **-ti*. The former then added secondary *-s* and *-d*, preferred for some obscure reason over primary **-si*, **-ti*, and the athematic endings then lost their **-i* by analogy to give **-s*, **-t*, subsequently generalised in Latin. This is both complex and implausible, since at every stage a more obvious analogy can be envisaged, and still does not explain the forms. Thus a 2sg. *regīs* must be from primary thematic **regesi* by apocope and cannot possibly be from **regei-s*, which would give Latin **regīs*. Latin *et* ‘and’ cannot always have had a final consonant, since the result even for Kortlandt would then be **ed*. Accordingly, a final vowel must have been lost, and a case can only be made out for **-i* by apocope, particularly in view of the etymological connection with Greek ἔτι ‘further, still’. Kortlandt’s analogy cannot, of course, explain this non-verbal form’ (McCone, 1982, 18, n. 24). In short, ‘Latin 1st sg. thematic *agō* vs. athematic *sum*, *eram*, but 2nd and 3rd sg. *agis*, *agit* just like *es* (OL *ess*), *est*; and when we probe beneath the surface, we find no good reason to dispute the testimony of the surface evidence’ (Cowgill, 1985b, 103).

Jasanoff (1998), in effect, proposes a compromise between the ‘standard’ approach to the PIE endings and that of Watkins, arguing that ‘even with the substitution of **bhéreti* for **bhére* as the late PIE preform.... cooccurrence of **-eti* (3sg.) and **-oh₂* (1sg.) in a single paradigm is an anomaly that needs to be explained’ (Jasanoff, 1998, 303) and summarising his findings as follows: ‘We find that the well-known rarity of inherited thematic presents in Anatolian is matched by an equally impressive, though hitherto unrecognised, dearth of old thematic presents in Tocharian. This agreement between the two branches has a simple explanation. Most of the thematic stems traditionally assigned to the parent language are in fact type II thematic presents which

arose from h_2e -conjugation aorist subjunctives. The conversion of these forms into present indicatives was an innovation confined to the “inner” IE languages: the familiar PIE $*u\acute{e}ĝheti$, $*p\acute{e}k^u\acute{e}ti$, etc. were still subjunctives at the time of the separation of Anatolian and Tocharian from the rest of the family.... The only genuinely *Indo-European* thematic presents were those of type I, the $*bh\acute{e}reti$ -type. For this class, a modified version of Watkins’ theory remains the best explanation we have’ (Jasanoff, 1998, 314). ‘Standard’ $*-ō$, $*-e-si$, $*-e-ti$ etc. thus retain their validity as far as the later PIE ancestor of demonstrably ‘inner’ PIE families such as Italic and Celtic are concerned.

1.3.2. The case for thematic primary 2sg. $*-e-si$ (see 1.7 below) and 3sg. $*-e-ti$ in Celtic is equally overwhelming. Continental Celtic furnishes unequivocal evidence in the shape of probably (originally root-aorist) subjunctive but certainly thematic Gaulish 3sg. $(de-uor-)buetid$ (McCone, 1991, 118-135; see also *LG* 63) and Celtiberian $uerzoniti$, $kabizeti$, $ambitiseti$, $robiseti$ (Bot. I A3, 3, 5, 8; see Meid, 1993, 124, 90-91, 82-3, 108), regardless of whether the latter set is read as $/-eti/$ or apocopated $/-et/$ (see 1.3.1 above on arguable sec. $-t > -d > -z$ in Celtiberian and 3.2-3 below on possible apocope of $-i$ there). The first two are probably 3sg. pres. ind. (see *RChron.* 49 on $-ī < *-eĵe-$, and McCone, 2000, 485-6 or 2002, 137 on $kabizeti < *gabiyeti$) and the other two are almost certainly 3sg. (originally s -aorist) subjunctives (see McCone, 1991, 78 on $ambitiseti$) The evidence of Old Irish on this point is similarly compelling and that of British is fully compatible with this by virtue of furnishing no tangible counter-evidence whatsoever. The impossibility of deriving OIr. 3sg. $-f(e)il$ ‘is’ from a 3sg. $*wele$ ‘one sees’ rather than a perfectly normal thematic 2sg. ipv. $*wele$ ‘see!’ (like French *le voi-ci* ‘here he is’, lit. ‘see him here!’ etc.) has been argued elsewhere (McCone, 1982, 19-21; and conceded by Kortlandt (1994, 66, n. 4). Pace Schumacher (*KPV* 672), the use of neg. $ní$ rather than na with this form is a weak argument against an original 2sg. ipv., since $(-)f(e)il$ had presumably ceased to be felt as an imperative synchronically well before the Old Irish period. That said, his contention that the variants $-feil$ and $-fil$ point to different preforms seems eminently valid. The latter is derived, following Sims-Williams (1984, 153-5), from a 2sg. pres. ind.: thus rare independent $fil-us$ ‘there are’ and the overwhelmingly preponderant longer relative form $file < abs. *fili-us$ ‘you see them’ $< *weliyi-$ and rel. $*weliyi-yo$ ‘which you see’ respectively, both $< *welisi- < *welesi-$ (see 1.2.2 above and the development posited for 2pl. $-the$ in 1.5.5 below, but note that, as a believer in Schrijver’s particle $*et(i)$ mentioned in 1.3.3c and discussed fully in V, Schumacher would reconstruct the ending differently), dependent $-fil < conj. *welis$ ($< *welisi < *welesi$; see 1.5.2 below on the different approach adopted by Schumacher). Schumacher (*KPV* 673) derives the $-feil$ variant from pres. 3sg. conj. $*welet$ ‘(s)he sees’ but 2sg. ipv. $*wele$ will do just as well formally and, on the whole,

seems preferable as the alternant of a 2sg. pres. ind., particularly in the absence of any trace of a 3sg. rel. **fe(i)les* or the like. Be that as it may, pres. ind. 3sg. conj. **wele* can be safely excluded.

As pointed out by Cowgill (following Meid) as cited in 1.2.1 above, the peculiar 3sg. conjunct *-t* found in the present indicative of a number of strong verbs with root-final dental can only be due to an early Primitive Irish syncope of **-ð/θe/iθ* (< **-d/t-e/i-t* < **-d/t-(y)e-ti*, where the **-i-* variant is the regular outcome of **-ye-*; *RChron.* 49) followed by delentition, thus supplying proof positive of thematic 3sg. conj. **-e-t* (not **-e*) < **-e-ti*. To Kortlandt (1994, 66) ‘it appears that the original athematic conjunct endings was preserved in *-tét*, Wb. *-téit* (THURNEYSSEN 1946: 376) < **tēxti* “goes”, where the root-final consonant was lost in the position between a long vowel and a tautosyllabic plosive after the apocope (KORTLANDT 1979a: 50, fn. 2). Following THURNEYSSEN (1946: 377), I assume that the thematic conjunct ending spread to *-fét* “leads”, *-rét* “rides”, **-ret* “runs”, prototonic *-tet*, *-at*, *-rat*, and then to other verbs with a root-final dental plosive such as *ad:fét*, *-adbat* “relates”, *ar:neät*, *-airnet* “expects, sustains”... There is no reason to assume an irregular syncope (MEID 1972: 352) or apocope (COWGILL 1985) which does not explain the alternative forms *-feid*, *-réid*, *-reith*. Another athematic conjunct form may be attested in *co cóic séotu cingith* “it extends to five chattels” (BINCHY 1971: 157, GREENE 1977: 18)’. The entirely *ad hoc* sound change invoked to derive the admittedly problematical 3sg. *téit*, *-té(i)t* ‘goes’ from < **tēxti* is not only unceremoniously disproved by an OIr. form such as *cécht* ‘plough(share)’ but is also incompatible with the voiced value /-d/ of the final dental conclusively demonstrated by ModIr. (and Scots Gaelic) *t(h)éid*. The follow up to this unfortunate starting point is not only hard to square with Kortlandt’s (1979, 35) own dictum that ‘analogic change requires not only a model, but also a motivation’ but also fails to explain the restriction of the phenomenon in question to compounds of strong verbs with a root-final dental. Still more seriously, it ignores good evidence (see McCone, 1981, 35-40) that the forms at issue first arose when the syllable before the ending was unstressed, i.e. in verbs compounded with two or more preverbs and in only the prototonic forms of those compounded with a single preverb. Thus formulated, the syncope in question turns out to be perfectly regular and accounts for, say, the consistent Old Irish opposition between stressed 3sg. conj. *-reith* ‘runs’ (note the tell-tale asterisk before Kortlandt’s **-ret* above) and unstressed *-rat* or *-ret* in compounds such as *do:etar-rat* ‘comprehends’, *do:fúa-rat/-dí-u-rat* ‘remains’ and *do:im-thi-ret* ‘serves’. Understandably enough, there was some spread from the unstressed to the stressed root of a couple of compounds (notably deut. *ad:fét* or *in(d):fét* ‘relates’ on the basis of historically regular prot. *-indet*) but this was too limited to obscure the original conditioning (note too the argument in McCone, 1981, 40 that *ad:fét* must have been first created from prototonic *-indet* after /-t/ had become

/-d/ after an unstressed vowel c. 700 A.D.). Moreover, the 3sg. *-t* ending is never found in the 3sg. abs. or conj. of simple verbs, which would be strange indeed if simple *téit/-tét* had provided the starting point as Kortlandt supposes. The less said about his remarkable final flourish in suggesting that the ending of *cingith* in a phrase from an Old Irish legal poem may be an utterly isolated athematic 3sg. conj. (so also Kortlandt, 1979, 46) rather than a perfectly straightforward thematic 3sg. abs., the better.

There is, then, not a scintilla of reasonable doubt about the reconstruction of a Proto-Celtic thematic 3sg. **-e-ti*, given that this is firmly supported by three of the four sub-branches in question and quite uncontradicted by the fourth.

Finally, acknowledgement of Italic apocope of 2sg. **-esi* to **-es*, in certain forms at least, raises the intriguing possibility that Lat. 1pl. *-mus* and 2pl. *-tis* could derive from **-mosi* and **-tesi* as well as from **-mos* and **-tes* and so could reflect an Italic merger of earlier prim. **-mosi/*-tesi* with sec. **-mos/*-tes*. If so, the set of endings ascribed to Proto-Celtic above could already have been in existence at an arguable Italo-Celtic stage favoured by a number of scholars (e.g. Cowgill, 1970), although the 1 and 2pl. can hardly be used as positive evidence for such a stage in view of the historical ambiguity of the Italic forms. As is well known, forms such as Lat. neut. *i*-stem *mare* ‘sea’ militate against positing apocope of *-i* (> *-e* when retained or restored) across the board in Italic. For that very reason the reflex of loc. **-i* seen in the abl. sg. of consonant stems such as *virtut-e* (< **-tūt-i*) or *gener-e* (< **genes-i*) and infinitives such as *regere* ‘to rule’ (< **reges-i*) does not constitute strong evidence against a general Italic apocope of *-i* after *t* and *s* at least, since the distinctive **-i* ending could easily have been restored to a bare stem **wirtūt*, **genes* and then **reges* etc. (cf. the similarly motivated post-IE encroachment of the **-i* upon the endingless locative) from other categories such as the large class of *r*-stems with abl. *-(t)ore* < loc. *-(t)ōr-i*, where it had been regularly retained.

1.4. As noted in II.3.2c, the crucial advance was made by Cowgill (1975, 56-8), who posited an early Insular Celtic loss of **-i* similar to one long recognised in Italic. This would have obliterated the formal distinction between primary and secondary endings and resulted in 3sg. **-t*, 3pl. **-nt* and so on in all active categories characterised by either set: e.g., 3sg. pres. **ber-e-t* (< **ber-e-ti* by apocope) and pret. **bir(-s)-t* (no change) throughout in the right-hand column in 1.1 above. Cowgill’s apocope of **-i*, which was subsequently corroborated with reference to the so-called ‘short’ datives of various Old Irish consonant-stem nouns (e.g. *t*-stem dat. sg. *óentu* ‘unity’ < **oino-tūt* < **oino-tūt-i*; McCone, 1978), immediately squared the distribution of the Insular Celtic conjunct endings with the inheritance of a standard system of primary

and secondary endings from PIE. It has rightly been accepted as an essential first step by almost all scholars (apparently with the solitary exception of Kortlandt; see II.3.3a, 1.3.1-2 above and 1.7 below) who have contributed to this question since (see II.3.3b-c).

It might, of course, be argued that an enclitic particle **es* or the like of obscure origins must still be posited in Insular Celtic main clauses because there is no viable alternative explanation of the differentiation of absolute from conjunct endings deriving in part from inherited secondary endings and in part from inherited primary endings that had lost their **-i* by apocope. However, the present writer (McCone, 1979c, 1982 and 1985b) has endeavoured to show that such an alternative does exist if one makes the perfectly reasonable assumption that this Insular Celtic apocope of **-i* was impeded by a following enclitic (as also posited by most versions of the particle hypothesis) in just the same way as the verbal ending was later preserved by an enclitic pronoun or relative marker from the ravages of the more general Primitive Irish apocope on the evidence of oppositions such as that between 3sg. abs. OIr. *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ < **bereθi* and *be(i)r[†]thi* ‘bears it’ < **bereθi(y)-e* or that between 3pl. *ber(a)it* ‘bear’ < **berodi* < **beronti* and 3pl. rel. *ber[†]t(a)e* ‘who bear’ < **berode-ya* < **beronti-yo*. The outcome in Insular Celtic would then have been pres. 3sg. *#bereti-E....#* versus **beret* < **bereti* elsewhere and so on.

Wackernagel’s Law governing the placement of enclitics determined that **bereti-* was confined to clause-initial simple verbs just like the Old Irish *be(i)rid* with absolute ending that can be derived from it without the slightest formal difficulty. The identity of the ending of 3sg. pres. **beret* ‘bears’, pret. **bir(s)t* ‘bore’ and so on in most environments inevitably destroyed any functional distinction between primary and secondary endings, the only point of formal divergence now being between pres. *#*bereti-E....#* and past *#*bir(s)t-E....#*. At this second stage an obvious interpretation of the **-i-* would have been as an element used to attach a following enclitic, its convenience as a device for breaking up heavy consonant clusters providing more than adequate motivation for its spread to categories with inherited secondary endings according to the straightforward formula (here representing E by the **swes* underlying OIr. 2pl. *-b-* ‘you’) **beret* : **beret-i-swes* = **bir(s)t* : x (x = **bir(s)t-i-swes*).

At a later third stage specifically initial forms with **-i-* such as **bereti-* and **bir(s)ti-* came to be used even when there was no enclitic attached, the upshot being initial *#*bereti(-E)....#*, *#*bir(s)ti(-E)...#* and so on with exactly the same distribution in relation to non-initial *#X(P)*beret(...)#*, *#X(P)*bir(s)t(...)#* etc. as that of their direct Old Irish descendants abs. *be(i)rid*, *birt* in relation to conj. *-beir*, *-bert*. This homogenisation of initial forms with and without an attached enclitic seems a natural

enough development, its direction being determined by the undesirability of eliminating **-i-* on account of its continuing usefulness, when followed by an enclitic, as a buffer between consonants. Watkins' (1963, 40) comments with reference to the univerbation of compound verbs can also be applied here by simply substituting 'V + **-i-*' for his 'P': 'The enclitic E was immobile, in second position in the sentence; it was phonologically and syntactically bound. P in initial position was likewise bound, since its presence was necessary to support E. Irish could have developed free and mobile forms for pronominal objects, as did other languages. But it did not do so, and this fact left no choice as to the direction and manner of the process..'. Indeed, due allowance being made for the lack of a 'Wackernagel'-type restriction on the position of enclitics in the sentence as a whole, a close parallel is provided by those Biscayan dialects of Basque that replace the familiar 2sg. fem. marker *-n* with a *-na* obviously extrapolated from forms where it had retained its vowel owing to the presence of a further overt clitic pronominal: e.g., 2sg. fem. ergative (+ 3sg. absolutive Ø) *egin do-na* (standard *egin du-n*) 'you (f.) have done' like 2sg. fem. dative (+ 3sg. absol. Ø + 3sg. erg. Ø) *emon deu-na* for *emon deu-n* (standard *eman din*) '(s)he has given it to you (f.)' on the model of *emon deu-na-z* (standard *eman dizkin*) '(s)he has given them (3pl. abs. -z) to you (f.)', *emon deu-na-t* (standard *eman di-na-t*) 'I have given it to you (f.)' etc. (see Irazola, 1989, 47 and 49).

1.5.1. Straightforward application of apocope of *-i* except where followed by an enclitic causes all of the primary endings except thematic 1sg. **-ū* reconstructed for Proto-Celtic to become identical with the corresponding inherited secondary endings in 1.3.1 above. Conversely, well motivated spread of the **-i* retained by primary endings in initial position before enclitics to the corresponding secondary endings with final consonant would have made all of the latter identical with the former in that environment (note too that, even if the 1pl. had been **-mos* and the 2pl. **-tes* in both prim. and sec., this analogical process would still have resulted in the 1pl. **-mos-i-E* and **-tes-i-E* ultimately responsible for the OIr. abs. endings here). The equally justifiable homogenisation of the endings of initial verbs, whether followed by an enclitic or not, in favour of the variant with **-i* then yields the precise distribution of initial (> absolute) in relation to non-initial (> conjunct) endings as in the table below, given that primary thematic 1sg. **-ū* (with a final vowel conducive to the avoidance of heavy consonant clusters when followed by certain enclitics) will have remained in all positions for the simple and wholly sufficient reason that it was unaffected by both the apocope of **-i* and any readjustments arising therefrom. Since there is no good reason to posit any Insular Celtic category with inherited secondary 1sg. **-o-m* (see below), abs./conj. **-ū* will have been the sole 1sg. thematic ending. That is clearly why it constituted the 1sg. of the *s-* and *t-*preterites (e.g. 1sg. conj. *-gabus* 'I took' < **gabass-ū*, *-biurt* 'I bore' < **birt-ū*) when the other persons of these were created by

thematising a 3sg. base such as **gabass*, **birt* (the phonetically regular outcomes of **gab-as-t* and **bir-s-t*) taken to consist of stem plus zero ending, as conclusively demonstrated by Watkins (1962, 171-180).

	Initial (> absolute)	Non-initial (> conjunct)
1sg.	<i>*-ū/*-mi</i> (them./athem.)	<i>*-ū/*-m</i> (them./athem.)
2sg.	<i>*-si</i>	<i>*-s</i>
3sg.	<i>*-ti</i>	<i>*-t</i>
1pl.	<i>*-mosi</i>	<i>*-mos</i>
2pl.	<i>*-tisi</i> (< <i>*-tesi</i> ; 1.2.2 and 1.5.2)	<i>*-tis</i> (< <i>*-tisi</i> < <i>*-tesi</i>)
3pl.	<i>*-nti</i>	<i>*-nt</i>

It is generally agreed that primary endings characterised the PIE present indicative underlying the corresponding Insular Celtic/Old Irish category and secondary endings the PIE aorist indicative upon which the Insular Celtic/Old Irish *s-* and *t-*preterites are based, while it also seems clear that primary endings were used by the PIE reduplicated desiderative that ultimately yielded the various Old Irish future formations (see Rix, 1967, 267 and McCone, 1991, 174-182). As long as it was taken to be cognate with the historically problematical Italic *ā*-subjunctive, the Old Irish *ā*-subjunctive might have been expected to have inherited secondary endings, whether as a shifted root aorist or as some sort of erstwhile optative like other Italic subjunctives (see McCone, 1991, 85-98). If so, it could easily enough be assumed to have acquired primary **-t(i)* by analogy in Insular Celtic as in Classical Latin, whence OIr. 3sg. conj. *-bera* < **berāt* replacing **berā* < **berād* (Ins. Celt. **berā* > OIr. **-ber*). This anyway minor problem has now disappeared following the demonstration (McCone, 1991, 55-83 and 98-135) that all Insular Celtic subjunctives derive from the thematic PIE aorist subjunctive (mostly from the *-s-e/o-* subj. of the *s*-aorist), a category almost certainly characterised by primary endings either exclusively as in Greek (e.g. Cowgill, 1975, 64 and 1985b, 101-2) or alongside secondary endings as in Indo-Iranian (e.g. Rix, 1967, 267-8), if these were not spread from the optative at a post-PIE stage. Regardless of whether the PIE thematic subjunctive used primary endings alone or in free variation with secondary endings, the already cited (1.3.2 above) Gaulish *bueti(d)* and Celtiberian *ambitseti*, *robiseti* (to which can perhaps be added *kuati* and *asekati*; see KPV 751-3) provide good evidence for use of the primary endings in Celtic and the same can be confidently assumed for Insular Celtic with OIr. 3sg. conj. *ā*-subj. *-era* ‘may give’ (BIV/S3 -ern) < **-erāh* < **-erāθ* < **-erahet* (or **-erāhet* influenced by the future) < **eraset* < **eraseti* < **perh_{2/3}-s-e-ti* like *ā*-fut. *-ebra* ‘will give’ < **-eβrāh* < **-iβrāθ* < **-iβrāhet* < **iβrāset* < **ibrāseti* < **piprh_{2/3}-se-ti* (see McCone, 1991, 158) and so on.

Insular Celtic apocope of **-i* except when immediately followed by an enclitic will, then, have directly resulted in **-m* versus **-mi-E* (athem. 1sg.) or **-ū(-E)* (them. 1sg.), **-s* versus **-si-E* (2sg., 1 and 2 pl.) and **-t* versus **-ti-E* (3sg. and pl.) throughout the Insular Celtic present indicative, present subjunctive and desiderative/future. It is to be emphasised that the great majority of formations involved (i.e. all but the AI = W1 and BIV/V = S3 present indicatives) will have been inflected thematically according to the scheme 1sg. **-ū(-E)*, 2sg. **-is(-i-E)*, 3sg. **-et(-i-E)*, 1pl. **-omos(-i-E)*, 2pl. *-etis(-i-E)*, 3pl. *-ont(-i-E)* and that this was the only thematic inflection available in the absence (already mentioned in the first paragraph of this section) of any thematic categories with inherited secondary endings. The only Insular Celtic categories with inherited secondary endings, namely the *s-* and *t-*preterites, can be assumed quite unproblematically to have been constituted after apocope of **-i* (and concomitant loss of a clear distinction between primary and secondary) by adding the relevant thematic personal endings to an inherited 3sg. *-V-*ss* (< *-V*-s-t*) and *-R-*t* (< *-R-*s-t*) reinterpreted as stem plus zero ending. The result will then almost inevitably have been 1sg. **-ss-ū(-E)* and **-t-ū(-E)*, 2sg. **-ss-is(-i-E)* and **-t-is(-i-E)*, 3sg. **-ss(-E)* and **-t(-E)*, 1pl. **-ss-omos(-i-E)* and **-t-omos(-i-E)*, 2pl. **-ss-etis(-i-E)* and **-t-etis(-i-E)*, 3pl. **-ss-ont(-i-E)* and **-t-ont(-i-E)*. In other words, in the only active categories to acquire a desinential opposition between *-C* and *-Ci-E* other than by regular sound change, this very probably occurred as a direct consequence of straightforward thematisation rather than on the anyway by no means unmotivated (see 1.4 above) analogy of the present, subjunctive and desiderative/future endings. It is to be noted that Cowgill (1975, 63-4) makes essentially the same assumptions about the *s-*preterite but, of course, uses a particle **(e)s* to generate the absolute forms: ‘when this formation was partially thematicized,... the only thematic endings the language had were the primary ones. Hence, if **karass* ‘thou lovedst’ was to be differentiated from **karass* ‘he loved’, the available form was **karasses-i* > OIr. *·carais* (like *·bir* < **beresi*), and, with the element **(e)s*, **karasses-i-s* > OIr. *cars(a)i...* The third singular simply kept its inherited shape abs. **karass-es* developing regularly to OIr. *·carais..* and conj. **karass* to OIr. *·car*’.

However, if one dispenses with a particle, the 3sg. is the only point in the paradigms of the *s-* and *t-*preterite where it is necessary to posit analogical spread of **-i-* under pressure from all of the other persons. Hence **-ss-i-E* and **-t-i-E* corresponding to **-ss* and **-t* in line with the already illustrated (1.4) usefulness of **-i-* as a device for breaking up heavy consonant clusters or restoring morphological clarity, as in the case of the replacement of 3sg. *s-*pret. **gabassin* (*gabass* + 3sg. fem. enclitic pron), **gabassus* (+ 3pl. pron.), **gaba(s)swes* (+ 2pl. pron.) by **gabass-i-sin*, **gabass-i-sus*, **gabassi-swes*.

1.5.2. Cowgill (1975, 56-7) envisaged an Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* after *-t-* only under rather ill defined conditions not unlike those held to obtain in Italic and was consequently ready to entertain various exceptions (notably OIr. *inn-uraid* ‘last year’ from unapocoped **-eruti* < **peruti*; see McCone, 1978, 37-8) and to discount the possibility of **-si* to **-s* on the basis of forms like dat. sg. **tig* ‘house’ < **tegī* < **tegei* < **tegehi* < **tegesi* and similarly 2sg. conj. *-bir* ‘you bear’ < **berī* < **berei* < **berehi* < **beresi* (see 1.2 above and Cowgill, 1975, 57-8). Nevertheless, whatever about Italic (see 1.3.1 above), it is clearly methodologically preferable to posit a historically regular apocope of *-i* under clearly defined conditions in Insular Celtic. Understandably enough, the only apocoped forms posited by Cowgill were in the finite verbal system, but it then transpired (McCone, 1978) that the form and distribution of the so-called ‘short’ dative singular of various Old Irish consonant-stem nouns not only supplied crucial confirmation of Cowgill’s early apocope of **-i* (1.4) but also gave grounds for thinking that this had applied without exception in Insular Celtic, wherever **-i* was in genuinely final position and not shielded by a following enclitic. The problem of *inn-uraid* disappeared with the realisation (McCone, 1992, 36, n. 108, and *RChron.* 101; likewise Schrijver, 1994, 162) that the form *inn-* of the prefixed article in the earliest attestation (Wb. 16c14) was acc. sg. (not dat. sg. *ind-*) pointing to **erut-en* or **arut-en* (< **-an* < **-am* < **-m̄*) analogically generated from inherited **erut(i)* in accordance with the normal dat./acc. alternation in dental stems. Presumably this will originally have denoted duration (‘for the last year’) as opposed to a point (‘last year’) of time and then, when this semantic distinction had been eroded by the Old Irish period (*GOI* 157), simply displaced weakly characterised **er* or **ur* < dat. **e/arut*. As Schrijver (1997, 156) rightly observes, ‘Kortlandt’s objection (1994: 62) that *inn* in *inn-uraid* is a recent addition may well be correct, but if it is of pre-apocope date, which is quite conceivable, it presupposes that **erut-* must have been formally characterised as *Asg. *erutan* at the time and at any rate could not have been an overtly characterised dat. sg. like **eruti*. His remark that (Dsg.) *ind-echt-so* ‘this once’ was replaced by (Asg.) *in fecht-so* begs the question’. A more recent argument for preferring a regular general Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* over a more restricted one has been made elsewhere (*RChron.* 100-102) and this position underlies all relevant analyses advanced in the present work.

As far as **-si* was concerned, regular apocope to **-s* in Insular Celtic could be posited without difficulty once it was recognised that this development had been preceded by an equally regular change of unstressed *-es-* to *-is-* before a following vowel (*RChron.* 99-100; note the corollary that the Old Irish system of regular stress of the first syllable of a word goes back as least as far as early Insular Celtic, as argued on other grounds by Schrijver, 1995, 17-20, and accepted by *KPV* 139). This simple hypothesis solves a whole range of problems at a stroke. To begin with, the raising of *e* to *i* in the root

of *s*-stems was not confined to the dat. sg. but occurred at every point in their paradigm where the suffix had been **-es-*: e.g., sg. nom./acc. *nem* ‘heaven’ < **nem-os*, gen. *nime* < **nem-es-os*, dat. *nim* < **nem-es-i*, pl. nom./acc. *nime* < **nem-es-a*, gen. *nime* < **nem-es-om*, dat. *nimib* < **nem-es-obis* (see *GOI* 216 and McCone, 1994, 102-3). The *ad hoc* postulate of **-esi* > **-ehi* > **-ei* > **-ī* only applied to the dat. sg. and left a number of other forms with *nim-* etc. unexplained. An Insular Celtic sound change *-esV(-)* > *-isV(-)* was, by contrast, fully efficacious, converting the gen. sg. into **nem-is-os* (> **neuihah* > **neuiyah* > **niuiyah* > **niueya(h)* > OIr. *nime* quite regularly) and so on (cf. Sims-Williams, 1984, 150). The upshot was a perfectly straightforward derivation of dat. dg. *nim* < **niui(h)* < **neuih* < **nemis* < **nemisi* < **nemesi*, 2sg. abs. *biri* < **biri* < **berisi(-E)* < **beresi*, 2sg. conj. *-bir* < **biri(h)* < **berih* < **beris* < **berisi* < **beresi*, 2pl. abs. cop. *adi* < **eθ’i* < **eθiyi* < **e-tisi(-E)* < **e-tesi-E* (1.2.2 above; see *RChron.* 110-111 on non-raising of stressed *e* over a voiceless fricative), 2pl. conj. *-beirid* < **ber’eθ’* < **bereθi(h)* < **bereθih* < **beretis* < **beretisi(-E)* < **beretesi* and so on.

This sound change has recently been disputed by Schumacher (*KPV* 139-153), principally on the strength of his analysis of a number of copula forms. Arguing that *a-t* (see V.2.3 on the *-t* taken over from the so-called ‘conjugated’ forms of prepositions) was the original form of the pres. ind. 2sg. abs. by virtue of being attested three times in Wb. and twice in Ml., whereas *i-t* is attested twice in Ml. only, Schumacher (*KPV* 139-40) posits a preform **ehit* (**ehi* without Schrijver’s **(e)ti* in II.3.3c will do just as well in the light of the remarks about non-lenition after a main-clause copula in 1.2.1 above) > **e-iθ* (**e-i* without particle) > **ēh* (**ē* without particle) > **ē* > **a* → *at* with the help of an *ad hoc* sound law *e-i* > *ē*. As pointed out below (1.9.4 on 3pl. pret. cop. *batir/batar*) it is unsound automatically to assume the chronological priority of a form in Wb. over an alternative in Ml. when linguistic considerations suggest otherwise, a principle rightly followed by Schumacher himself with regard to *t*-pret. 3pl. *-at* (Ml. only; see 1.9.4 below) versus *-(a)tar* (Wb. and Ml.) taken over from the suffixless preterite. The fact is that the vocalism of 2sg. *a-t* can easily be analogical to that of the other first and second person forms with historically regular *a-* (see the paradigm in V.2.3), whereas that of *i-t* cannot. Schumacher (*KPV* 306) takes the quite isolated syncopated *airmi* ‘for we are’ (Ml. 23d23) as evidence that **ari* plus copula were univerbated as **ari-(e)mmi* (note that **ar(i)emmi* would yield the same result) and then argues quite improbably that in Wb.16b9 2pl. *ar idib* the vowel has been restored from 2sg. *air it* ‘for you are’ (Ml. 55d11) < **ar’ih* < **ari-(e)hiθ* (*-θ* being the particle) as also in Wb. 12a12 1pl. *ar ammi* influenced by unaccompanied *ammi* (and thus taken to be a later form than Ml. *airmi* contrary to the line adopted in relation to *at/it*). Regarding his claim that 2sg. abs. *it* at the beginning of a main clause in Ml. 108d2 (‘but only there!’) is ‘certainly secondary’, one can only

say that ‘but only there!’ could just as well be applied to *it* after *air* at Ml. 55d11. In short, none of this elaborate special pleading is at all compelling and it remains a good deal more straightforward to take *i-t* to contain directly inherited **i < i-i < *ihi < *isi(-) < *esi*. A similar lack of persuasiveness attaches to Schumacher’s (*KPV* 140) derivation of pres. subj. 2sg. abs. *ba < *behit* (for the present writer **behi*) *< *besi(-t)* without *esV > isV* on the grounds that there would be no motive for replacing a distinctive 2sg. **bi < *bihi(-t)* with a form identical with 1sg. *ba* (possibly the regular outcome of the unstressed **be(y)-ū* securely inferred from subst. verb 1sg. subj. abs. *beu/o*, conj. *-béo < stressed *be(y)-ū*; McCone, 1991, 122). 2sg. abs. subj. **bi* would not only lack the characteristic *-e(-)* of the stem in the rest of the paradigm (and throughout that of the closely related substantive verb) but would also almost certainly be identical with the 2sg. abs. **bi < *bii* (by Prim. Ir. loss of hiatus in all but sequences involving a stressed vowel) *< *biyihī < *biyisi(-) < *biyesi* of the consuetudinal present of the copula. In the copula, unlike the substantive verb, these forms were already tending to be replaced in Old Irish by those of the ordinary present *is* (*GOI* 487) with the result that only the 3sg. abs. *bid*, conj. *-bi/-pi* and perhaps 3pl. conj. *-bit* (see *DIL*, *i* col. 309) are securely attested. However, this was obviously a quite recent development and a full paradigm must have been in existence not long before, in which case there would have been a very good reason to replace 2sg. abs. **bi* with **be (> OIr. ba)* in Early Old Irish. Finally, Schumacher’s (*KPV* 140) derivation of the *-a* of admittedly problematical neg. 2sg. pres. *níd-a* ‘you are not’ (see V.2.3 for a tentative explanation of this and the identical OIr. 1sg.) from (**e < *ehē < *eses* not only introduces a thematised form for which there is otherwise no evidence in Irish (unlike British, where the phenomenon is clearly secondary; cf. McCone, 1995, 127-8, and *KPV* 302-4) but also fails to account for the lenition after *-a* in Ml. 84c3 *cenit-a chumgabtha-siu* ‘are you not exalted?’. In conclusion, then, none of the copula forms adduced above constitutes cogent evidence against unstressed *-esV(-)* to *-isV(-)*, and one might add that Schrijver’s derivation of neut. *sodain* ‘that’ *< *so-de-sin(-)* is, *pace KPV* 152, far from convincing (see McCone, 2003, 179-180).

The most serious objection to Schumacher’s approach is the havoc that it plays with the otherwise utterly straightforward derivation of the 2sg. abs. *-biri*, conj. *-bir* and various *s*-stem forms presented above. Conceding that an *s*-stem dat. sg. *nim* can hardly be other than from **neuih*, Schumacher (*KPV* 144-5) has recourse to an *ad hoc* postulate of raising of *e* to *i* in hiatus before a low back vowel after loss of *-h- < -s-*, whence gen. sg. **-e-ah > *-i-ah* rapidly lowered again by a well established rule (*RChron.* 110) *> *-e-ah > OIr. -e*, nom./acc. pl. **-e-a > *-i-a > *-e-a > OIr. -e* and so on. This is patently uneconomical, not least because of the need to separate this putative raising of unstressed *e* in hiatus before the Prim. Ir. apocope from an

undoubted later raising of stressed *e* to *i* in hiatus after the Prim. Ir. syncope (*RChron.* 130). Be that as it may, during what can only have been the quite brief period of **-i-a(h)*'s existence prior to lowering, pressure from **-i-* in the gen. sg. and throughout the pl. is assumed to have changed dat. sg. **neueh* (< **nemes* < **nemesi* by apocope) analogically to **neuih*. Hitt. nom./acc. sg. *nepiš* 'heaven' is cited as an example of analogical levelling by spreading the **-es-* variant of the suffix to the one point in the paradigm with a reflex of **-os*, but one is then left wondering why the supposed Primitive Irish levelling of the suffix did not also affect nom./acc. sg. **neuah* (> OIr. *nem*).

The thematic 2sg. is even more problematical. That forms such as 2sg. *biri*, *-bir* are due to straightforward raising is clearly indicated by a form such as OIr. *ar-a:rethi* 'which you assail' (Wb. 6b22) with added *-i* (from the abs.; see below) in order to differentiate 2sg. conj. **-reith* (with regular lack of raising by **-ih* over a voiceless fricative; *RChron.* 110-111) from 3sg. *-reith* < **-reθeθ*. Rightly accepting that the sound change **-esi(-)* > **-ehi(-)* > **-e-i(-)* > **-ē(-)* posited by him in relation to the 2sg. of the unstressed copula should also have applied to post-tonic unstressed vowels, Schumacher (*KPV* 145-52) launches into an elaborate network of analogies necessitated solely by the consideration that 2sg. abs. **be(i)re* < **berēh* < **berehiθ* < **beresit* (with Schrijver's particle **-θ* < **-t*, of course) and 2sg. conj. **-beir* < **bereh* < **beres(i)* should have resulted from his phonological assumptions. Remodelling the former to **be(i)ri* on the basis of pres. ind. *-i* versus subj. *-e* inherited in certain other classes does not present undue problems but the model of *-rethi* would then suggest a new conjunct 2sg. **-be(i)ri* (actually introduced in Middle Irish; *EIV* 204). Moreover, the root vocalism of *biri*, *-bir* remains unaccounted for and the best that can be done in this regard (*KPV* 146-7) is the utterly *ad hoc* suggestion that, in the relatively short period between raising and the Prim. Ir. apocope, presents of the shape *Cel/r-e/o-* underwent remodelling of a 2sg. conj. such as **-bereh* to **-bireh* alongside 1sg. **-biru* (> OIr. *-biur*) < **berū*) on the analogy of the relationship existing in the *t*-pret. between 1sg. **birtu* (> OIr. *-biurt*) and 2sg. conj. **-birteh* (> OIr. *-birt*; 2sg. conj. *-fil* discussed in 1.3.2 was then presumably < **wil-es* for **wel-es* on the analogy of **bir-es* etc. in the absence of any good reason to suppose that this defective form still had a *t*-pret. **wil-t(-)* in Primitive Irish as late as the fifth century A.D.). Schumacher duly acknowledges the apparent paradox that the preterite should have influenced the present stem here rather than the other way round (as may have happened later to produce *t*-pret. 3sg. conj. *-bert* with the same vocalism as pres. *-beir*; *KPV* 147, following a suggestion by McCone, 1994, 165). An even more serious difficulty is the lack of any obvious motive for the selective analogical remodelling of just 2sg. **(-)ber-* to **(-)bir-* (cf. the similar problem besetting Schumacher's view of the dat. sg. of *s*-stems above) in a present paradigm with synchronically predictable

1sg. **(-)bir-* before **-u* (by raising) versus **(-)ber-* elsewhere on the basis of a preterite paradigm with **(-)bir-t(-)* throughout. Even if implausible analogical remodelling of perfectly normal pres. **ber-* (with exactly the same inflectional pattern as unaffected **reθ-* ‘run’ etc. with 1sg. **riθ-u* > OIr. *-riuth*) from pret. **birt(-)* had taken place, it is surely far more likely to have resulted in **bir-* throughout the pres. like **birt(-)* throughout the pret. than to have applied to the 2sg. pres. alone. In that case, **(-)ber-* would, of course, have reemerged in the 1 and 3pl. as a result of lowering before **-o-* but OIr. 3sg. **birid*, **-bir* and/or 2pl. **birthe*, **-birid* would have resulted. Sound methodology calls for evidence beyond the 2sg. as a precondition for entertaining the notion that accommodation of present to *t*-preterite vocalism was the trigger of 2sg. pres. **(-)bir-* rather than perfectly normal raising before a reflex of **-is(i) < *-isi < *-e-si* with a pre-desinential *-i-* confined to the 2sg. by the conditioning of the regular sound change involved. It goes without saying that the 3sg. and 2pl. forms in question actually contain *be(i)r-*.

Here, then, we have yet another all too typical instance (see II.3.4.1) of its devotees’ readiness to sacrifice phonologically and morphologically straightforward explanations to far more complicated and poorly motivated alternatives in the interests of a particle that turns out to be as implacable as it is elusive. The agenda involved in this case should become clear from the discussion of OIr. 2pl. *-the* below (1.5.5) in the present section. In the final analysis, the only substantial counterexample to a general unstressed **-esV(-)* to **-isV(-)* adduced by Schumacher (*KPV* 142-3) is the **temes-el-* probably underlying OIr. *teimel* ‘darkness’, MB *teffoal*, MW *tywyll* ‘dark(ness)’ (OW/B *timuil*) and, if so, pointing to a development **-ese- > *-ehe- > *-ee- > *-ē-* and so on. However, it seems a poor bargain to purchase a plausible explanation of this one form at the price of the serious problems just documented, and there would seem to be two obvious ways out of the dilemma. The first would be to restrict the raising rule to **-esi(-) > *-is(i)(-)* and adopt an explanation of all but the dat. sg. of the *s*-stems along the lines suggested by Schumacher above. The second, which is surely preferable, would be simply to posit that a following *-e-* (possibly only if there was also a preceding stressed *-e-*) kept the identical vowel of *-es-* unchanged, in which case the rule would acquire a slightly more restricted formulation as unstressed **-esV- > *-isV-* except where *V = e*. If so, **-es- > *-is-* throughout the *s*-stems would present no difficulty.

1.5.3. To return to the main thrust of this section, the processes outlined above, which include (notwithstanding some just discussed doubt about its precise extent) a firmly established Insular Celtic sound law responsible for unstressed **-esi(-) > *-isi(-)*, not only generate the precise distribution of the absolute/conjunct dichotomy in the Old Irish (and, to judge from British vestiges, Insular Celtic) active but also yield virtually

all of the absolute and most of the conjunct forms in question quite regularly (see below and McCone, 1982, for further details). The best that can be said of the alleged particle's contribution to the derivation of the active absolute endings is that it is 'mostly harmless'. It is to be stressed that, according to this scenario, the opposition between *-Ci* (initial simple verb followed by an enclitic) and *-C* (elsewhere) endings in the active arose by regular sound change (apocope of **-i* unless shielded by an enclitic) in those categories (present indicative, present subjunctive and desiderative/future) with inherited primary endings and was probably not spread as such to any other category by analogy, its establishment in the *s-* and *t-*preterites being readily explicable as the direct consequence of thematisation in all but the 3sg.

The Insular Celtic imperative and suffixless preterite active were based upon PIE categories (the present imperative and the perfect indicative respectively) with their own peculiar sets of endings, which differed significantly from both the primary as well as the secondary set and, above all, contained no **-i* liable to apocope. The lack of an old absolute/conjunct distinction in the inflection of the Old Irish imperative and suffixless preterite is, then, fully compatible with the present account but poses considerable problems for approaches involving a particle, as will be seen in greater detail below (1.9.1-5). In brief, no explanation entailing the generalisation of an enclitic particle **es* or the like in Insular Celtic main clauses can account for the lack of an opposition between absolute and conjunct endings in the Old Irish suffixless preterite. Moreover, given the normality of such expressions as 'go and open the window' in English, there is no obvious reason why Schrijver's **et(i)* 'and' (II.3.3c) should have been absent from imperatives. This omission can be motivated in the case of asseverative **es* 'it is (so)' or the like, but only at the cost of positing a quite unmotivated analogical extension of the absolute/conjunct opposition to the present subjunctive at a later stage when the particle or its reflexes had become semantically empty (see II.3.2c). Discussion of the deponent and passive endings will be reserved for 1.8.1-4 below, where it will be seen that not one single deponent absolute ending can be regarded as the phonologically regular outcome of the corresponding conjunct form plus a particle **es* or the like.

Once a distinction between absolute and conjunct endings had been established by natural means, so to speak, in most persons of a given paradigm, strictly limited analogical spread to the odd hitherto unaffected corner thereof would seem likely enough on occasion in order to fill out the pattern. The already discussed (1.5.1) systemically motivated creation of 3sg. abs. **-ss-i(-E)* and **-t-i(-E)* in the *s-* and *t-*preterite is the only instance of this that seems likely to have occurred as far back as Insular Celtic in the active. By contrast, a date after the Primitive Irish apocope of c. 500 A.D. seems most likely in the case of the analogical creation of the 1sg. abs. type

BI/S1 pres. *biru*, *s*-subj. *tiasu* and *s*-pret. *gabsu* corresponding to 1sg. conj. *-biur* < **biru* < **berū* (end of 1.2 above), *-tias* < **tēssu* < **tēχsū* and *-gabus* < **gaβasu* < **gaβassū* respectively.

The 1sg. abs. *-a* of the *a*-subj., *a*-fut. and *f*-fut. can be similarly explained on the assumption that, once **-ā-* (< **-āe/o-* < **-āhe/o-* < **-āse/o-* also tending to replace **ase/o-*) had arisen throughout these except in the 1sg. with **-ū* (< **-āū* < **-āhū* < **-āsū*), an S1 or W2a 1sg. subj. such as **berū* or **lēgiyū* was remodelled to **berā* (> OIr. conj. *-ber*) or **lēgiyā* in order to distinguish it from the corresponding pres. ind. **berū*. or **lēgiyū* and that 1sg. **-ā* with the now characteristic marker was spread throughout the *a*-subj./fut. system where the root ended in a consonant (see McCone, 1991, 104-5). After the Primitive Irish truncation of final syllables W2a will have had 1sg. abs./conj. **lēg'e* < **lēgeyā* < **lēgiyā*, 2sg. abs./conj. **lēg'ee* < **lēg'eyāi* < **lēgiyāhi* and < **lēg'ea* < **lēg'eyāh* < **lēgiyāh* (cf. gen sg. *túaithe* < **tōθ'ea* < **tōθ'ea* < **tōθ'eyāh* < **tōθiyāh* < **tōt(i)yās*) respectively, and 3sg. conj. **lēg'e* < **lēg'ea* < **lēg'eyāh* < **lēgiyāh* < **lēgiyāθ*.

In other words, all three persons of the singular conjunct as well as the 1/2sg. abs. will have been formally identical, and this brings us to an important structural point. Since the verbal endings were often the sole indicator of person in Old Irish, it was highly desirable that all three persons singular and plural be formally distinct on either side of the absolute and conjunct divide, whereas the identity of an absolute with a conjunct ending across that divide (e.g. 3sg. abs. *beirid* and 2pl. conj. *-beirid*) was unproblematical because the two sets of endings were in complementary distribution. The validity of this principle is clear from the fact that an individual absolute, conjunct or other (e.g. imperative) paradigm in Old Irish almost invariably displays six formally distinct personal endings (the identical 1 and 2sg. of the suffixless preterite being the main exception). On the absolute side of the fence there will have been similar reasons for making formal distinctions between non-relative and relative forms or between plain personal endings and those containing a suffixed pronoun.

At all events, there would have been considerable pressure towards reshaping parts of the W2a subjunctive paradigm in order to avoid the serious ambiguities just documented. Since **-e* (OIr. *-e*) was the 2sg. abs./conj. ending elsewhere in the *a*-subj./fut. (McCone, 1982, 26), the obvious solution was to retain this and remodel the others. In the 1sg. conj. the obvious solution was to adopt the form with zero ending seen in W1 *-marb* < **marwā*, S1 *-ber* < **berā* and S2 *-gab* < *gabā*, the upshot being OIr. *-léic*, while in the 3sg. conj. *-e* was simply replaced by the *-a* of other classes (e.g. W1 *-marba* < **marwāh*, W2b *-loga* < **logāh*, S1 *-ber* < **berāh* and S2 *-gab* < *gabāh*) to produce **lēg'a* (OIr. *-léicea*) and the 1sg. abs. was similarly

reshaped to **lēg'a* (OIr. *léicea*) in order to distinguish it from 2sg. **lēg'e*. Once an opposition between 1sg. abs. *-a*, conj. $-\emptyset$ had been established by well motivated analogy in W2a, the other classes could easily acquire 1sg. abs. *marba*, *bera*, *gaba* etc. corresponding to their own 1sg. conj. with zero ending. Although the *f*-fut. (McCone, 1991, 176-182) had retained **-ū* in 1sg. conj. *-iub* < abs./conj. **-ifū*, it acquired a new 1sg. abs. *-fea* /-f'a/ by the straightforward proportion (*a*-fut.) abs. 2sg *géb(a)e* : 1sg. *géba* = (*f*-fut.) 2sg. **-if(a)e* : x (x = **-if-a*). Once conj. **-iuf* vs. abs. *-f(e)a* had been established in the *f*-fut., it could be extended to the *s*-fut. to produce 1sg. abs. *gigsea* 'I shall pray' as the counterpart of 1sg. conj. (and formerly abs. too) *-gigius*.

It is, of course, true that the above scenario makes 1sg. abs. *-u* in the S1 pres. and *-a* in the *a*-subj./fut. of all but W2a as well as in the *f*-fut. isolated instances of rather late prehistoric Irish analogical spread of the absolute/conjunct distinction for its own sake rather than as a byproduct of other functionally motivated changes. It is also true that this is one case where a particle **es* or the like would serve some purpose insofar as forms such as OIr. 1sg. abs. pres. *biru*, subj. *bera* etc. would be the regular outcome of **berūh*, **berāh* with such an element attached as opposed to conj. *-biur*, *-ber* < **berū*, **berā* without it. Nevertheless, even if it were not out of the question for other reasons (see II.3.2-4 above and 1.8-9 below), a particle would not be entirely unproblematical here, since a contrast in the *f*-fut. between 1sg. abs. **-ifūh* and conj. **-ifū* would have yielded a perfectly viable EOIr. opposition between 1sg. abs. **-fiu* and conj. **-iuf* (> OIr. *-iub*; *RChron.* 133). If so, it is difficult to see why this coherent pattern should have been disrupted by changing the former to *-fea* taken over from the *a*-fut. while leaving the latter as synchronically anomalous **-iuf* rather than replacing it with equally distinctive **-ef* (> OIr. **-eb*), and the same problem confronts *s*-fut. 1sg. *gigsea*, *-gigius* in place of inherited **gigsiu*, *-gigius* with an absolute containing a particle. In both cases this is easier to explain by starting from identical abs./conj. **-iuf*, *(-)gigius* undifferentiated by a particle, as proposed in the previous paragraph. It is also significant that an opposition such as that between pres. 1sg. abs. *biuu* (Wb. 16d8) and conj. *-bíu* (Wb 20a3) in the *i*-hiatus class (H2) cannot be accounted for in terms of a particle, since disyllabic 1sg. abs. **biu* should have resulted from **biyūh*. It thus looks very much as though monosyllabic 1sg. abs./conj. **(-)biu* (with a short diphthong later regularly lengthened to *-bíu* in absolute asulaut under the stress: *RChron.* 132 and 138) resulted from **biyū* in the first instance, a distinctive abs. then being created by simply adding *-u* on to this according to the proportion (disyllabic 2sg. abs. **bii* being unattested but securely inferred) abs. 2sg. *gaβ'-i* : 1sg. *gaβ'-u* = 2sg. *bi-i* : 1sg. x (x = *biu-u*). The basic point is that, if 1sg. abs. *-u* must be due to analogy in the H1 present class, particle or no, there is no obvious reason why 1sg. abs. *-u* elsewhere cannot likewise be due to analogy.

After the Primitive Irish apocope, the just discussed 1sg. types (along with the 3sg. pret. pass., on which see 1.8.5 below) will have been the only instances from paradigms with a formal absolute/conjunct contrast in which the former consisted of a stem not followed by a further syllable. In such paradigms both abs. and conj. had inherited such an extra syllable or syllables on occasion (e.g. OIr. S2 pres. 2sg. *gaibi*, *-gaibi*, S1 3pl. *berait*, *-berat*) or the abs. only had inherited this (e.g. OIr. S1 pres. 2sg. *biri*, *-bir*, 3sg. *beirid*, *-beir*) but there were no instances of the reverse pattern with a conj. form longer than the corresponding abs and very few where the abs. as well as the conj. lacked a further syllable after the stem (in effect, 1sg. abs. S1 and H pres. **biur*, **biu* etc., *a-/s*-subj. **ber*, **gess* etc., *a*-fut. **bér* etc., *s*-fut. **gigiūs* etc. *f*-fut. **léiciuf* etc.). All that need be posited is a late prehistoric tendency to iron out this last synchronic anomaly on the margins of a system characterised by an inflectional dichotomy between absolute and conjunct that may have been redundant functionally but was quite pervasive structurally. Understandable formal pressure, then, triggered a trivial enough tidying up of the overall system by endowing this handful of ‘bare’ 1sg. absolute types with an extra syllable for the provision of which suitable analogical models were readily available.

1.5.4. Several other Old Irish forms must also be due to relatively late analogy aimed not at spreading a morphologically redundant distinction between absolute and conjunct forms but at making highly desirable clear formal distinctions between the different persons of an absolute/suffixing paradigm or those of a conjunct paradigm. With the exception of 2pl. abs. *-the* (1.5.5 below), these mostly involve conjunct endings and so are anyway unamenable to explanation with the help of a particle. The W1/S3 1sg. pres. abs./conj. *(-)marb(a)im/(-)ben(a)im* might, like the lenition after the OIr. prep. *imm* < **imbi* < **ambi*, be accounted for by a restriction whereby the Insular Celtic apocope of **-i* did not apply after a labial (cf. Schrijver, 1994, 159-65 and 1997, 157). In that case **marwāmi*, **binami* etc. would have been retained in all contexts and not just in initial position before an enclitic. However, an apocopated preposition **amb* ‘around’ could easily have regained **-i*, which was anyway likely enough retained before suffixed pronouns as in 3sg. m. *imbi* ‘around him/it’ < **ambiy-e(n)*, from the corresponding preverb **ambi* ‘around’ (with **-i* regularly in a prototonic form such as *-imthet* ‘goes round’ < **-ambi-t-* and as a result of the same processes as those affecting primary **-i* in the case of pretonic *imm* < **ambi(-E)*). OIr. **-mairb*, **-bin* (< **-marwen*, **-binen* < **-marwan*, **-binan* < **marwām*, **binam*; *RChron.* 79 and 106, cf. Cowgill, 1975, 61) with synchronically anomalous palatal final consonant (and root vocalism in the case of **-bin*) would have resulted from apocopated **-ā/am(i)*. The obvious way to resolve this discrepancy would have been to transfer a distinctive and synchronically transparent 1sg. abs. of the type *marb(a)im*, *ben(a)im* (< **marwāmi*, **binami*) to the conjunct as well, a suitable model being

provided by W2/S2 pres. 1sg. abs./conj. (-)léiciu/(-)gaibiu (see McCone, 1982, 9-14 on the original restriction of -(a)im(m) to the W1/S3 pres.). These forms, then, do not constitute a compelling reason for abandoning the straightforward postulate of a Insular Celtic loss of any final -i that was not shielded by a following enclitic.

The 2sg. abs. -(a)i is the regular outcome of *-isi < *-esi in all but the W1 present, where *marb(a)e < *marwāi < *marwāhi would have been identical with a-subj. 2sg. abs./conj. marb(a)e < *marwāi < *marwāhih(i) < *marwāsis(i) (McCone, 1982, 26). Well motivated analogy will then have led to replacement of the former with distinctive marb(a)i on the model of other classes such as W2a with 2sg. abs. pres. lé(i)ci vs. a-subj. lé(i)ce. Pres. 2sg. abs. *bini < *binī < *binai < *binahi < *binasi (like 1pl. abs. -mi < *-mosi; McCone, 1982, 25 and *RChron.* 131-2) in S3 will simply have been remodelled to ben(a)i with the same vocalism and non-palatal -n- as the rest of the paradigm. In both W1 and S3 the identity of 2sg. conj. *-marba and *-ben < *marwās, *binas with 3sg. -marba, -ben < *marwāt, *binat was easy to resolve by taking -(a)i over from the 2sg. abs. on the model of abs./conj. -i in W2 (-)lé(i)ci, S2 (-)ga(i)bi (see McCone, 1982, 23-6 for the more detailed treatment of the 2sg. forms upon which this paragraph is based).

1.5.5. It is now time to turn to the 2pl. abs. -the, which adherents of a particle are free to derive directly from *-tes-es (Cowgill, 1975, 58) or the like if they discount the case for *-esV(-) > *-isV(-) or merely exempt -ese- from its operation as suggested in 1.5.2 above. However, there is then no explanation for, the copula's 2pl. pres. ind. a-di (see *RChron.* 133 on OIr. voicing of dental fricatives between unstressed vowels), which almost certainly contains the original form of this ending, namely *-thi < *-tisi < *-tesi (see 1.2.2 and 1.5.2 above), in view of the complete lack of motive for replacing an inherited *a-da < *e-the with a-di or *e-thi. Schumacher (*KPV* 143) demurs in an attempt to retain the alleged advantage of a particle in the derivation of 2pl. -the < *-θ'ēh < *-θēh < *-θe-eθ < *-tes-et (but presumably *-tesi-'t like 1pl. -mosi-'t on p. 141 of his book would serve him as well with the help of his above -e-i(-) > -ē(-) rule). According to him (*KPV* 306-8) Wb.'s two or three secure attestations of adi alongside eighteen of adib with a pronoun -b taken over from the conjugated forms of prepositions (see 1.5.2 above on 2sg. i-t, a-t and V.2.3 on this phenomenon in general) are back formations from the latter, and isolated adabail (Wb. 3b7) contains 2pl. ada < EOIr. *e-the with the same ending as other verbs, although mention is made of the surely preferable alternative of assimilation of the final -b of the copula to the non-palatal initial of baill (so /aðəbaL'/).

The expanded form adib very probably had palatal final -b, as argued by Schumacher without drawing the ineluctable conclusion that -b can then only have begun to be

attached to the base after the Early Old Irish depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics (*RChron.* 134-5). Given the evidently secondary nature of the *-b*, it seems perverse to derive *adi* /ađi/ from *adib* /ađəβ'/ on the uneconomical and otherwise unnecessary assumption of final /-i/ on the analogy of 1pl. *ammi* (with 12 and 3 attestations versus 1 and 2 of expanded *ammin(n)* in Wb. and Ml. respectively) rather than taking *adib* as a completely straightforward derivative of *adi*. Since, moreover, suffixed *-n(n)* was regularly broad unlike *-b* and /amən/ would normally be spelled **amman(n)* in Old Irish, the expanded 1pl. form must represent /amiN/ with a genuine *-i* that is evidently due to the late affixation of *-nn* to *ammi* on occasion after Early Old Irish reduction of unstressed internal vowels (*RChron.* 135-6) as opposed to unstressed final vowels (*RChron.* 142-3). It is difficult to see how /ađəbaL'/ above (or perhaps /ađabaL'/; either way no more than nonce partial or total assimilation of unstressed *-i-* to the *a* of the preceding as well as the following syllable need be involved) can be other than an isolated anomaly. This is because it is impossible to see how *adib* can represent anything but /ađiβ'/ if its formation postdated an Early Old Irish depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics that was obviously just about contemporary with the reduction of unstressed vowels to /ə/, as it must have done for the simple reason that /ađəβ/ (the expected Old Irish spelling of which would be **adab*) would have resulted if a 2pl. with *-b* had been created prior to these developments. There is, then, no reasonable alternative to the anyway natural assumption that *adib* /ađiβ'/ was based upon *adi* /ađi/, which was uncommon but still clearly attested in Old Irish..

The significantly greater frequency of pronominal affixation in the 2pl abs. (mostly *-b*) of the pres. ind. cop. than in the 1pl. abs. (*-n(n)* rare in Wb. at least) of the same can simply be put down to the usefulness of *-b* as a means of clarifying synchronically irregular OIr. *adi* (like *-t* in the case of the particularly weakly characterised 2sg. **i*). By contrast, *a-mmi* (EOIr. **e-m'i*) had a synchronically regular 1pl. abs. ending (its unlenited *-m(m)*- actually having been spread to the 1pl. abs. of all other verbs by analogy), and the same applied to EOIr. 1sg. *em'* (the unlenited *-m(m)* of which likewise spread by analogy to produce the 1st. sg. pres. ind. *-(a)im(m)* found with many other verbs) until the depalatalisation of consonants and retraction of *e* in proclitics produced OIr. *am(m)* (probably around the third quarter of the seventh century; cf. the remarks on proclitic forms in the Cambrai Homily in *RChron.* , 135). The OIr. 1sg. pres. ind. of the copula had thus acquired (by regular sound change) an ending *-m(m)* formally identical to the 1sg. pronominal affix and consequently unsusceptible to further clarification from it. Indeed, the synchronically obvious possibility of taking the OIr. 1sg. as *a-* + pronominal *-(m)m* probably made it the trigger for the acquisition first of *-t* by the 2sg. (apparently compulsory by OIr.), then of *-b* by the 2pl. (usual but not invariable in OIr.) and finally of *-n* by the 1pl. (still

infrequent in OIr.). Be that as it may, there can be no doubt whatsoever that 2pl. *adi* is the inherited 2pl. form of the copula and contains the regular reflex *-di* < EOIr. **-thi* of the inherited 2pl. abs. ending **-tisi(-E)* < PC **-tesi*. Anyone so wishing remains free to tack a particle on to this form (**-tisi-s* or **-tisi-t* according to taste) without affecting the outcome, but the crucial point is that a formal advantage no longer attaches to the postulation of such an element in order to generate a 2pl. abs. that must have been **-θ'i* throughout after the Primitive Irish apocope of c. 500 A.D. and then have been remodelled to or replaced by *-the* for some reason in all but the present indicative of the copula by the beginning of the Old Irish period a couple of centuries later.

The next question is why **-thi* should have been generally replaced by *-the* and why the copula alone should have resisted this development. The obvious answer would be that the 2pl. abs. (e.g. **beirthi* 'you bear' < **ber'eθ'i* < **beretihi* < **beretesi*) was remodelled for the simple reason that, as a result of the Primitive Irish apocope, it had become identical to the common 3sg. form plus 3sg. m./n. suffixed pronoun (e.g. *beirthi* 'bears him/it' < **ber'eθ'i* < **bereti-y-e(n)*) in the case of all verbs other than the copula, which opposed pres. 2pl. **e-θ'i* to quite different 3sg. + 3sg. m./n. pron. **is'i(ð')* (OIr. *iss-id*, possibly in place of earlier but still distinctive **is'i* < **issiy-e(n)* < **esti-en/d*; see 1.2.1 above and V.2.5 below). That accounts for the difference between the copula and other verbs quite straightforwardly but there remains the question of the source of **-the*. A simple transfer of 2pl. conj. *-beirid* < **-beirith* < **ber'eθ'* < **bereθi(h)* < **beretis* < **beretesi* to absolute position too was out of the question because of its still more serious formal identity with 3sg. abs. *beirid* < *beirith* < **ber'eθ'* < **bereθi* < **bereti-*. The only other 2pl. ending likely to have been in existence at the time was a relative **-the*, probably < **-θea* < **-θi(y)a* < **-θī(y)a* < **-θiyiya* < **-tihiya* < **-tisi-yo* < **-tesi-yo* (cf. *RChron.* 131-2). It seems easy enough to envisage this *-the* being pressed into service as a new non-ambiguous 2pl. absolute *beirthe* etc., its original relative function then being assumed by a clearly differentiated alternative syntagm involving prefixed *no* plus lenition or nasalisation (see I.1.7) as in OIr. *no:beirid* 'which you bear' < **nu:βer'eθ'*.

1.6.1. The foregoing account is dependent upon no rules of word order beyond the generally acknowledged PIE restriction (Wackernagel's Law) on sentential enclitics (including direct and indirect object pronouns) to second place in the clause after a stressed initial constituent and an equally widely accepted PIE topicalisation/focus rule entailing the shifting of an element requiring such treatment to the head of the clause, the corollary being that initial position was the only one in which a finite verb could be followed by such an enclitic. That being so, it is no longer liable to the charge levelled with some justice by Cowgill (see II.3.3b above) against the present writer's

similar but my no means identical earlier account (McCone, 1979c, 1982 and 1985b; see II.2.4) that ‘there is no evidence for a period when verbs could occur clause-initial only if followed by an enclitic’. As in the earlier versions, reasons have been given for the non-application of what Cowgill regards as ‘the more natural way of creating clause-initial verbs not followed by an enclitic’, namely ‘to use the already existing shape of non-initial verbs not followed by enclitics’, to Insular Celtic, and some quite striking typological support has now been adduced from Biscayan Basque. Moreover, the above explanation hardly seems to involve ‘a whole host of complicated analogic explanations’ (Cowgill as cited in II.3.3b), the ‘analogical spread of a redundant morphological distinction’ (Kortlandt, 1979, 35) or ‘massive analogy to create and develop the absolute-conjunct distinction of Insular Celtic’ (Schrijver, 1997, 147). Indeed, it has been found to fare better in this respect than the asseverative **es* favoured rather hesitantly by Cowgill and more decisively by Kortlandt (see II.3.2c). All that it requires in order to generate the absolute/conjunct from an inherited primary/secondary dichotomy and account for the vast majority of associated Old Irish active forms directly by means of established sound laws is in chronological order (i) one regular sound change (early apocope of *-i* except when followed by an enclitic, a basic rule and restriction also employed by Cowgill, Schrijver and Schumacher in conjunction with an alleged particle), (ii) the almost inevitable effects of indisputable thematisation upon the endings of the *s*- and *t*-preterites (also admitted by Cowgill, 1975, 63-4), and (iii) readily motivated analogical spread of **-i(-)* from the relevant forms of clause-initial simple verbs plus enclitic to the corresponding initial forms without a following enclitic.

It is also worth emphasising that the formal complexity of what is usually considered (but see 1.6.4 below) ‘a redundant morphological distinction’ between conjunct and absolute inflection in Old Irish is due to a cataclysmic series of phonological changes in the quite recent prehistory of that language (see *RChron.* 105-127) and that no more was involved at the much earlier Insular Celtic stage of concern here than the contrast between a consonant-final ending used with non-initial verbs and precisely the same ending plus **-i* used with initial (simple) verbs. This opposition between 2sg. **-s/*-si*, 3sg. **-t/*-ti* and so on, according as a verb was non-initial or initial, was so straightforward formally and so clearly defined functionally that it is hardly surprising that it should have held its ground for centuries without the generalisation of one set at the expense of the other. After all, it is hardly fair to blame the Insular Celts and their successors in Ireland or Britain for failing to foresee the difficulties that this inactivity was to cause in the future.

1.6.2. Sims-Williams (1984) has made an extremely elaborate set of proposals that can only be presented in bare outline here. Essentially these combine the present writer’s

earlier thesis that enclitic object pronouns could only be attached to part of the verbal expression, thus automatically forcing this into initial position in Insular Celtic, with the further proposal ‘that British and Irish Celtic, like many other languages throughout the world including neo-Celtic, tended to use anticipatory object pronouns (cf. French *Je les aime les danseuses*)’ (Sims-Williams, 1984, 175). The next stage was a partial process of ‘enclitic deletion’ responsible for the third-person absolute endings of British and Irish by distinctly late (‘stage C, which corresponds more or less to archaic Irish’; 1984, 173) parallel separate developments. It is then argued that the first two factors produced two types of initial simple verb, namely an emphatic apocopated $\#*beret... \#$ (opposed to non-emphatic $\#...*beret(..)\#$) and a non-emphatic unapocopated $\#*bereti-E... \#$ automatically conditioned by the presence of an object pronoun that was frequently proleptic or (as in the case of OIr. *téit-i* ‘goes (it)’ < $V*-ti-e(d)$) internal. Crucially, it is further assumed that at a relatively early ‘stage B’ the latter ‘redundant’ object pronouns ‘were used to differentiate unemphatic from emphatic verbs in initial position’ (Sims-Williams, 1984, 177). Since the non-emphatic form tended to be doubly marked by E as well as *-i-* (in the case of simple verbs) or deuterotonic stress (in the case of compounds), E could be and was dispensed with where no ambiguity with the emphatic initial form resulted, the upshot being, say, 3sg. non-emphatic $\#*bere\theta i... \#$ (tending to oust $\#...*bere\theta(..)\#$) versus emphatic $\#*bere\theta... \#$. However, deletion of the (typically 3sg. n. *-e*; Sims-Williams, 1984, 178) enclitic pronoun would have resulted in a formal merger of non-emphatic and emphatic forms in thematic 1sg. *-ū-e* vs. *-ū* (and *ā*-subj./fut. 1sg. $*-ā-e$ vs. $*-ā$; see 1.5 above and Sims-Williams, 1984, 180) and 2pl. $*-te-e$ vs. $*-te$ with the result that the ‘redundant’ pronoun was retained in these non-emphatic 1sg. and 2pl. endings (whence OIr. 1sg. abs. pres. *biru*, subj. *bera*, 2pl. abs. *-the* quite regularly) and possibly in the 2sg. and 1pl. too ‘in solidarity with these persons’ (Sims-Williams, 1984, 179). Elimination of the initial emphatic forms (e.g. pres. 3sg. $*ber'$ < $*bere\theta$ < $*beret$, 3pl. $*berod$ < $*beront$) finally occurred on ‘the eve of the historical period of Irish’ (Sims-Williams, 1984, 170) because some of these, unlike non-emphatic pres. ind. forms such as 3sg. $*ber'e\theta'$ (> OIr. abs. *be(i)rid*) < $*bere\theta i(-E)$ < $*bereti-E$ and 3pl. $*berod'$ (> OIr. abs. *berait*) < $*beronti(-E)$, tended to become confused with corresponding imperative forms such as OIr. 2sg. *beir* < $*ber'$ < $*bere$ or 3pl. *berat* < $*berod$ < $*berontō$ (or the like; see 1.9.1 below).

Since Sims-Williams’ derivation of OIr. 2pl. *-the* is vitiated by its failure to apply to the evidently inherited pres. 2pl. copula *adi* (thus leaving no viable alternative to the approach adopted in 1.5.5), the only significant formal advantage that his account has in the final analysis over the one advanced in 1.4-5 above is its ability to generate the 1sg. abs. of the BI/S1 present class and of most subjunctives and futures in Old Irish without recourse to the analogies proposed in 1.2.2 and 1.5.3. However, this quite

minor gain can only be achieved by stringing together a series of interdependent hypotheses and constructs that are supported by no remotely reliable evidence. The starting point is the constraint upon enclitics, which remains liable to Cowgill's criticism as cited above (1.6.1), and the next link is the postulate of an extensive use of proleptic and other 'redundant' object pronouns at what would presumably be (for the present writer at least) an Insular Celtic stage. While it is true that such usages are quite well attested in Old Irish but less well attested in Middle Welsh, they are far from common even in the former and anyway Sims-Williams (1984, 175) himself rightly cautions that 'it would be wrong to project the prolepsis seen in Old Irish back mechanically into antiquity'. Be that as it may, this speculation about the widespread deployment of proleptic pronouns at an early stage leads on to the even more questionable claim that these came to be used quite consistently as a means of differentiating non-emphatic from emphatic initial verbs.

Since prolepsis of the type *caínt-i in dúnad uile int-í Fráech* 'the whole fort laments (him) the aforesaid Fráech' (Sims-Williams, 1984, 175) occurs, predictably enough in view of the typically specific reference of a personal pronoun, before a definite object in Old Irish as a rule: 'its function seems to be to reinforce the definiteness of the following object, as in Semitic languages' (Sims-Williams, 1984, 176). Accordingly it would seem reasonable to accept that this was probably also its basic function to the extent that it was employed at an earlier period, particularly in the likely event the **sindos* demonstrative would not yet have acquired its regular role as a definite article by that stage. Given that proleptic object pronouns could by definition only be used with transitive verbs, one might have expected any double inflection triggered by their presence or absence in the manner envisaged by Sims-Williams to correlate with transitivity versus intransitivity, the above mentioned internal *téit-i* 'goes (it)' type surely being of far too restricted occurrence to make much difference to the basic distribution. More specifically, an obvious tendency for prolepsis to foreshadow a definite rather than an indefinite object might have led to a dichotomy between a definite (transitive with definite direct object) and an indefinite (intransitive, and transitive with indefinite direct object) conjugation such as is found in consistent Hungarian (see Rounds, 2001, 23-9) oppositions of the type *taxival megyek/megy* 'I am/(s)he is going by taxi' (intrans.) and (trans.) *látok egy házat* 'I see a house' versus *látom* 'I see him/her/it', *látom a házat* 'I see the house' or *(egy) könyvet olvas* '(s)he is reading a book' versus *olvassa* '(s)he is reading it', *a könyvet olvassa* '(s)he is reading the book' (cf. I.3.6 and VI.3.2). Needless to say, no pointers of this kind are to be found in Old Irish or Old Welsh and, in their absence, Sims-Williams' hypothesis of pervasive prolepsis in Insular Celtic must be regarded as unfounded.

Once this stage is past, a series of quite circumstantial and far from inevitable parallel

developments beginning with ‘enclitic deletion’ must be supposed to have taken place independently in late prehistoric Irish and British (see II.3.3b on the methodological undesirability of such a scenario). All in all, then, Sims-Williams’ account is to be rejected for the good reason that its one arguable advantage in relation to some 1sg. absolute forms is too meagre to begin to offset the plethora of inadequately supported speculations and coincidentally duplicated developments upon which this modest outcome depends.

1.6.3. Isaac (2001, 156-168) has recently suggested that a comparison of ‘emphatic’ and corresponding ‘non-emphatic’ (as he terms them in an explicitly different sense from the one used by Sims-Williams above; Isaac, 2001, 157) verbal forms in Ancient Egyptian with the Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct inflections may prove typologically illuminating and help to remedy a perceived failure of almost all previous studies of the latter to ‘assess the function of the double flexion in Old Irish itself, or consider the role of this function in the development of this system’ (Isaac, 2001, 152). The following are his basic conclusions: ‘There are many categories where an opposition of marked and unmarked forms is not attested. But Egyptologists working on the theoretical-linguistic analysis of the language have established that, where it occurs, the opposition has to do with the communicative function of the forms. The emphatic forms have a topicalising effect on the predicative content of the verbal form; where the non-emphatic forms occur, in non-clause initial position, other facets of the content of the clause have higher communicative prominence, e.g. negativity, consecutivity, the speaker’s guarantee of the truth of his utterance. I propose that not only are the Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct paradigms formally comparable to the emphatic and non-emphatic forms of Ancient Egyptian, but that their functional typology is comparable too. Just as in Egyptian, some flexional categories are immune to the opposition in Old Irish’ (Isaac, 2001, 161-2).

Turning to the already quoted (I.2.1d) medieval Welsh proverb *trenghit golut, ny threigk molut* ‘wealth perishes, fame does not perish’, Isaac (2001, 163) offers the following analysis as a concrete example of what he has in mind: ‘The proverb consists of a contrast between the two parallel but opposed clauses, affirmative and negative. In the affirmative clause, the predicate [PERISHES] carries high salience in the communicative content of the clause. This salience is realised not only by the initial position of the verb, but also by its marked, absolute form. In the negative clause, it is not the predicate itself that carries the high salience, but its negation [NOT [PERISHES]]. Since the lexical realisation, the verb, of the semantic predicate is subordinate in the communication of the clause to the semantic complex [NOT [PERISHES]], it appears in an unmarked, less complex form, the conjunct form (compare the comments of Koch 1987: 168-69). This is the basis of the system. This

is the key to understanding it. Further work must extend the analysis to the aspectual particles, to the semantics of verbal compounds, and to the broader perspective of information structure in chains of clauses within texts’.

The approach adumbrated by Isaac raises two basic questions, the first relating to the validity of the comparison between Insular Celtic and Egyptian and the second concerning the more general typological validity of the pragmatics postulated. To begin with, ‘Egyptian first appeared in writing shortly before 3000 BC and remained in active use until the eleventh century AD. This lifespan of more than four thousand years makes it the longest continually attested language in the world’ (Allen, 2000, 1). Since the time span involved is thus more or less the same as that from late Proto-Indo-European (as reconstructed) to Middle English, it comes as no surprise that ‘in the morphology and syntax of the verbal forms a major evolution takes place between Old and Middle Egyptian on the one hand and between Late Egyptian and Coptic on the other’ with the result that ‘the picture is, therefore, rather complex’ (Loprieno, 1995, 73) and ‘the current theory of Egyptian grammar is still in the process of formation’, a process entailing ‘historically three major schools of thought about how the verbal system of Middle Egyptian works’ (Allen, 2000, 408). There are obviously plenty of potential pitfalls here for a non-specialist such as Isaac or the present writer.

Isaac (2001, 156-7) begins an avowedly simplified sketch of the features with which he is concerned as follows: ‘The simplest, unmarked category is the so-called *sdm=f*. Verbal forms are referred to by third person singular masculine forms of the root *sdm* ‘to hear’. The =*f* is the third person singular masculine suffixed pronoun in subject function [see I.3.3]. The *sdm=f*, called aorist, may be translated by the present (e.g. ‘he hears’), though it refers in texts to past events. It is recognised that behind the simple *sdm=f*, there are actually two distinct forms..... The distinction between emphatic and non-emphatic will have been realised in all roots in Egyptian in the vocalisation, but since this is invisible to us, we can only see it in roots of certain shape’. The basic situation is put thus by Loprieno (1995, 79): ‘The first one shows a reduplication of the second radical in the III-inf. (*jrr=f* from *jrj* “to do”) and of II-gem. verbs (*m33=f* from *m33* “to see”)..... its use in Egyptian... is determined primarily by its syntactic function as topicalized or nominalized VP; hence its modern label “*emphatic* or *nominal sdm=f*”. Like its Semitic equivalent *iparras*, the nominal *sdm=f* is based on a nominal stem..... The second *sdm=f* pattern is used in non-initial position, i.e. when preceded by a particle or a topicalized element. In this case, the temporally unmarked aorist form is the non-reduplicating *sdm=f* form, for example *jrj=f* “he does” from the verb *jrj* “to do”. When following the initial particle *jw*, with or without topicalized subject, the aorist indicates a general or gnomic present’. Isaac (2001, 157-8) was

understandably struck by the distribution of these two sets of forms according to initial versus non-initial (including after various preverbal particles) position and then made the following further observation: ‘The syntax of negation in Egyptian has many facets, which I shall not try to explicate here. In fact, the $\underline{s}dm=f$ after negative nn stands for what would, in the affirmative, be a preterite $\underline{s}dm.n=f$, this alternation of T[ense]A[nd]M[ood] categories being known as ‘polarity’ (Loprieno 209). The important point here, however, is not *that* a $\underline{s}dm=f$ form is used as negative counterpart to the preterite $\underline{s}dm.n=f$, but rather, *which* $\underline{s}dm=f$ is used: the non-emphatic, as in $nn wn$ above. Bearing this point in mind it is nevertheless obvious that the distribution of emphatic and non-emphatic forms is parallel to that of Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct forms’.

On closer inspection, however, this parallellism becomes less obvious. To begin with, the positionally conditioned absolute/conjunct opposition in Insular Celtic is realised by adding one of two different sets of endings to a given stem as determined by the tense and mood system, whereas in Ancient Egyptian it is not the endings but the stem that changes according (in part) to position. Moreover, Isaac’s point about negation seriously oversimplifies ‘the phenomenon of polarity called in Egyptological literature “Gunn’s rule”’: while the negation of the aorist (jw) $\underline{s}dm=f$ “he hears” shows the past form $nj \underline{s}dm.n=f$ “he cannot/does not hear”, the negative counterpart of the preterite [$(jw) \underline{s}dm.n=f$] exhibits the indicative form $nj \underline{s}dm=f$ “he did not hear” (Loprieno, 1995, 209). Clearly this curious skewing of tense/aspect stems in the affirmative versus the negative is quite different from the straightforward Insular Celtic opposition between an independent absolute and a dependent conjunct ending. The probable Egyptian developments are outlined as follows by Loprieno. ‘In addition to the present perfect $\underline{s}dm.n=f$, Old Egyptian possessed two real preterites. The first one is a form in which the verbal stem is followed by the nominal or pronominal subject: it is called *indicative* $\underline{s}dm=f$ and is well attested in texts of the Old Kingdom....In classical Egyptian, this form is functionally replaced by the $\underline{s}dm.n=f$ and is limited to archaic uses and bound constructions, such as the negative form $nj \underline{s}dm=f$ “he did not hear” (1995, 77). ‘The crucial typological point is that the negative patterns of natural languages are not always the result of a simple juxtaposition of a negative morpheme to the positive statement; rather they often appear grammaticalized as *bound* constructions, and their evolution runs independent of the historical changes experienced by their positive counterparts. In this respect, it is likely that the structure of the negative aorist $nj \underline{s}dm.n=f$ “he cannot/does not hear” goes back to an early use of the $\underline{s}dm.n=f$ as present perfect “he has heard”... The corresponding contradictory pattern, therefore, was originally something like “he has not heard,” from which the meaning as negative aorist “(and thus) he cannot/does not hear” is easily derivable on semantic grounds. Similarly, the $\underline{s}dm=f$ -form negated by the morpheme nj in the

negative past “he did not hear” is in fact nothing other than the Old Egyptian indicative *s $\underline{d}m=f$* , which is the usual preterital form “he heard” in the early stages of the history of the language.. That the *s $\underline{d}m=f$* -form used in the negative pattern is in fact the indicative is shown by the full writing of the verbal form as *rd $\underline{j}=j$* (rather than as aorist *d $\underline{j}-j$*) in examples (112) and (114)..... In this case, the negative patterns outlived their positive equivalents: the *s $\underline{d}m.n=f$* maintained in the negative construction the “gnomic” function in which it was gradually replaced by the aorist *s $\underline{d}m=f$* for positive statements, and the indicative *s $\underline{d}m=f$* was still used by the negative past form even after it had been superseded by the *s $\underline{d}m.n=f$* for the expression of the preterite tense in positive sentences’ (1995, 209-10).

It is difficult to see what relevance this scenario can possibly have to the genesis and workings of the Old Irish opposition between the likes of 3sg. pres. *beirid* ‘carries’, pret. *birt* ‘carried’ and their corresponding negatives *ní:beir* ‘does not carry’, *ní:bert* ‘did not carry’, especially when it is realised that there are no less than ‘six kinds of *s $\underline{d}m=f$* now universally recognized as distinct forms’ (Allen, 2000, 405) and that ‘the morphological relation between “indicative” and “aorist” *s $\underline{d}m=f$* .. remains opaque’ (Loprieno, 1995, 80). The negative type, then, hardly belongs with the other ‘non-emphatic’ *s $\underline{d}m=f$* forms in non-initial position contrasted with ‘emphatic’ initial *s $\underline{d}m=f$* on Isaac’s (2001, 157-8) list, and this is a serious blow to his proposed parallel with Insular Celtic. Moreover, according to Allen (2000, 405) an emphatic sentence like *ḥꜣ rꜣ m pt* is to be understood as ‘that Re appears (is) in the sky’, i.e. ‘it is in the sky that Re appears’ and ‘analysis of the verb forms in emphatic sentences as nominal remains an essential part of the current theory of Middle Egyptian grammar. Although the “Standard Theory” identifies them as nominal forms of the *s $\underline{d}m.f$* and *s $\underline{d}m.n.f$* , this book has retained Polotsky’s original idea that they are special uses of the relative forms.... Since the emphatic forms of Middle Egyptian are identical to the relative forms except for their lack of gender and number endings, there is no reason to ignore this clear formal equivalence and identify them instead as additional forms of the suffix conjugation.... Since the Middle Egyptian emphatic forms are simply special uses of the relative forms, they are nominal forms.. This does not mean, however, that they function as the subject of an emphatic sentence, as we have already seen. The fact that Middle Egyptian uses such forms as the predicate of an emphatic sentence is simply a feature of the language. The reason it does so has been explained on the basis of the nominal nature of these forms. In normal sentences with a verbal predicate the sentence’s theme is naturally associated with the subject of the verb, which is either a noun or noun equivalent (pronoun or noun clause), and the rheme with the verb itself. By using a nominal form of the verb in emphatic sentences, Egyptian indicates that the verb is to be understood as part of the theme rather than the rheme, and that the hearer or reader is to look for the rheme elsewhere in the sentence’. In other words,

the so-called ‘emphatic’ form is actually non-emphatic (in terms of topic or focus) as far as the verb is concerned and the emphasis (as topic or focus) is placed upon some other part of the sentence (e.g. *m pt* ‘in the sky’ in the example above). This seems to be the direct opposite of Isaac’s interpretation and anyway it is difficult to see how a nominalisation such as a relative form can be usefully compared with an Insular Celtic absolute form such as OIr. *beirid*, which is patently non-relative and non-nominal.

1.6.4. It seems, then, most unlikely that the Egyptian features adduced by Isaac constitute a formally or functionally legitimate typological comparison with the absolute/conjunct or the deuterotonic/prototonic opposition manifested by Old Irish simple and compound verbs respectively (cf. Isaac, 2001, 162, ‘deuterotonic forms can be considered just as marked in opposition to the prototonic as the absolute forms in opposition to the conjunct’). Nevertheless, this does not invalidate his basic contention above that in an affirmative clause the most salient element may be verb itself, whereas in a negative clause this is most likely to be its negation. Regardless of whether such pragmatic considerations continued to be relevant as late as Old Welsh (when the abs./conj. distinction in simple verbs and any surviving correlates in compound verbs were on the verge of disappearing; see I.2.1d) or Old Irish after the generalisation of an initial verbal complex, it must be conceded that the latter’s conjunct particle category contains a significant early nucleus of negative and interrogative elements typologically prone to function as focus (see II.2.4) as well as connectives such as **nu* (> OIr. *nu/no*, on which see I.1.6-7, probably cognate with the regularly initial Hittite connector *nu*; Watkins, 1963, 13-15) liable to be placed in clause-initial position as topic for anaphoric reasons. It seems eminently reasonable to postulate that, at the time of apocope of *-i* unless followed by an enclitic, Insular Celtic still retained Wackernagel’s Law governing the placement of enclitics and the essentially PIE use of initial position (automatically entailing accentuation) for marking an element for topic or focus of its clause. This state of affairs can be schematised as follows (**beret(i)* ‘bears’ represents a typical verb, E any enclitic(s), N a negative, C a ‘conjunct’ particle other than the negative, and X = any other initial constituent such as a noun).

# <i>*bereti</i> -E.(...)#	(V as topic/focus)
# <i>*beret</i> .(...)#	(V as topic/focus)
#N(E)(.)* <i>beret</i> (...)#	(N as topic/focus)
#C(E)(.)* <i>beret</i> (...)#	(C as topic/focus)
#X(E)(.)* <i>beret</i> (...)#	(neutral order or X as topic/focus)

In such a system **bereti* would be an exclusively ‘emphatic’ topic or focus form in

Isaac's sense, whereas **beret* would be emphatic as topic or focus on occasion but non-emphatic a good deal more often than not. It is surely then easy enough to envisage **-i* as an accessory morphological marker of emphatic initial verbs followed by E being spread to corresponding emphatic initial verbs not followed by E in order to produce a positionally (initial vs. non-initial) and semantically (emphatic vs. non-emphatic) clear-cut distribution between *#*bereti(-E).(....)* and *#.E(..)*beret(..)#* in those categories characterised by inherited or acquired (basically by thematisation in the case of the *s-* and *t-*preterite; 1.5.1 above) primary endings (see IV.3.1 on a possible similar motivation for the deuterotonic/prototonic opposition in compound verbs). If so, the third stage posited above (1.4), namely the spread of **-i* from initial position before -E to initial position in general in the present indicative, present subjunctive, desiderative/future and *s-/t-*preterite active is no longer at odds with Kortlandt's anyway rather dogmatic claim (II.3.2c) that 'the distinction between absolute and conjunct endings must originally have been motivated semantically, as morphological distinctions always are'. Failure of **-i* to spread beyond this substantial original base is then easy enough to explain in terms of its status as no more than an accessory morphological reinforcement of an opposition between 'emphatic' initial *#V(E)(....)#* as topic/focus and pragmatically neutral non-initial *#.E(..)V(..)#* that was already adequately expressed syntactically. One might add that, if it were not otherwise unacceptable (see II.3.2-4), an asseverative particle **es* 'it is (so)' of the type favoured by Kortlandt could also be most plausibly supposed to have first established itself as an accessory formal mark of topicalisation/focus of initial V and C in affirmative main clauses.

Basque offers an illuminating typological parallel for the basic idea advanced here, insofar as its remaining synthetic verbal forms are compulsorily marked by a prefix *ba-* (almost certainly a reduced form of affirmative *bai* 'yes, indeed') as topic or focus of their clause, a situation particularly prone to arise when they are in initial position and consequently preceded by no other focus element such as negative *ez* (see the penultimate paragraph of II.2.4 above and Zubiri, 2000, 552-3 and 590-93): e.g., *ba-dakit (nor den)* 'I know (who it is)', *hori ba-nekien* 'I knew that', *ba-dago ogirik?* 'is there any bread?', *autobusa ba-dator* or *ba-dator autobusa* 'the bus is coming' (versus *autobusa dator* 'the bus is coming' as opposed to, say, a/the taxi). One obvious consequence of this rule is that clause-initial synthetic verbs (including when they are the sole constituent of a sentence as in the case of *ba-dakit* etc.) must be accompanied by *ba-*. This principle even applies to inflected auxiliaries (on the rather rare occasions when they are placed at the head of a sentence) as in the contradictory *ez duzu ordaindu - ba-dut ordaindu!* 'you haven't paid - I have paid!', although the status of periphrastic verbal forms as topic or focus is otherwise usually indicated by adding *egin* 'do': e.g., *sarrera ordaindu egin dut* 'I've paid for the (entrance) ticket' (as

opposed to, say, getting it free) versus *sarrera ordaindu dut* ‘I’ve paid for the (entrance) ticket’ (but not, say, a reserved seat ticket) or neutral ‘I’ve paid for the (entrance) ticket’.

In conclusion, although the spread of **-i* from the *##bereti-E(....)#* type to its *##beret(....)#* counterpart can be adequately accounted for as a straightforward process of formal simplification in a direction determined by the continuing usefulness of **-i(-)* as a glide to attach enclitics that still conformed to Wackernagel’s Law, it seems quite possible that semantic considerations also played a significant or even the major role in this process, given that V will have been marked as topic/focus in the *##bereti-E(....)#* and *##beret(....)#* > *##bereti(....)#* type as opposed to the *#.E(..)*beret(..)#* alternative. Whatever the precise mechanism that brought it about (see II.2.4), the development of an initial verbal complex in the prehistory of Old Irish, almost certainly at an Insular Celtic phase shared with the precursor of British (see I.2.1 and II.2.1), is an established fact. As far as the simple verb was concerned on the present scenario, this will obviously have entailed the straightforward generalisation of initial *##bereti(-E)...#* (> OIr. *##berid...#*, *##beirth-i...#* etc.) and the demise of *#.E(..)*beret(..)#* except where the initial slot was occupied by a C(onjunct particle), including N(egative), or a P(reverb) (e.g. *##N(E(..)*beret(..)#* > *##N(E)*beret...#* > OIr. *##ní:beir...#*; see IV.3.1).

1.7. Kortlandt’s (1979 and 1994) view of the origins of the absolute/conjunct dichotomy has already been sketched in II.3.3a along with Cowgill’s (1985, 109-10) telling criticisms. It depends upon three more or less equally dubious tenets, namely (i) a significant formal difference in PIE between the thematic and athematic personal endings in most persons, (ii) the retention of this dichotomy virtually unchanged in Celtic (and then down to Insular Celtic; see 2.1-2 below) and (iii) the generalisation of an enclitic particle **es* (probably an asseverative 3sg. copula in origin as tentatively suggested by Cowgill) in Insular Celtic. The whole explanation collapses if any one of these supports is removed and (ii) is, of course, directly dependent upon (i). Following Szemerényi (e.g. 1970, 218-9; 1989, 247-52) and others, Cowgill (1985b) has argued cogently and comprehensively that the only distinction between athematic and thematic personal inflections in PIE was the generally acknowledged one between primary 1sg. athem **-mi* and them. **-ō* (itself possibly derived from a still earlier **-o-mi* on the basis of a suggestive but avowedly speculative concluding argument by Cowgill, 1985b, 108; alternatively it may have been a 1sg. ‘voluntative’ **-oh₁* or the like that was incorporated into the invariably thematic PIE subjunctive paradigm and spread later to otherwise formally identical thematic indicatives - see Dunkel, 2002, for a recent proposal along these lines). Acceptance of Cowgill’s compelling case disposes of both (i) and (ii) but, ‘even if the existence of a special thematic primary

2 and 3sg. in late Indo-European were firmly established, this would still fall a long way short of demonstrating the relevance of such forms to Celtic, which could very easily have developed the analogical **-e-si*, **-e-ti* envisaged for its nearest neighbours, Italic and Germanic, as well as Indo-Iranian at least' (McCone, 1982, 19). As argued above (1.3.2), the thematic primary 3sg. was quite certainly **-e-ti* not **-e* in Proto-Celtic, while OIr. 2sg. *-bir* cannot possibly continue a supposed PIE/PC **berei* (> **berē* > OIr. **beir*) but can be derived from Prim.Ir. **birih* < IC **beris* < **berisi* < PC **beresi* by a straightforward sequence of well established regular sound changes (see 1.5.2 above). Accordingly, even if Cowgill's masterly demolition of (i) is not granted, (ii) is completely unsustainable and it goes without saying (see II.3.2-4) that the present writer, unlike Cowgill, regards (iii) as quite untenable too.

Even if it were not based on three basic premisses that are all unacceptable, a whole array of serious problems would still confront various other key details of Kortlandt's (basically 1979, 45-6 and 48-50; 1994, 64-5) extraordinarily complicated explanation, which involves 'massive analogical spread' (see 1.6 above) by any standards. Indeed, one central set of his detailed postulates (Kortlandt, 1979, 21-2) has been subjected to criticism elsewhere (McCone, 1982, 21-3). As far as the all-important 3sg. is concerned, in Kortlandt's view old strong athematics (basically the old nasal-infix presents in BIV/S3) would have opposed abs. **-aθih* (< **-a-ti-(e)s*) to conj. **-aθi*, whereas old strong thematics (such as BI/S1 and BII/S2) will have opposed abs. **-eh* (< **-e-(e)s*) and **-i-eh* to conj. **-e* and **-i(-e)* (loss of *-e* supposedly by analogy with AII/W2 **-ī* < **-īe* below). The first step was supposedly triggered after an alleged loss of final *-e* (but not the vowel of **-eh*) after a long vowel by the presence in AII/W2 of old athematic *ī*-statives (3sg. **ruđīθi(h)* 'blushes') and old thematic *ī*-denominatives (3sg. **rāđī(eh)*; to these should be added old causatives with **-ī* < **-e-īe-* too). Thereupon, 'the two types of *ī*-flexion merged through the generalization of 3rd. sg. abs. **-īθih* and conj. **-ī*' (Kortlandt, 1979, 45). One might well wonder why a synchronically rather straightforward relationship between con./abs. them. **-ī(eh)* and athem. **-īθi(h)* would be skewed in this quite unmotivated way, and Kortlandt (1979, 45-6) can do no better than suggest that 'the element **-θi* was perhaps reinterpreted as a clitic, which was incompatible with the conjunct forms'. This anyway intrinsically improbable postulate (given a glaring positional discrepancy between conj. **-θi* invariably placed after the stressed part of the verb and enclitic pronouns etc. attached to a preceding proclitic when used with compound and dependent simple verbs) would only apply to the demise of conj. **-īθi* and provides no explanation at all for the preference of **-īθih* over **-īeh* in the abs. in view of the latter's synchronically obvious relationship with conj. **-ī* in Kortlandt's system. As if this were not enough, the rather poorly attested *ruidid* 'is red blushes' (L *rubet*) is just about the only secure OIr. example of an erstwhile athematic *i*-stative in **-ī* (< **-ē-*

< *-eh₁-; Watkins, 1969, 170-1). Schumacher (*KPV* 41-2) ascribes just four such formations to Insular Celtic, only two of these having reflexes in Old Irish, and argues that the formation in question was thematic *-eh₁ġe/o-. Since the phonetic changes needed by Kortlandt to trigger his morphological scenario are to be located quite late in the prehistory of Irish, the process envisaged by him will have happened at a time when there can have been at most a couple of such athematically inflected forms (none, if Schumacher is right about inherited thematic inflection) in the AII/W2 class amidst a mass of old denominatives and causative with indisputably original thematic inflection, the almost inevitable inflectional preponderance of the latter being clearly seen in its originally general abs./conj. 1sg. -iu < them *-iyū in Old Irish (McCone, 1982, 9-14). That being so, the generalisation of at best very rare 3sg. athem. abs. *-īθih over a far commoner them. abs. *-īeh envisaged as an essential first step by Kortlandt must be dismissed as utterly incredible, with fatal consequences for the rest of his explanation.

According to a later version of this theory (Kortlandt, 1994, 64-5), ‘as a result of the lenition the regular 3rd sg. endings became BI *-e(h), BII *-ie(h), BIV *-aθi(h), AI *-āe(h), AII *-īe(h) and *-īθi(h), while *-ti was preserved in *tēxti(h) “goes” [see 1.3.2 above on the impossibility of this as a preform of OIr. *téit*, -té(i)t]. This fairly transparent system collapsed when *-e was lost after a long vowel, which yielded a zero ending in AI *-ā and AII *-ī, but not in the corresponding absolute forms in *-āeh and *-īeh (cf. KORTLANDT 1979a: 41, 45). The zero conjunct ending evidently spread from the weak verbs to BII *-i for *-ie, further to AII *-ī for *-īθi, and eventually to BIV *-a for *-aθi. Such a development could not take place in the absolute forms because there was no model’. It is to be noted that the allegedly different treatment of *-ā/īe and *-ā/īes is an *ad hoc* contrivance of Kortlandt’s, the sole purpose of which is to generate some degree of instability in the paradigms posited by him. Even so, this is not very great, merely entailing the shift from a system in which an absolute ending was distinguished from a corresponding conjunct by addition of *-h to one where the distinguishing element had two synchronically predictable allomorphs *-h and *-eh. One is also left wondering why synchronically regular abs./conj. alternations of the type BIV/S3 *-aθih/*-aθi (to which should be added AI *-āθih/*-āθi; McCone, 1982, 10) and BII/S2 *-ieh/*-ie should have been remodelled to appreciably less predictable *-aθih/*-a (and *-āθih/*-ā) and *-ieh/*-i on the basis of a somewhat anomalous *-ā/īeh/*-ā/ī in old thematic weak verbs, the conjunct of which would surely have been easy enough to restore to *-ā/īe in conformity with the relationship obtaining elsewhere. The change in the old athematics is particularly difficult to understand and no motivation for any of this is offered by Kortlandt, whose ‘evidently’ can only refer to the actual OIr. outcomes of his alleged preforms rather than to any reason(s) for the quite complex process envisaged. Once

again (see 1.3.2 above), this is at odds with his insistence that ‘analogic change requires not only a model, but also a motivation’, the only possible motive for such developments to occur to the present writer being a deliberate reinforcement of the formal opposition between absolute and conjunct inflections that would hardly differ much from the postulate of ‘massive spread of a redundant morphological category’ so vigorously objected to by Kortlandt (see II.3.2c).

His treatment of the absolute endings (Kortlandt, 1994, 65) is even more problematical: ‘The generalization of the athematic 3rd sg. present ending **-θih* in the absolute forms was motivated by the merger of the present and preterit (sigmatic aorist) endings in the weak verbs. While the conjunct endings AII **-ī(e)* and **-īh < *-īs* remained distinct up to the apocope, the corresponding absolute endings merged into **-īeh* as a result of the loss of intervocalic **-s-* in the preterit. In a similar vein I think that the absolute present ending AI **-āeh* was replaced by **-āθih* for differentiation from the subjunctive endings **-āeh < *-āses* (cf. KORTLANDT 1984: 182). When the functional distinction between primary and secondary endings was lost and after shortening of long vowels in medial syllables (stage 10 of KORTLANDT 1979a: 44), the subjunctive ending **-aeh* was in its turn replaced by **-aθih* for differentiation from the preterite ending **-aeh < *-ases* (cf. KORTLANDT 1984: 183). The replacement of the latter ending by **-aseh* was probably motivated by the introduction of primary endings in 1st sg. **-asūh* and 2sg. **-asīh* on the analogy of the present tense’. In this case the quest for a trigger of paradigmatic confusion has led Kortlandt to abandon Watkins’ (1962, 174-80) compelling derivation of the Insular Celtic *s*-preterite from a 3sg. base **-V-ss* (reinterpreted as a suffix plus zero ending; *< *-V-s-t*) by adding thematic personal endings in the other persons, since **-s- < *-ss-* was patently not lost in Old Irish (e.g. 3sg. pres. ind. cop. *is < *esti* or, for particle addicts, **esti-s(t)* or OIr. 3pl. *s*-pret. *-gabsat < *gabass-ont*). Apparently, thematisation of a stem with single *-s-* (then regularly *> -h- > Ø*) throughout is envisaged but, since probably as early as Insular Celtic (and certainly by the quite late prehistoric Irish stage invoked by Kortlandt) the marker of the *s*-preterite was invariably preceded by a vowel, there would be no point in the paradigm capable of generating restoration of the unlenited *-s(-)* actually found in the Old Irish (and British) forms.

By now it should be apparent that Kortlandt’s account of the origins absolute and conjunct dichotomy in Old Irish is inordinately convoluted, heavily dependent on numerous unmotivated or dubiously motivated analogies, and also highly problematical in other respects. It remains to mention yet another fatal flaw. His explanation is geared to Old Irish alone and the major changes in the system envisaged by him are perforce ascribed on grounds of relative chronology to a rather late stage

in its prehistory well after separation from the British branch on any view of the basic relationship between the various sub-families of Celtic (see 3.1-3 below). However, as has been seen (I.2.1), Old Welsh in particular offers clear evidence for an admittedly moribund (but apparently not until the ninth and tenth centuries A.D.) contrast between absolute and conjunct inflection in the 3sg. active at least that corresponds in a formally and functionally straightforward manner to the one still fully operational in Old Irish. Kortlandt's chronology calls for the staggeringly counter-intuitive separation of these virtually identical Irish and British phenomena from one another and rules out their otherwise obvious inheritance from a shared earlier stage of development (Insular Celtic according to the present writer; see 3.1-3). Is one really to suppose that the enormously complicated processes envisaged by Kortlandt occurred in a roughly parallel manner in both Irish and British independently of each other but, to all intents and purposes, with the same outcome?

In the absence of a serious alternative, it must surely be concluded that early apocope of **-i* was an indispensable first step towards the development of an inflectional opposition between absolute and conjunct in Insular Celtic (whether by means of a distinctly problematical particle or along the lines of 1.4-6 above) and that alleged distinctions (apart from the incontrovertible one in the 1sg. active) between the primary athematic and thematic endings played no role whatsoever in this process.

1.8.1. It is generally agreed that Proto-Indo-European did not formally distinguish a middle from a passive inflection but rather opposed to the already discussed active conjugation a single set of mediopassive endings differentiated syntactically as to middle versus passive sense. In Cowgill's (1983, 75) convincing opinion the basic formans of this PIE mediopassive was an *-o(-)* originally added to endings identical with those of the perfect (minus *-e* where applicable; see 1.9 below), which only had a single set of endings undifferentiated as to active/middle in PIE. Thus mediopassive secondary 1sg. **-h₂-o* (or **-x-o* and so on in Cowgill's notation), 2sg. **-th₂-o*, 3sg. **-o*, 3pl. **-r-o* versus primary (with a marker **-r* different from the **-i* used in the active) 1sg. **-h₂-o-r*, 2sg. **-th₂-o-r*, 3sg. **-o-r*, 3pl. **-r-o-r*. As in the active (see 1.2.2 above), the 1pl. and 2pl. stood outside this system, apparently being characterised by an element **-d^h-* in the mediopassive (1pl. sec. **-me-d^hh₂*, prim. **-me/os-d^hh₂*, 2pl. sec./prim. **-d^hu-e/o*). However, 'in addition to these oldest forms there exist in all the old IE languages 3rd person mediopassives in which the voice marker **-o* is added not to the person/number markers zero and *-r-*, but rather to the person/number markers *-t* and *-(é)nt* of the active aorist and present, resulting in mediopassive secondary endings **-t-o* and **-nt-o*. Some scholars, e.g. Oettinger 1976, Rix 1977:134ff., somewhat differently Kortlandt 1979[b]:69, have suggested that there was an original

functional difference between the *-o*, *-ro* mediopassive and the *-to*, *-nto* mediopassive, the former being ‘stative’ and the latter a more dynamic mediopassive. I doubt that this is correct, and believe that the 3rd person in *-to*, *-nto* arose as the first step in the integration of the mediopassive into a more tightly knit system of verb inflection, in which mediopassive verbs often functioned as close partners of active presents and aorists, and so acquired endings relatively close in shape to those of active aorists and presents. Be that as it may, Celtic offers no support (pace Rix 1977:136) for an original functional difference between the 3rd singulars *-o* and *-to*.... Similar, but more restricted and therefore probably later, is the replacement of 2nd sg. **-tx-o* by **-s-o*, with the *s* of present/aorist active. This replacement is universal in Latin, Germanic, Greek and Iranian, but only partial in Indic (primary *-se* vs. secondary *-thās*), and unknown in Celtic, Tocharian and Hittite. It was therefore probably a development of the central area of late PIE. These new endings *-to*, *-nto*... formed primary endings **-t-o-r*, **-nt-o-r*.. in the same fashion as the older endings beside which they arose. But, in nearly the same central area in which *-so* replaces *-txo*, the primary marker *-r* was replaced by *-i* taken from the active present and subjunctive: active *-t* : *-t-i* = mediopassive *-to* : *-X*; *X = -to_i*’ (Cowgill, 1983, 75-6).

These views will form the framework of the following discussion of the Old Irish deponent endings. Like their Italic counterparts, these derive formally from the PIE middle endings but are functionally active. True middle inflection had a distinctive semantic function (as it still does in, say, Ancient Greek and Sanskrit) and frequently alternated with active inflection in one and the same verb. By contrast, deponent and ‘normal’ active inflection were complementarily distributed on a purely lexical basis, a verb being regularly inflected either in the normal way (e.g. Lat. *dicit* ‘says’, OIr. *beirid*, *-beir* ‘bears’) or as a deponent (e.g. Lat. *loquitur* ‘speaks’, OIr. *molathir*, *-molathar* ‘praises’) in the active with no continuing functional opposition between the two types of ending. As Cowgill (1983, 83) rightly insists, the only mediopassive precursors of OIr. deponent conj. 3sg. *-e/a-thar*, 3pl. *-e/a-tar* for which there is any solid foundation are **-tor*, **-ntor* respectively (cf. now Celtib. *ne-bintor* and Gaul. *ni-tixsintor*, on which see *KPV* 226 and 749-50), and the invariable retention of a vowel before the ending of the 3sg./pl. deponent (as opposed to the passive, where it was usually lost by syncope as appropriate) does not warrant questionable reconstructions such as **-(n)t(o)ri* (Jasannoff, 1977, 159-163), **-(n)tr-i/*-(n)tr_i* (Schmidt, 1977, 104-5, who mistakenly posits PIE *-r_i* > PC *-ri* instead of > PC *-ar*; *RChron.* 49) or **-(n)tro* (e.g. *GOI* 367 and Kortlandt, 1981, 18-19).

Cowgill (1983, 104-6) is also clearly right to trace the formal differentiation of passive and deponent in (Insular) Celtic to the preterite, where the deponent active (typically an *s*- or a suffixless formation; *GOI* 418, 423 and 432-3) and the passive (based on

an old *-to-* verbal adjective; *GOI* 437-40) had acquired quite different stems. The preterite passive's non-finite origins called for the creation of hitherto lacking first and second person forms by means of 3sg. plus the relevant infix pronoun (e.g. OIr. *do:breth* 'it/(s)he was brought' and then *do-t/b:breth* 'you (sg./pl.) were brought' etc.). This new system then spread to originally finite formations to distinguish, say, pres. pass. *no-t:suidigther* 'you (sg.) are placed' from dep. act. (previously also pass.) *(-)suidigther* 'you (sg.) place' in Insular Celtic. The main final step (see McCone, 1986b, 240-1) was the relatively late exploitation of divergent patterns arising from syncope such as that between 3sg. conj. *-cruthaigther* 'is shaped, *shapes' (< **kruθhay'θor* < **k^writu-sagī-tor*) and *-suidigethar* 'places, *is placed' (< **suð'a(h)γ'iθor* < **sodiyō-sagī-tor*) in the largest and only productive class of deponents in Early Old Irish in order to differentiate a third-person deponent active from a corresponding syncopated passive. Interpretation of a form like *-cruthaigther* as exclusively passive 'is shaped' in accordance with the widespread pattern seen in *-léicther* 'is let' < **lēgīθor* etc. was accompanied by acquisition of a new (deponent) active *-cruthaigethar* 'shapes' modelled on *-suidigethar*, which itself could then acquire a new passive *-suidigther* 'is placed' and thus become exclusively (deponent) active 'places'. This useful distinction will then have spread to other deponent classes (basically W1 and S2) to yield W1 active *-molathar* 'praises' beside passive *-moltar* 'is praised' < **molθor* < **molātor* 'is praised, *praises', W2 active *-midethar* 'judges' beside passive *-mitter* 'is judged' < **mið'θor* < **meditor* 'is judged, *judges' and so on. Whatever the precise details, the essential point is that the (in the third person, particularly the 3pl., still not quite complete) formal differentiation of passive from deponent inflection in Old Irish rests upon manifestly secondary developments and that an identical set of original endings must be posited for both (see *EIV* 83 on the late prehistoric development of an unsyncopated passive 3(sg./)pl. conj. *-(a)it(h)er* distinct from deponent *-e/at(h)ar*).

1.8.2. The Old Irish deponent endings thus almost certainly derive from Insular Celtic preforms (notably 1sg. **-ūr*, 2/3sg. **-tor*, 1pl. **-mor* and 3pl. **-ntor*) without **-i* but do differentiate absolute endings with palatal *-r* from corresponding conjunct endings with non-palatal *-r* in all except the 1/2sg with identical abs./conj. in non-palatal *-r* and the 2pl. with abs. *-th(a)e* vs. conj. *-(a)id* just like the active. At first sight, this state of affairs seems to contradict the approach adopted above and to constitute a good reason for positing an enclitic particle **es* or the like as the basic differentiating factor. Thus Cowgill (1983, 77) states that 'the palatalization of the final *-r* in absolute ending *-m(m)ir*, e.g. *messimmir* 'we will judge' Wb 9c10, is, in my view of the Insular Celtic absolute endings..., the result of an enclitic **(e)s* which in Primitive Irish followed the first word of non-relative non-imperative clauses that were not responses to questions: thus *messimmir* comes from Prim. Ir. **mīessomor-es*', its palatal *-m(m)-* being 'no

doubt modelled on 3rd pl. deponent abs. /d'í/, rather than being evidence for something other than *-*mor-es* as the Primitive Irish shape of the 1st pl. deponent absolute ending' (Cowgill, 1983, 96).

However, this merely displaces the problem, since deponent abs. 3sg. *-ithir* (e.g. Ml. 30c8 *midithir* 'judges') and 3pl. *-itir* (e.g. Wb. 31b20 *sechitir* 'follow') with palatal /θ'/ and /d'/ respectively cannot possibly be the regular outcome of -V-**tor-es* and -V-**ntor-es* (> OIr. **-e/ath(a)ir* and **-e/at(a)ir*). Cowgill (1983, 96) duly concedes this before remarking that 'it looks more as if, somehow, the absolute 3rd-person deponent forms were made, after the operation of Old Irish apocope and syncope rules, by adding /t/, preceded eventually by an automatic /i/, to the non-deponent absolute endings'. As Cowgill (1983, 80-81; cf. Kortlandt, 1981, 18-19) points out, OIr. 2pl. dep. conj. *-(a)id* may be < PIE middle -V-**d^hue* (see 1.8.1) or may simply be the normal active ending (see *EIV* 75 on the erosion of distinct deponent inflection even as early as Old Irish). Either way 2pl. abs. *-the* is perfectly straightforward as the old normal active abs. ending (1.5.5 above) either introduced in tandem with normal act. conj. *-(a)id* < *-(a)ith* or else understandably associated with conj. *-(a)id* < -V-**dwe* after this had fallen together with the normal active as a result of the voicing of final dentals after an unstressed vowel around 700 A.D. (*RChron.* 132-3). That being so, it has no useful contribution to make to the issue of the specifically deponent absolute endings with *-r*. The innovatory 1pl. **-mor* underlying OIr. 1pl. conj. *-e/a-m(m)ar/-me/ar* was apparently extracted from act. **-mos* by replacing its *-s* with the *-r* seen in 1sg. mid./dep. **-ūr* vs. act. **-ū* (cf. Cowgill, 1970, 142). Be that as it may, it is obviously comparable with Lat. *-mur* < **-mor* in 1pl. dep. *loquimur* 'we speak' etc. and might even be ascribed with it to an arguable shared Italo-Celtic phase (cf. Cowgill, 1983, 77 and 1970, 142). Finally, of course, there is dep. 1sg. *-(i)ur* (*a*-subj., *a*-*f*-fut. *-e/ar*) and 2sg. *-ther* (*-er* in *s*-subj./fut./pret.) with an invariable non-palatal *-r* and lack of distinction between absolute and conjunct that are hard to square with pre-apocope palatalising **-es* or the like in the former. It thus transpires that not one single absolute form of the deponent in *-r* (i.e. 1/2/3sg. and 1/3pl. abs.) can be derived directly or even (see below) by plausible analogy from the corresponding conjunct endings plus enclitic **es* or the like in the manner required by any version of the particle hypothesis.

Cowgill (1983, 76-7) derives OIr. dep. 1sg. *-ur* < PIE them. **-o-h₂or* and then states that the variant '*-ar* (*-er* after palatalized consonants)... is regular from Primitive Irish and Proto-Celtic **-ār*, and corresponds exactly to Latin *-ar* in *sequar* etc., so that 1st sg. *-ar* in the mediopassive of the *ā*-modal is a common innovation of Italic and Celtic'. Both derivations are formally unimpeachable but, whereas the former is also morphologically straightforward, the latter is vitiated by good grounds for deriving the

proximate **-ā-* of the Old Irish subjunctives and futures in question from **-āse/o-* and/or **-ase/o-* (McCone, 1991, 91-113). In the likely event that the 1sg. *-ā/asūr* thus implied would have yielded Prim. Ir. **-ūr* (cf. McCone, 1991, 104-5), **-ār* seems best ascribed to analogy according to the following straightforward proportion (see 1.5.3 above on *a*-subj./fut. 1sg. **-ā*) normal act. pres. ind. **ber-ū* : subj. **ber-ā* = dep. act. pres. ind. **mol-ūr* : *mol-X* ($X = *-ār$) and so on. A particle after the 1sg. should have resulted in OIr. abs. **-uir*, **-air* < **-ūr-es*, **-ār-es* vs. conj. *-ur*, *-ar* and in a similar contrast in the 2sg. between an abs. with final palatal *-r* (OIr. **-thir?*) and a conj. with non-palatal *-r* (OIr. *-ther*). The fact that these forms are identical (with non-palatal *-r*) in abs. and conj. is obviously a problem for any version of the particle hypothesis, and Cowgill (1975, 63) must ‘agree with Boling 1972:95 that the absence of special first and second singular deponent absolute endings is analogic to the prevailing identity of absolute and conjunct forms in the active inflection of these two persons in the present indicative’. This *ad hoc* explanation must be dismissed as quite arbitrary, since an opposition between abs. */-r’/* and conj. */-r/* will have characterised all but the 2pl. of the deponent paradigm, if the abs. forms had contained suffixed **-es* or the like. There is no obvious reason why this coherent system should have been dislocated on the analogy of actives with quite different endings, particularly when the large B1 class quite clearly still distinguished pres. abs. 1sg. *-u*, 2sg. *-i* from corresponding conjunct endings without a final vowel. Not only did this situation only begin to be eroded somewhat within the Old Irish period itself (McCone, 1982, 9-14 and *GOI* 361) but the identity of 2sg. abs. and conj. is also patently due to relatively late prehistoric Irish analogy in all but the W2 and S2 presents (see 1.5.4 above and McCone, 1982, 23-26).

Cowgill’s eminently plausible PIE mediopassive 2sg. **-th₂o(-r)* should have yielded PC **-to(r)*, the problem then being that OIr. dep. 2sg. ipv. *-the*, ind./subj. *-ther* require a front vowel *-e-* or the like rather than *-o-*. As regards the imperative, ‘whatever the exact Primitive Irish reconstruction, one’s first thought would be that it represents the PIE secondary 2nd singular mediopassive **-txo* remodelled in fashion parallel to that which led to *-ther* in indicative and subjunctive. Use of the secondary ending as imperative mediopassive (whence Irish deponent) is easily paralleled by the use in Latin and Greek of (innovated) **-so* at that point’ (Cowgill, 1983, 79).

It will be recalled that Cowgill (see 1.8.1 above) believed that replacement of 2sg. **-t(h₂)o* by **-so* did not take place in Celtic, unlike its Italic and Germanic neighbours. However, there is one form that may suggest otherwise, namely the isolated 2sg. ipv. *cuire* ‘put!’ of W2a deponent *-cuirethar*. This is attested not only in the Old Irish Carlsruhe glosses on Bede (*Thes.* II 19, 36 vs. *Ml.* 56c5 *cuirthe*) but also a couple of times in *LU* (ll. 4784 and 10821; also twice at ll. 36347/8 of *LL*, and *tochra*, *tochre* from cpd. *do:cuirethar* at *LU* 10821 and 10881). Since all four *LU* examples are from

texts of presumed Old Irish provenance (namely *Táin Bó Cúailnge* and *Tochmarc Étaíne*), it appears that this was a well established imperative of this particularly common deponent verb. As such, it seems likely to be an archaism rather than an innovation and there is little to recommend Thurneysen's view (*GOI* 376) that synchronically normal *cuirthe* was somehow remodelled on the basis of the quite different *déne* 'do!' type of non-deponent *do:gní, -déní* 'does'. If it is indeed an isolated survival in a common verb, *cuire* can be derived quite regularly from **kur'e(y)a* < **kóriha* < **korīso* < **koreye-so* with exactly the same ending as Lat. dep. 2sg. ipv. *seque-re* 'follow!' < **sek^he-so*, thus paving the way for an explanation of the troublesome vocalism of 2sg. dep. ind./subj. *-ther* in Old Irish. This can now be accounted for simply by positing interaction after the Primitive Irish apocope between 2sg. ind./subj. **-θor* (< **-t(h₂)or*) and ipv. *-e*, the former becoming *-θ'er* (and hence distinct from 3sg. ind./subj. **-θor*) and the latter tending to become more clearly characterised **-θ'e*. It remains to add that a derivation of 2sg. dep. *-s-er* in the *s*-pret./subj./fut. from athematic **-s-tVr* (Cowgill, 1983, 79) is singularly unattractive in view of the fact that even in the active these forms were thematic outside the 3sg. (see 1.5.1 above and McCone, 1991, 72) and that in the deponent even the 3sg. *-e/astar* for (on the model of *-e/athar*) **(a)ister* < *-V-*s'-θor* < *-V-ssetor* was thematic. Perfectly regular derivation of 2sg. *-s-er* from **-ss-e-sor* might be regarded as a better solution, although it must be conceded that there is no obvious reason why **-e-so-r* should have been preferred to 2sg. **-e-to-r* specifically in these *s*-formations.

1.8.3. It is now time to return to the issue of the problematical deponent absolute 3sg. *-(a)ithir*, 1 pl. *-(a)immir/-mir* (see 1.5.5 above on the analogical spread of unlenited /m/ for lenited /μ/) and 3pl. *-(a)itir*. As pointed out earlier, these cannot possibly continue *-V-* plus **-tor-es*, **-mor-es*, **-ntor-es* with a particle, since the outcome would then have been OIr. **-e/ath(a)ir*, **-e/am(m)(a)ir*, **-e/at(a)ir*. Given that the latter would have been quite clearly distinguished by /-r'/ versus /-r/ from the corresponding conjunct endings *-e/athar*, *-e/ammarr*, *-e/atar*, there would have been no motive for the analogical introduction of palatalised *-th-*, *-m(m)-*, *-t-* into such absolute forms. Boling's (1972, 94-5, n. 10) view that 'palatalisation has been taken over from the active forms', i.e. 3sg. *-(a)ith*, 1pl. *-m(m)i* 3pl. *-(a)it* entails yet another arbitrary analogy, particularly since both the normal active and the deponent third person abs. forms were essentially characterised by *-C'* in this system (abs. *-C'* vs. conj. *-C* in both in the 3pl.). Moreover, Old Irish forms such as nom. sg. *naithir* 'snake' < **naθ'rĩ* < **naθrih* < **natriχs* (later *nathair* under the influence of the rest of the paradigm with gen. sg. *nathrach* < **naθriχah* < **naθriχah* < **natrik-os* etc.; see *RChron.* 115-120 on the basic palatalisation rules) and acc./dat. sg. *bré(i)thir* < **brēθ'r'* < **brētr-en/-ī* (< **-an/*-ai*; *RChron.* 78-9 and 103) versus nom. sg. *briathar* 'word' < **brēθr* < **brētr-ā* clearly show that a cluster *-θr-* underwent palatalisation

to $-\theta'r'$ before an old final syllable containing a front vowel later lost by apocope and that post-apocope $-\theta r$ and $-\theta'r'$ then became the $-\theta\theta r$ and $-\theta'\theta r'$ seen in *briathar* and *bré(i)thir* by regular anaptyxis (*RChron.* 96; cf. Cowgill, 1983, 96). That being so, a gen. sg. such as *arathair* /arəθθər'/ or *tarathair* /tarəθθər'/ contrasting with nom. sg. *arathar* /arəθθər/ 'plough' or *tarathar* /tarəθθər/ 'auger' can hardly be other than an analogical replacement of **araithir* /arəθθ'ər'/ or **taraithir* /tarəθθ'ər'/ < **(t)araθ'r̃* < **(t)araθri* < **(t)aratrī* by introducing non-palatal $-th-$ from other parts of the paradigm such as the nom. sg. The fact that in such cases a hypercharacterised inherited opposition between (unstressed) $-V-\theta\theta r$ and $-V-\theta'\theta r'$ was analogically simplified to one between $-V-\theta\theta r$ and $-V-\theta\theta r'$ obviously makes it virtually inconceivable that an inherited form such as 3sg. dep. abs. $-V-*\theta\theta r'$ < $-V-*\theta or'$ < $-V-*tor-es$ versus conj. $-V-*\theta\theta r$ < $-V-\theta or$ < $-V-*tor$ would have been pointlessly hypercharacterised to $-V-\theta'\theta r'$ or $-V-\theta'or'$.

The intractable difficulties confronting an approach such as that just adumbrated prompted Cowgill's already mentioned suggestion that OIr. dep. abs.3sg. $-(a)ithir$, 3pl. $-(a)itir$ (to which might be added 1pl. $-(a)im(m)ir/-mir$) look like non-deponent absolutes (EOIr. 3sg. $-(a)ith$, 3pl. $-(a)it$ and 1pl. $-(a)immi/-mi$) plus palatal $-r$. This is characteristically insightful, as is the proposed link between this phenomenon and the non-deponent 3sg. 'which is de rigueur before suffixed object pronouns (type *Wb firianichthi* 2b28, *foilsigthi* 12a7, *oenichthi* 32d8)' (Cowgill, 1983, 96). However, Cowgill's insistence upon a suffixed enclitic particle **es* as the basic ingredient differentiating absolute from corresponding conjunct endings made it necessary to place the addition of $/-ir'/$ to (for him) already generalised non-deponent third persons absolute at an implausibly late date when the functionally otiose deponent inflection had supposedly already undergone serious erosion in the crucial third person. Quite simply, if according to his tentative scenario third person absolutes had already generally become non-deponent at a late prehistoric post-syncope stage, it is difficult to see why this did not trigger loss of this distinction elsewhere and very difficult indeed to see why perfectly normal forms as abs. 3sg. $/-\theta'/$, 3pl. $/-d'/$ should have added $/-ir'/$ under pressure from conj. $/-\theta or/$, $/-dor/$ with a different vowel and a non-palatal $/-r/$. It is to be noted that, even if it were viable, an explanation along such lines would deprive the particle of its one possible advantage in relation to the deponent endings, namely its ability to account for the palatal final $-r$ in the 3sg., 1pl. and 3pl. As we have seen, Cowgill rather desperately seeks to rescue 1pl. $-V-*mor-es$ by positing remodelling of **-am(a)ir* to $-(a)im(m)ir$ on the basis of the third-person forms but this is by no means compelling and, if abs. $-(m)mi$ had become $-(m)mir$ first by Cowgill's analogy, this would at least provide the $/-i-/$ required by him in the third-person absolute ending. Be that as it may, the specifically deponent (i.e. apart from the already discussed 2pl.) endings of the indicative and subjunctive furnish yet

another instance where a putative enclitic particle **es* or the like not only cannot account for the actually attested Old Irish forms in a direct or even a tolerably plausible indirect manner but also places insuperable obstacles in the way of a satisfactory solution.

1.8.4. That said, Cowgill is surely right to insist that OIr. dep. abs. 3sg./pl. *-V-thir/-tir* must derive from earlier *-V-θir/-dir* with an /i/ in the suffix. Clearly, if one reconstructs normal active abs. 3sg. *-V-*ti*, 3pl. *-V-*nti* in line with the hypothesis advanced above by the present writer, the creation of the requisite deponent absolute preforms 3sg. *-V-*tir*, 3pl. *-V-*ntir* by the addition of **-r* to an ending containing **-i* can easily be placed as far back as an Insular Celtic stage after the emergence of an opposition between initial 3sg. **bereti(-E)*, 3pl. **beronti(-E)* etc. and non-initial 3sg. **(-)beret*, **(-)beront* in the normal active by 1.4 above. Moreover, as briefly intimated elsewhere (McCone, 1985b, 269-270), a plausible mechanism for this development can be arrived at straightforwardly enough by combining the present writer's view of the origins of the absolute/conjunct dichotomy with the already mentioned rule that the presence of a suffixed pronoun conditioned a switch from deponent to normal active inflection. There is no obvious reason why Old Irish usage in this regard could not go back at least as far as Insular Celtic, thus deriving the final element of the forms cited by Cowgill above (e.g. 3sg. pres + suff. pron. *foils-igth-i* 'reveals it' beside abs. *foils-igithir*, conj. *foils-igethar*) < IC **-sagīti(y)-e(n)* beside abs. **-sagī-tir*, conj. **-sagītor*. Furthermore, the 3sg. f. **sin* and 3pl. **sus* enclitic object pronouns (see IV.3.2) provide an obvious motive for this insofar as **-(n)ti-sin/sus* would be an eminently natural replacement of the opaque **-(n)tor-rin/-rus* resulting regularly < **-r-sin*, **-r-sus*, given the impossibility of restoring **-sin/-sus* after **-r* without introducing a phonotactically inadmissible cluster *-rs-*. Once the old middle had (presumably at least as early as Insular Celtic) merged functionally with the active as a deponent, there would be no obstacle to the replacement of deponent with normal active endings, first of all in this specific context and then by natural extension in front of any enclitic object pronoun.

Since the quite serious constraints upon the use of suffixed pronouns in Old Irish (I.1.6) are rather obviously for the most part a quite recent response to phonetic complications that can hardly have arisen before the sixth century A.D., it seems reasonable to posit an Insular Celtic system in which any such pronoun could be freely combined with any active personal ending of the verb as in PIE itself on the evidence of Hittite, Indic, Greek etc. The scheme below for an Insular Celtic deponent verb (excluding the 2pl. as irrelevant for the reasons given above) such as S2 pres. **meditor* 'judges' (< **med-ye-tor* in accordance with *RChron.* 49; OIr. *-midethar*) would follow from a combination of this fluid suffixing system with the continuing application of

Wackernagel's Law placing enclitics after the first word of the sentence and the innovative use of normal as opposed to deponent active endings in front of an enclitic object pronoun. The first two columns cover initial simple deponent verbs with and without a following enclitic object pronoun (E) respectively, while the third on the far right applies to any non-initial deponent (including when preceded by a conjunct particle and/or preverb).

1sg. #*medyū-E....#	#*medyūr....#	#.(E)(..)*medyūr(..)#
2sg. #*medisi-E....#	#*meditor....#	#.(E)(..)*meditor(..)#
3sg. #*mediti-E....#	#*meditor....#	#.(E)(..)*meditor(..)#
	(>> #*meditir....#)	
1pl. #*medyomosi-E....#	#*medyomor....#	#.(E)(..)*medyomor(..)#
	(>> #*medyomosir....#)	
3pl. #*medyonti-E....#	#*medyontor....#	#.(E)(..)*medyontor(..)#
	(>> #*medyontir....#)	

Owing to the aforementioned mostly recent prehistoric restrictions on the use of suffixed pronouns, the only type in the first column on the left actually attested in Old Irish is a 3sg. verb in combination with a 3sg. m./n., 3sg. f. or 3pl. suffix. However, this derives quite straightforwardly from the pattern in the table, and the remaining combinations with -E above may confidently be assumed to have existed at an earlier stage. Allowing for already mentioned (1.8.2-3) late prehistoric Irish substitution of unlenited *-m(m)*-for lenited *-m*-in the 1pl. and of **-θer* for **-θor* in the 2sg as well as for the similarly late prehistoric introduction of an unsyncoated vowel before the ending in the third person (see 1.8.1-2 above), the forms in the final column all yield the attested Old Irish conjuncts (1sg. *-midiur*, 2sg. *-mitter*, 3sg. *-midethar*, 1pl. *-midem(m)ar*, 3pl. *-midetar*) quite regularly. OIr. abs. 1sg. *midiur* and 2sg. *mitter* derive equally straightforwardly from the preforms in the second column. The remaining OIr. absolutes (3sg. *midithir*, 1pl. *midim(m)ir*, 3pl. *miditir*) can then be derived without difficulty from the forms in the second column via the bracketed analogical accommodations to those in the first column (with 1pl. dep. abs. **-mosir* > *-m(m)ir* just like normal act. **-mosi* > *-m(m)i*; *RChron.* 131-2) according to the following straightforward proportion:

$$\begin{aligned}
 1\text{sg. } *medyū\text{-E} : *medyūr &= 3\text{sg. } *mediti\text{-E} : x \text{ (} x = *meditir \text{)} \\
 &= 1\text{pl. } *medyomosi\text{-E} : x \text{ (} x = *medyomosir \text{)} \\
 &= 3\text{pl. } *medyonti\text{-E} : x \text{ (} x = *medyontir \text{)}
 \end{aligned}$$

This is essentially the same process of homogenisation between initial finite verbal forms with and without a following enclitic as the one that has already (1.4 above)

been expounded in relation to the normal active, the only difference in this case being that the 1sg. trigger conditioned no more than partial homogenisation whereby the two forms became identical except for the presence of a final *-r* (matching that of the corresponding conjuncts) in the absence of a suffixed enclitic pronoun. It will be recalled that at this stage a new initial form such as **molātir* will, like initial **molāti-E* but unlike non-initial **molātor*, probably have been emphatic for topic/focus (see 1.6.4 above). In effect, it will have formed a link between the two by virtue of differing from likewise initial **molāti-* only in having final **-r* and from non-initial **molātor* only in the vocalism of the suffix. One clear advantage of this explanation is the ease with which it accounts for the lack of an absolute/conjunct opposition in the 1sg. (see above) and the 2sg., where initial **medisi-E* and **meditor* were quite simply too divergent formally to interact analogically in the manner envisaged above and anyway the latter had been rendered unambiguously 2sg. by the creation of initial 3sg. **meditir*.

Finally, in view of the fact that palatalisation in Primitive Irish was essentially a regressive assimilation conditioned by a following front vowel (although the nature of a preceding vowel and/or of the consonant(s) involved could impede it on occasion; see *RChron.* 116-117 and 1997b), it must be asked whether a form such as **meditir* should have yielded OIr. **midither* with non-palatal *-r* rather than actually attested *midithir*. Since *-r* was virtually the only single consonant not lost in final position in Primitive Irish, there is no obvious reason why, in the absence of a following vowel, a preceding high front vowel (basically *i* or *ī*) should not have palatalised it. Support for this contention is provided by the straightforward direct derivation of the nom. sg. of Old Irish *r*-stems such as *ath(a)ir* /aθər'/ 'father', *máth(a)ir* /māθər'/ 'mother' < **atīr*, **mātīr* (McCone, 1994b, 282), although these might just conceivably be due to necessarily late analogical reformation of **athar* /aθər/, **máthar* /māθər/ < **atīr*, **mātīr* in order to distinguish them from gen. sg. *athar* /aθər/, *máthar* /māθər/ < **aθr*, **māθr* < **atros*, **mātros*. At any rate, there is no compelling objection whatever to *midithir* < **meditir* and so on.

1.8.5. As far as the absolute/conjunct distinction in the (third person only - 1.8.1 above) passive endings are concerned, it seems perfectly reasonable to suppose that the inherited finite passive and deponent inflections were still for the most part formally undifferentiated when the latter acquired distinctive initial (absolute) endings in the manner just described. If so, passive 3sg./3pl. **-tor/*-ntor* (which will have been semantically incompatible with an enclitic object pronoun at that stage) will automatically have adopted the same **-tir/*-ntir* in conjunction with an initial simple verb (probably emphatic as topic/focus) as the deponent, while continuing to share the same endings **-tor/*-ntor* with it in non-initial position. Owing to the effects of

syncope, quite a few passive absolutes are formally compatible with **(n)tor-es* containing a particle: e.g., 3sg. pres. *mittir* ‘is judged’ < **mið’eθ’or’* < **meðiθoreh* < **meditor-es*, subj. *berth(a)ir* ‘may be carried’ < **beraθor’* < **berāθore(h)* < **berasetor-es*, 3p. pres. *bert(a)ir* ‘are carried’ < **berodor’* < **berodore(h)* < **berontor-es*. However, forms such as these can be derived just as easily from **mið’iθ’ir’* < **meðiθir* < **meditir*, **beraθir’* < **berāθir* < **berasetir*, **berod’ir’* < **berodir* < **berontir* with the same endings as the deponent, and strong support for this approach is provided by unsyncoated passive forms with regular abs. 3sg. *-ithir* or *-idir*, 3pl. *-itir* (*EIV* 79-84): e.g., 3sg. pres. *pridchidir* ‘is preached’ < **prið’εχαθ’ir’* (not **pridched(a)ir* < **prið’εχαθor’* < **preð’iχāθore(h)*), *f*-fut. *léicfidir* ‘will be let’ < **lēg’εφαθ’ir’* (not **léicfed(a)ir* < **lēg’εφαθor’* < **lēgifāθore(h)*), 3pl. pres. *miditir* ‘are judged’ < **mið’eod’ir’* < **meðiyodir* < **medyontir* (not **midet(a)ir* < **mið’eodor’* < **meðiyodore(h)* < **medyontor-es*. Cowgill’s (1983, 83-101) attempt to do things the other way round is not only a good deal more complicated but also (1.8.3 above) leaves the corresponding deponent endings unexplained.

On the other hand, it seems unlikely that separate absolute endings were developed by forms that were exclusively passive at this stage, notably the passive preterite and probably the 3sg. **-or* employed in some thematic presents (notably S1 with further spread as **-ar* to S3 presents) and the *s*-subjunctive (see *EIV* 81-2 on the OIr. distribution and McCone, 1986b, 239-40, for a possible origin, but note Cowgill, 1983, 102 on the problem posed by non-syncope before this enigmatic ending). As far as the latter is concerned, an OIr. opposition of the type pres. 3sg. pass. abs. *ber(a)ir* ‘is carried’ versus rel. *berar* ‘who/which is carried’ and conj. *-berar* could easily have been introduced at some time after the loss of final syllables c. 500 A.D. on the analogy of abs. *-r’* versus rel./conj. *-r* in the 3sg. passives discussed in the previous paragraph, adequate motivation being provided by the desirability of distinguishing a non-rel. abs. (**beror’* for **beror*) from the corresponding rel. (**beror*; see VI.3.3).

As an old verbal adjective, the preterite passive will originally have had just a singular (presumably **brit-os/-ā/-on* in the first instance, depending on the gender of the subject) and a plural (**brit-oi/-ās/-ā*). This, as pointed out above (1.8.1) following Cowgill, was obviously the point in the passive system where first and second person forms were first created by attaching an enclitic pronoun to the 3sg., as in OIr. 1sg. *do-m:breth* ‘I was brought’ < **to-mu:britos*. It cannot be determined whether simple verbs used **nu* for this purpose from the beginning (OIr. *no-m:breth* ‘I was carried’ < **nu-mu:britos*) or suffixed the pronoun at first (e.g. **britos-me*) and only later replaced this structure with an infixing one involving **nu*. Be that as it may, this distinctively passive as opposed to deponent syntagm had undoubtedly spread throughout the passive system before the end of the Insular Celtic period (e.g. OIr.

no-t:berar ‘you are carried’, MW *y-m:gatter* ‘I (may) be left’), thus bringing about the demise of first and second person passive (as opposed to deponent) endings. A 3sg. conj. such as OIr. *-breth* ‘was carried’ is the straightforward outcome of any of the three sg. endings given above (assuming that any following mutations were abandoned - otherwise general **britos* is indicated) but 3pl. conj. *-bretha* can only continue originally f. pl. **britās* (presumably generalised after the loss of final syllables by virtue of being more clearly distinguished from the 3sg. than m. **-briθ’* < **brit-ī* < **-oi* or n. **-breθ* < **britā*).

The 3pl. abs. is only attested in later manuscripts affected by the Middle Irish confusion of final unstressed short vowels as /ə/ (see *GOI* 440, where OIr. **-ai* is tentatively suggested) and can perfectly well have been **bretha* < **britās* etc. just like the 3pl. conjunct (cf. *linta* ‘were filled’ at l. 107 of the OIr. Life of Brigit, ed. Ó hAodha, 1978; see 1.9.5 below on this text). It is a moot point whether the 3sg. abs. *brethae* ‘was carried’ (Ml. 52) can be derived directly from **britos-es* or the like with a particle (**britā-s* and **briton-es* being obviously impossible) in view of OIr. 1pl. abs. /-m’i/ < **-mosi* (see 1.2.2 above and McCone, 1982, 27, on ‘Cowgill’s (1975a, 60-61) difficulties about deriving 1pl. abs. *-m(a)i* from **-mos-es*, which should have given *-m(a)e*’). The outcome of **brit-os(/-ā/-an)* without a particle would undoubtedly have been **breth* identical to the 3sg. conj. As an absolute form consisting of no more than a bare stem, this will have been liable to have been replaced by a form containing a further syllable in accordance with the principle enunciated in relation to certain 1sg. abs. forms such as *biru*, *biuu* in 1.5.3 above. Originally relative *brethae* (probably < **britohya* < **britos-yo*; cf. OIr. *ai* ‘his’ < **esyō* and see *RChron.* 132 on the monophthongisation of post-apocope **-oy* > **-ē* in unstressed syllables) was presumably pressed into service, as suggested by Greene (1976), in a manner similar to that posited above (1.5.5) in relation to 2pl. abs. *-the* (cf. McCone, 1982, 27-8) except that in this case the ending also continued to be used in its original relative function (*GOI* 430).

1.9.1. The explanation of the Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct inflection advanced in 1.4-5 above confines it to those tenses or moods of the active that either inherited (present indicative, present subjunctive, desiderative/future) or acquired (*s-* and *t-*preterite by thematisation) reflexes of the PIE/PC primary endings with **-i* in most persons (probably all but the thematic 1sg. in Proto-Celtic). There are just two remaining active categories, namely the imperative and the suffixless preterite, which inherited different sets of endings lacking **-i* throughout. Accordingly the theory defended here would predict a single set of endings without distinction of absolute and conjunct in the imperative or the suffixless preterite, and the following discussion should show that this is exactly what we find.

As far as the imperative with its undisputed lack of an abs./conj. distinction is concerned, ‘in the 2 sg. and pl. active the Irish formation corresponds to that found in cognate languages. The 2sg. had no ending; cp.Lat. *lege, cantā, finī*; Gaul. *gabi, moni...* The 2pl. had the secondary ending *-tē* (Gk. φέρετε etc.).... Further, all the remaining imperative forms, except the 3sg. act. (and dep.) and the deponent 2sg., are identical with the conjunct forms of the present indicative. This identity may be due to the example of the 2pl., or it may represent a survival of the usage, preserved in Vedic Sanskrit and Old Iranian, which employs indicative forms with secondary endings to express commands or prohibitions (the ‘injunctive’).... The 3sg. act. and dep. apparently points to *-et.* with a neutral vowel; hence it corresponds neither to Lat. *tō* (O. Lat. *tōd*) nor to Skt. *-tu*. Frazer, ZCP. VIII. 290, suggests an earlier ending *-tou*, comparable with Gothic *at-steig-adau* ‘let him descend’. Since the same form is used for the deponent, the possibility has also been suggested that the ending is based on **-to*, a middle secondary ending that was not specifically imperative’ (GOI 374).

The all important 2sg. and 2pl. are, then, quite unproblematical: e.g., OIr. 2sg. (-)beir ‘bear!’ < **(-)bere*, (-)gaib ‘take!’ < **gabi* < **gabye*, 2pl. (-)beirid < **berete*, gaibid < **gabite* < **gabyete* (see RChron. 49 on PC *-ye(-)* > *-i(-)*) with the same contrast between ipv. **-te* and indicative **-tes(i)* as in Latin (e.g. 2pl. ipv. *legite* ‘read!’ versus pres. ind. *legitis* ‘you read’). The 1pl. would seem to have been PC secondary **-mos* originally but could well have been remodelled early to distinctive **-mo* standing in the same relationship to indicative **-mos(i)* as 2pl. ipv. **-te* to ind. **-tes(i)*. Whatever the precise details, the final vowel of the 3sg. ipv. was certainly not **-i*. Fraser’s view has something to recommend it, in which case **-to-u* might be taken as a 3sg. middle imperative (> deponent active in Insular Celtic) in origin with sec. 3sg. *-to + -u* just like the PIE active 3sg. ipv. **-t + -u* seen in Skt. *han-tu*, Hitt. *kuen-tu* ‘let him/her kill’ < PIE **g^hén-tu* versus 3pl. Skt. *g^hn-éntu*, Hitt. *kun-andu* ‘let them kill’ < PIE **g^hn-éntu*. Although it can be derived without formal difficulty from ‘injunctive’ secondary **-nt*, an equally straightforward derivation from a form with the same ending as the 3sg. seems more probable: tentatively, then, OIr. 3sg. (-)be(i)red ‘let him bear’ < IC **beretō* < **beretou* (like dep. (-)mided ‘let him judge’ < **meditō* < **medyetou*) and 3pl. (-)berat ‘let them bear’ < **berontō* < **berontou* (cf. McCone, 1986b, 241-2). At all events, the active imperative paradigm contained no features liable to generate an absolute/conjunct dichotomy as accounted for by the present hypothesis, which makes the effects of apocope on endings containing **-i* (except when followed by -E) the basic trigger of any such differentiation.

1.9.2. Its stem formation and distinctive endings leave no doubt that the Insular Celtic suffixless preterite surviving vestigially in British and fully in Old Irish derives directly from the PIE perfect (e.g. GOI 433-4), which was characterised not only by a typically

reduplicated strong sg. stem *Ce-CóC-* and weak pl. stem *Ce-CC-* as in Skt. 2 sg. *ja-g^hán-t^ha*, 3sg. *ja-g^hān-a* ‘has smitten’ (< **g^{uh}e-g^{uh}ón-*) versus 3pl. *ja-g^hn-úr* (< **g^{uh}e-g^{uh}n-*) but also by a peculiar set of endings, namely sg. 1 *-*h₂e* [-*h₂a*], 2 *-*th₂e* [-*th₂a*], 3 -*e*, pl. 1 *-*mó*, 2 *-*é*, 3 *-*ēr* (or perhaps *-*r(s)*); see *KPV* 69, n. 63). The regular outcome of these in Proto-Celtic would have been sg. 1 *-*a*, 2 *-*ta*, 3 *-*e*, pl. 1 *-*mo*, 2 *-*e*, 3 *-*īr* (or *-*ar*) but the 2pl. was replaced very early by *-*te* as in Greek on the evidence of the highly anomalous 2pl. preterito-present *fitis* ‘you know/knew’, which can hardly have arisen otherwise than by addition of the *fit-* stem from other arts of the paradigm to a synchronically anomalous archaic 2pl. **fis* < **uid-te* (for PIE **uid-é* > Skt. *vidá*) just like Greek ἴστε ‘you (pl.) know’ (McCone, 1986b, 238; note that in classical Greek the common *[*w*](*o*)*id-* ‘know’ is the only verb to retain the inflection of the PIE athematic perfect virtually intact without recourse to the *a*-thematisation discussed briefly below).

In the case of roots with a final dental stop the regular sound change PIE *d/t^st* > PC *ts* (*RChron.* 48) will have resulted in synchronically anomalous alternations between the likes of 1/3sg. **g^weg^wod-a/e*, **rerot-a/e* and 2sg. **g^weg^wot-sa*, **rerot-sa* (**g^wed-* ‘pray’, **ret-* ‘run’) that could have been eliminated by analogically metathesising the latter to **g^weg^wod-as*, **rerot-as* with the help of secondary *-*a-s* (as in root aorists such as **ker-as*, **ster-as* < **kérh₂-s*, **stérh₃-s*; see McCone, 1991, 18-19; the former formation underlies OIr. *do:cer* ‘fell’ but the latter was subsequently replaced by a synchronically predictable *t*-preterite) in order to differentiate them from 1sg. **g^weg^wod-a*, **rerot-a*. An alternative source of 2sg. *-*a-s* may well have been an isolated but extremely common thematised root aorist **lud-e/o-* (and perhaps also **bow-e/o-*; see below), which inflects as a suffixless preterite in Old Irish and seems likely to have adopted this pattern once 3sg. **lud-ed* [luðeð] ‘went’ (see 1.3.1 above) had become **lud-e* by very early Insular Celtic loss of *-d* prior to apocope of *-*i* (see 3.2 below). As a result 1sg. **lud-a* will have replaced **lud-on* or **lud-an* (< **lud-on*; *RChron.* 103 and 109) < **lud-om* but it seems unlikely that distinctive 2sg. **lud-e-s* would have been simply replaced by ambiguous **lud-a* rather than remodelled to a 2sg. **lud-a-s* combining a synchronically normal inherited morpheme *-*s* with the ambiguous and synchronically anomalous *-a* of the suffixless inflection (see below for a similar suggestion in relation to the 3pl.).

Moreover, since there is no good reason to suppose that thematic **h₁lud^h-e/o-* goes back to PIE, Proto-Celtic may well have inherited a typical athematic root aorist from the parent language (PIE 3sg. **h₁léud^h-t*, 3pl. **h₁lud^h-ént*; McCone, 1986b, 231, and 1991, 125, also *KPV* 457). It is then not unreasonable to posit with Schumacher (*KPV* 457) that so common a form might have preserved the synchronically irregular reflexes of such a paradigm down to a relatively late stage before undergoing remodelling on

the basis of those forms containing a vowel after the ending, namely (at an early Insular Celtic stage) 1sg. **loud-an* (< PC **leud-am* < PIE **h₁léud^h-m̄*) and 3pl. **lud-ent* (cf. 3pl. pres. ind. cop. OIr. *it*, MW *ynt* < IC **sinti* < PIE **h₁s-énti* for a similarly isolated survival of the old athematic ending in an especially common verb). Schumacher (*KPV* 457-8) triggers everything from the 3pl. but morphologically opaque and ambiguous 2sg. **louss* (< PC **leut-s* < PIE **h₁léud^h-s*) could surely have been remodelled to **loud-as* from the 1sg. on the analogy of the relationship existing in an inherited root aorist such as 1sg. **ker-an*, 2sg. **ker-as* < (**kérh₂-m̄* **kérh₂-s*; see above) or even an imperfect like 1sg. **k^uri-na-n*, 2sg. **k^uri-na-s* ‘used to buy’ on the reasonable assumption that imperfect active forms were first lost in Insular Celtic after apocope of **-i* rendered them largely indistinct from pres. 2sg. **k^uri-na-s(i)* etc. By contrast, 3sg. **louss* (< PC **leuts(t)* < PIE **h₁léud^h-t*; *RChron.* 48) was likely to be remodelled to **lud-e* from 3pl. **lud-ent* by adopting the 3sg. secondary ending **-e* < **-ed*, presumably from a still surviving thematic imperfect with 3sg. **ber-e* < **ber-ed* vs. 3pl. **ber-ont* etc. (see 1.3.1 above and *KPV* 358). Once the fundamental 3sg. **lud-e* had been established in this way, remodelling of the 3pl. to **lud-ont* would follow almost as a matter of course, as would the spread of the **lud-* variant throughout the paradigm to give 1sg. **lud-a-n*, 2sg. **lud-a-s*, which then provide a straightforward trigger for analogical reshaping of the adjacent 1pl. **lud-mos*, **lut-ses* to **lud-a-mos* and **lud-a-tes* respectively (even if **loud-a-mos*, **loud-a-tes* resulted prior to homogenisation of the stem, third person **lud-* would surely soon have displaced **loud-* in the more marginal first and second persons).

The second scenario above envisages the inflectional merger of a single but very common old root aorist characterised by the endings sg. 1 **-an*, 2 **-as*, 3 **-e*, pl. 1 **-a-mos*, 2 **-a-tes*, 3 **-ont* with a substantial set (see *KPV* 68) of old perfects displaying the inherited endings sg. 1 **-a*, 2 **-ta* (with a post-dental allomorph **-sa*), 3 **-e*, pl. 1 **-mo(r)*, 2 **-te* (with a post-dental allomorph **-se*), 3 **-or* (see below). The identity of the paradigmatically fundamental 3sg. in both would provide an obvious trigger and it seems reasonable to suppose that the endings of the majority perfect category generally prevailed except where there were clear formal advantages to the ending of **lud-*. These will have existed in the 2sg., where *-as* contained a convenient vowel identical with that of 1sg. *-a* but consonant-initial 2sg. **-ta* was bedevilled by allomorphy (**-(s)a*) and other inconveniences resulting from interaction between various root-final consonants and its initial *-t-*. In the 1sg. by contrast **-an* had no obvious formal advantage over **-a* and the latter prevailed. Sg. 1 **-a*, 2 **-a-s* in the merged paradigm will have provided an excellent platform for the spread of quasi-thematic **-a-* to adjacent pl. 1 **-mo(r)* and 2 **-te* (with its opaque allomorph **-se*) as in the Greek perfect (see below). However, there was no obvious reason to alter the inherited endings themselves in the majority category of old perfects, and

**lud-a-mos*, **lud-a-tes* probably adopted these to produce **lud-a-mo(r)*, **lud-a-te*, although generalisation of **-a-mos* (> Prim. Ir. **-aμ*, which could have been remodelled to OIr. *-ammar* or its direct precursor at virtually any time between then and the earliest records on the basis of OIr. 3pl. *-atar* < **-ontor*), **-a-tes* can hardly be excluded as a possibility. The 3pl. will be discussed below.

Whatever its precise origin, a synchronically typical 2sg. **-as* could easily be spread throughout the perfect at the expense of anomalous **-ta* and then trigger 2pl. **-a-te* (e.g. 2pl. **g^wēd-ate*, **rēt-ate* for **g^wēt-se*, **rēt-se*; see McCone, 1986b, 235-8) on the model of root aorist **kar-a-te(s)*, **star-a-te(s)*, themselves remodelled from **krā-te(s)*, **strā-te(s)* < **k_ṛh₂-té(s)*, **str_ḥh₃-té(s)* under the influence of 3pl. **kar-a-nt*, **star-a-nt* (the latter with *-a-* for *-o-* on the analogy of the sg.) < **k_ṛh₂-ént*, **str_ḥh₃-ént*. Such a development would conform to a well established tendency in Celtic as in various other IE languages such as Greek or Latin towards the insertion of a vowel between a consonant-final stem and a consonant-initial ending in inherited athematic paradigms, *-e/o-* thematisation from 3pl. **-o-nt(i)* being the most prominent strategy of this type (see McCone, 1986b, 227-9, and 1991, 12, 29 and 41; *KPV* 37 prefers a somewhat different route to the same end result). Once *-a-* had been established in the 2sg./pl. perfect, its presence there and in 1sg. *-a* will almost inevitably have led to remodelling of the 1pl. to *-a-mo*, which then became **-a-mor* (> OIr. *-a(m)mar* with unlenited *-m(m)-* as in the 1pl. deponent) by spread of *-r* from the 3pl. on the model of the deponent pattern.

The 3pl. ending required to generate OIr. *-atar* /-ədər/ is **-ontor* and the details of the remodelling of inherited **-īr* (or **-ar*) to this form are perforce somewhat speculative. It seems likely enough that the latter first became **-or* under the influence of 1pl. **-a-mor* or by acquiring a typical thematic *-o-* in relation to 3sg. *-e*, and was then endowed with a distinctive 3pl. **-ont(-)* (cf. Lat. perf. 3pl. *-erunt* alongside *-ere*). The latter development may well have been mediated by the already discussed old root aorist **lud-* ‘went’, to which may perhaps be added OIr. *(-)boí* ‘was’ (< **bowe* < **buw-e(d)* replacing **būd* < PIE **b^huh-t* through secondary thematisation from the 3pl. according to McCone, 1991, 131-3; see Jasanoff, 1988 and 1997, 179-84, or *KPV* 251-4 for alternative derivations from perfect **beb(u)w-* and **bub(u)w-* respectively by means of reasonably plausible, if *ad hoc*, sound change). Whatever about *(-)boí*, in the course of the already discussed inflectional merger with the suffixless preterite **lud-* may be plausibly assumed to have merely added old perfect **-or* or the like (see above) to its own clearly marked 3pl. **lud-ont* (see above), the resultant **lud-ontor* (> **lođodor* > OIr. *(-)lotar*) then ousting less well characterised **-or* in the old perfects.

Since a virtually full range of personal endings is not attested with any but the

commonest formations, *luid* ‘went’ will be used below to illustrate the basic inflection of the Old Irish suffixless preterite and its direct Insular Celtic antecedents as reconstructed above.

sg.	1	(-)l ^o d	<	*lud-a
	2	(-)l ^o d	<	*lud-as
	3	(-)luid	<	*lud-e
pl.	1	(-)lodmar	<	*lud-amor (for *-a-mo(s))
	2	*(-)lod(a)id (like <i>-áncaid</i> ; GOI 432)	<	*lud-ate(s)
	3	(-)lotar	<	*lud-ontor

1.9.3. This is not the place to discuss the perfect stem in Celtic in detail, one significant aspect (also seen in Indo-Iranian) being use of *u* or *i* rather than *e* as the reduplicating vowel if the verbal root contained *u* or *i* respectively. The basic point may be summarised as follows. In the case of athematic paradigms with inherited primary or secondary endings, the 3pl. (*-o-nt in all probability; McCone, 1986b, 227-230) was the trigger of thematisation in Celtic with the result that the weak plural variant of the stem was typically generalised as part of this process. In the reduplicated perfect, by contrast, the eradication of paradigmatic ablaut usually accompanied the spread of a liaison vowel *-a- (in the 3pl. *-o- corresponding to 3sg. *-e) from singular to plural with the result that the former’s strong stem tended to be generalised at the expense of the latter’s weak counterpart (contrary to McCone, 1986b, 233-5 and following McCone, 1994, 166-8; cf. *KPV* 68-74; see McCone, 1986b, 235-8, Schumacher, 1998, 157-8 and *KPV* 74-9 on the special case of the unreduplicated Insular Celtic *ā*-preterite): e.g., 3pl. (-)gegnatar < *g^weg^won-ontor (not *gén- < *g^weg^wn-) like 3sg. (-)geguin ‘slew’ < *g^weg^won-e (not *géuin < *g^weg^wn-e; OIr. gon(a)id, -goin ‘slays’, on which see McCone, 1986b, 228, and 1991, 158), 3pl. selgatar < *seslog-ontor (not *silg- < *seslig- < *seslg-) like 3sg. (-)selaig ‘cut down’ (not *silig < *seslig-e; OIr. sligid, -slig ‘cuts down’), 3sg. (-)lelaig ‘licked’ < *liloig-e (not *lilig < *lilig-e-; OIr. ligid, -lig ‘licks’, on which see *KPV* 450-1), 3sg. -bobig ‘cut, broke’ < *bubōg-e < *buboug-e (not *bubig < *bubug-e; OIr. bong(a)id, -boing ‘cuts, breaks’, on which see McCone, 1991, 43). It remains to note that a striking parallel with many of the well motivated processes postulated above is provided by the classic Greek perfect of the type sg. 1/2/3 πέποιθ-α/-ας/-ε and pl. 1/2/3 πεποιθ-αμεν/-ατε/-ασι (< *-anti) with a strong full-grade stem plus -a- in the plural in place of an inherited weak zero-grade stem without it (πεπιθ- still attested just once in Homer; see Chantraine, 1961, 190-2 and the brief but insightful discussion of what he appositely terms ‘alpha-thematic’ formations in Greek by Rix, 1976, 207).

In the case of laryngeal-final roots one would expect something like 1/3sg.

**d^he-d^hoh₁-(h₂)a/-e* > **d^hed^hō* (Skt. *dad^hau* ‘I/(s)he put’ < **d^had^hā(w)*) > PC *dedū*, and this is duly confirmed by (Leponitic or) Cisalpine Gaulish 3sg. TETU /*dedū*/ ‘set up’. It would hardly be surprising if 1sg. *-*a* and 3sg. *-*e* replaced ambiguous *-*ū* here on the analogy of the consonant-final type discussed above, and this development too is found in Translapine Gaulish *δεδε* ‘set up’ as well as the OIr. type *ad:gén* ‘I recognised’, *ad:géuin* ‘(s)he recognised’ < **gegn-a/-e* in place of **gegnū* < **ġe-ġnoh₃-(h₂)a/-e* (Scr. *jajñau*; pres. Skt. *jānāti*, OIr. -*gnin* < IE **ġn₃-n-eh₃-ti*; see McCone, 1991, 21-3). It appears that 1/2/3sg. **gegn-a/-as/-e* triggered a new plural stem **gegn-a/o-* in the manner described above to produce 1pl. *ad:génammar* (for *-*gén[†]mar* on the model of (-) *geg[†]nammar* etc.) < **gegn-a-mor* etc. However, as Schumacher (*KPV* 73) points out, this stem will already have come into existence by regular sound change in the 3pl. of the CEH type, e.g. PC **ded-ar/-īr* < PIE **d^he-d^hh₁-r̄/ēr* (the precise shape of the ending being immaterial for present purposes; Skt. 3pl. *dad^h-ur*), which may then have been the starting point for the introduction of **ded-e* and so on into the sg. The CREH/CERH type is less amenable, as a 3pl. such as **ġe-ġnh₃-r̄/ēr* would regularly yield PC **gegan-ar/-īr*. However, this (see McCone, 1994b) could presumably have been remodelled (cf. Skt. 3pl. *jajñ-ur*) to **gegn-* (> OIr. -*gén* etc. above; similarly **ġe-ġnh₁-* with **gegn-* > *gén(-)* in the innovatory deponent suffixless pret. OIr. (-)*génair* ‘was born’ of -*gainethar* ‘is born’ < PC **gan-ye-tor* < PIE **ġnh₁-ġe-tor*; *RChron.* 53) on the analogy of 1/2pl. **gegn-a-mo/-te* (probably with analogical shortening of **gegn-ā-mo/-te* from early but post-PIE **gegnh-mo/-te* under the combined influence of 1/2pl. **ded-a-mo/-te* < **d^he-d^hh-mo/-te* etc. and 1sg. -*a*).

The reasons for the application of the same pattern to roots of the shape C(R)eġH- is less obvious but, if *y* was lost sufficiently early after *o/ō* (cf. 3.7), PC or IC 1/3sg.. **rirō* < **ri-roy-a/-e* < **h₂ri-h₂roġh-(h₂)a/-e* (**ri-r-* for **rī-r-* under the influence of other verbs without initial laryngeal) would be likely to undergo a similar remodelling to 1sg. **rir-a*, 2sg. *rir-as*, 3sg. **rir-e*, (> OIr. 1/2sg. (-)*rer*, 3sg. (-)*rir* ‘sold’; OIr. pres. *renaid* ‘sells’ and then pl. **rir-a/o-* (OIr. *renaid* ‘sells’ < **ri-na-* < **h₂ri-n-h-*; McCone, 1991, 37-40). Similarly 1sg. (-)*cér* ‘I bought’, 3sg. -*ciuir* < **kexr-a/-e* < **k^wik^wr-a/-e* (pres. *crenaid* ‘buys’ < **k^wri-na-* < **k^uri-n-h₂-*; Skt. *krīnāti*), 3sg. -*lil* ‘adhered’ < **lil-e* (OIr. *lenaid* < **li-na-*; McCone, 1991, 11), 3pl. -*leldar* < **Lelodor* < **lil-ontor*. Schumacher (*KPV* 73-4) considers this type to have arisen by analogy from the previous one but does not explain how. As long as one posits 3pl. *-*īr* rather than *-*ar*, a 3pl. like **k^wik^wr-īr* ‘they bought’ < **k^wik^wr(i)-īr* < **k^uik^urih₂-ēr* would provide a plausible point of contact for analogical introduction of the pattern seen in types covered in the previous paragraph by virtue of an identical structure with 3pl. **ded-īr*, **gegn-īr* etc. The upshot would then be the sg. 1 **k^wik^wr-a*, 2 **k^wik^wr-a-s*, 3 **k^wik^wr-e*, pl. 1 **k^wik^wr-a-mo(r)*, 2 **k^wik^wr-a-te*, 3 **k^wik^wr-īr* that yield the actually

attested Old Irish paradigm quite unproblematically, due allowance being made for the already discussed remodelling of the 3pl. to **k^wik^wr-ontor*.

The foregoing raises the intriguing possibility that perfects of various roots with an erstwhile final laryngeal (cover symbol H) were the source of ‘*a*-thematisation’ as a result of regular or near-regular phonological developments in the 1 and 2 pl. followed by analogical spread of this pattern to an adjacent type. If so, a combination of 1sg. **-a* with 1/2pl. **-a-mo/-te* would have exerted strong pressure on 2sg. **-ta*, which could easily have been replaced by **-a-s* according to the straightforward proportion (preterites from old root aorists; see above) 2pl. **-a-te(s)*: 2sg. **-a-s* = 2pl. **-a-te* : x (x = **-a-s* in preterites from old perfects of CEH and CREH or CERH roots). Once sg. 1 **-a*, 2 **-a-s*, 3 **-e* had come into being in this category, spread of the highly advantageous 2sg. **-a-s* to the suffixless preterites of other root shapes (notably CET, CER and CERT) at the expense of **-ta* (**(s)a*) would be almost inevitable and the stage was thus set for the thematisation of the plural from the singular stem.

The crucial point for present purposes is that, whichever of the three or four different possible scenarios presented above is adopted, there is no difficulty in generating a new distinctive 2sg. *-as* comparable (despite a somewhat different analogical trigger) to Greek perfect *-ας* in the Proto-Celtic and/or Insular Celtic perfect/suffixless preterite. It is with good reason universally accepted that the singular of the Old Irish suffixless preterite did not distinguish between absolute and conjunct endings. Given the functional merger of perfect and aorist in Insular Celtic at latest as a preterite containing formal reflexes of both in lexically conditioned complementary distribution (as independently in Italic with major differences of detail), adherents of some version of the particle theory have been bound to accept that there is no conceivable reason why the particle in question (whether **ed*, **es(ti)* or **et(i)*) should have been present in the *s*- and *t*-preterites, which do make a distinction between absolute and conjunct forms, but absent from the semantically identical suffixless preterite. Their solution is to suppose that, as usual, the vowel of the particle was neutralised by elision after another vowel, whence, say, 1sg. abs. **luda-(e)s* > OIr. *lod* like conj. **luda* and 3sg. abs. **lude-(e)s* > OIr. *luid* like conj. **lude*. However, 2sg. **ludas-es* could not possibly have yielded OIr. abs. *lod*. It would certainly have resulted in a final vowel (probably OIr. **-i*) that made a vital formal distinction between the 2sg. and the 1 or 3sg. That being so, this would not only be most unlikely to have been lost by analogy but would actually have been prone to spread to the corresponding conjunct (OIr. *-lod* < **ludas*) in order to make a desirable distinction there too in accordance with a well motivated tendency documented in 1.5.4 above. Accordingly it is usual for the particle lobby to claim that distinctive reflexes of inherited perfect 2sg. **-ta* were analogically replaced by an **-a* identical with the 1sg. with the result that OIr. 2sg. *(-)lod* is the

regular outcome of both abs. **loda-(e)s* and conj. **loda* like the 1sg. (e.g. *KPV* 69, n. 63).

Cowgill (1985, 116) makes the following characteristically candid remark: ‘2 sg. is difficult. No basis in Celtic for replacing **-ta* by **-as* as in Greek, where model was *s*-aorist 2sg. *-sas*, 3sg. *-se* (vs. Insular Celtic 2 sg. **-ssī*, 3 sg. **-s(s)*). Attested forms could be explained by supposing **-ta* → **-a* (= 1sg.!) but no motivation or model for this.’ The point about the lack of a precise parallel with the Greek development is obviously valid but it has been argued above that there are adequate alternative motivations for **-as* in Insular Celtic. Indeed, one of these centring upon the erstwhile root aorist *luid* ‘went’ produces in 2sg. **lud-as*, 3sg. **lud-e* a trigger that is, to all intents and purposes, formally identical to that supplied by the *s*-aorist in the case of the Greek perfect. As Cowgill concedes, analogical 2sg. **-a* for **-ta* would be ill motivated in the extreme. For instance, even if a 2sg. such as **g^weg^wot-sa*, **rerot-sa* above had become **g^weg^wossa*, **rerossa* by Insular Celtic *ts* > *ss* (*RChron.* 48) and then **g^weg^wod-a*, **rerot-a* in the first instance by restoration of the root final from the first and third persons, there would be every reason not to replace **-ta* elsewhere with this hopelessly ambiguous form. Boling (1972, 95-6) simply accepts 2sg. abs. **ráthae* < (for him) **rātas-ed* versus conj. *-ráth* < **rātas* and then claims that ‘a very likely result of the fact that in the basic member of the paradigm, the third person singular, the forms are identical would be the tendency to abandon any distinction between simple and compound forms’, whence abs./conj. 2sg. *(-)ráth*, 3pl. *(-)ráthatar* for **ráthae/-ráth*, *ráthaitir/-rathatar* etc. triggered by 3sg. abs./conj. *(-)raith* < (for him) **rāte-(e)d/*rāte*. If such a process had indeed affected the 2sg., it is surely far more likely, as suggested above, that abs. **ráthae* or the like would have replaced conj. *-ráth* in the 2sg. (cf. 1.5.4 above) in order to distinguish this form from 1sg. abs./conj. *(-)ráth* < (for Boling) **ráta-(e)d/*rāta*.

1.9.4. An even more crucial test case is provided by the 1 and 3pl., where the likes of OIr. *(-)lodmar*, *(-)lotar* etc. without distinction of absolute and conjunct would be quite fatal to any version of the particle theory by virtue of failing to oppose abs. *lodmair*, *lotair* < **ludamor-es*, **ludontor-es* (or the like) to conj. *-lodmar*, *-lotar* < **ludamor*, *ludontor*. *GOI* 433 refers to ‘the absolute flexion, of which there are very few examples in the early MSS.’ (mainly because almost all instances in the Glosses contain an augment, on which see IV.2.1-4, and so are conjunct) and goes on to make the following statement: ‘In the 1 and 3 pl. the non-relative forms show fluctuation between *-ar* and *-ir*: **bámar** § 789, **ó lodmar-ni** LL 246^b26, beside **femmir** § 702; **fichimmar** or **-mmir** § 693; **bátar** and **bátir** (§ 789, cp. § 810); **ráthatar** Féil. Sept. 18, **gádatar** Thes. II 313, 1, **lelgatar** ZCP IX. 127, 9, beside **memdaitir** LU 5316, **táchaitir** Trip. 70, 28; **lotir** (emended to **-tar** by a later (?) hand) LU 10575, **lotair**

SR. 3457, usually **lotar**. It is probable that here too the absolute forms were originally identical with the conjunct. But the resemblance of the plural endings to those of the deponent flexion, which in the absolute distinguishes relative *-mar*, *-tar* from non-relative *-mir*, *-tir*, led to the occasional use of *-mir*, *-tir* in non-relative forms, though the earlier endings were not entirely superseded’.

Thurneysen’s evaluation of the evidence is eminently reasonable, given an obvious motive and model for creating an abs. *-m(a)ir*, *-t(a)ir* distinct from rel *-mar*, *-tar* and the lack of manuscript evidence for *-ir* forms of normal stressed verbs until the Middle Irish period. Particle enthusiasts are, by contrast, obliged to take abs. *-m(a)ir* and *-t(a)ir* as the older set and argue that these tended to be replaced by conj. *-mar*, *-tar* at a later date owing to the lack of an abs./conj. distinction in the singular (Cowgill, 1985, 116, and Schrijver, 1997, 151-2), despite the fact that such a development would have tended to eradicate a useful distinction between relative and non-relative forms that is otherwise extremely well preserved in Old Irish. A more likely version of this approach would be that *-mir*, *-tir* began to be replaced by *-mar*, *-tar* in the early Middle Irish period as a result of the generalisation of the augmented forms of the preterite with invariably conjunct endings in normal usage, the upshot being that the absolute endings became artificial literary survivals prone to replacement by the corresponding conjunct forms (see *EIV* 234). However, this would be hard to square with the almost certainly Old Irish examples of abs. *-mar* or *-tar* with normally stressed verbs presented below. If, on the other hand, *-mir* and *-tir* were analogical creations, as argued below following Thurneysen, their shelf life was a rather short one owing to the aforementioned Middle Irish penchant for augmented forms (see *EIV* 235), and the transitional tenth century would seem to have been the period of their greatest, if still limited, use.

The Old Irish glosses do offer a number of abs. 3pl. pret. forms of the unstressed copula, notably *batar* (Ml. 31a3, 23c16) and *batir* (Wb. 5c14, Ml. 90d17). However, notwithstanding its status as the only attestation in Wb., the latter form must be analogical (McCone, 1982, 3-4, and 1985b, 264) on account of the regular Early Old Irish depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics (*RChron.* 135) and *batar* must be the older of the two, particle or no, since it would be the regular outcome of both **ba-dor* < **-ntor* or the like and **bador*’ < **-ntor-es*. Schrijver (1997, 152) agrees that ‘the palatal *-r* must have been introduced from elsewhere’ and continues (152-3) as follows: ‘The most straightforward source would be a 3pl. pret. **-atir* in normally stressed verbs. McCone rejects this possibility because his chronology indicates that **-atir* did not exist there at that time but arose much later. He derives the ending *-tir* in *batir* by analogy from the 3pl. present deponent... Difficulties remain, however, even apart from the fact that the 3pl. present deponent, being morphologically and

semantically quite different from a 3pl. preterite, is a highly questionable source for the palatalization. If *batir* is the innovated form, why does it appear already in Wb., while the later Milan Glosses still partially preserve *batar*? If we admit that this is possible nonetheless, surely we should not worry about innovated 3pl. *-atar* around 800 and preserved *-atir* a century later in the stressed verb? Furthermore, McCone's assumption that the 3pl. pres. deponent abs. *-atir* first triggered the 3pl. pres. abs. *-atir* in the copula (Wb. *batir*) and only much later in stressed verbs (*-atir* in the Vita Tripartita) is phonologically unlikely: since proclitics like the copula did not allow palatalized consonants in Old Irish, the copula would surely be the last form to introduce *-atir*. Clearly the issue of the suffixless preterite does not allow a straightforward and simple conclusion as it stands. It can hardly be used as a valid counterargument against the particle theory.'

To begin with, the fact that forms of the copula regularly underwent proclitic depalatalisation shortly before the Old Irish period did not prevent the admittedly infrequent analogical introduction of palatalisation on occasion, the pres. subj. 2pl. abs. *bede* '(that) you be' (Wb. 13a10) and conj. *a-na-mbaid* 'when you be not' (Ml. 115b10) beside normal *-bad* being cases in point (see 1.5.5 above on 2pl. pres. *adib* 'you are' with palatal *-b*). There is, then, no compelling reason why, if this served a purpose, pret. 3pl. *batar* should not have been palatalised to *batir* on the analogy of the deponent rather than a preexisting pret. *-tir* with stressed verbs for which there is no direct evidence at so early a date (see 1.9.5 below). To reiterate the basic point, *batir* must be an innovatory analogical form on the ineluctable historical phonological grounds given above. It is the only attestation of the 3pl. abs. pret. of the copula in Wb. but occurs once alongside at least two instances of *batar* in Ml., these two sources being too close together in time (conventionally c. 750 and c. 800 AD) for forms in the former to be automatically accorded priority over those in the latter. The plural of the *t*-preterite is a case in point. As an old *s*-aorist, this must once have had the same plural endings as the *s*-preterite (see 1.5.1 above) but in Old Irish these have been generally supplanted by those of the suffixless preterite. However, Ml. has a couple of examples of what can hardly be other than the older 3pl. conj. *-at* (*pace GOI* 424; *KPV* 63 rightly observes that 'Thurneysens Vermutung, es könnte sich dabei um Schreibfehler handeln..., hat nichts für sich'), whereas Wb. invariably has *-atar*.

Schrijver's objection to the deponent as a model ignores two crucial considerations. Firstly, the structurally motivated general Old Irish tendency to differentiate between relative and non-relative verbal forms will have provided very adequate grounds for seeking a pattern elsewhere in the system capable of generating a distinctive abs. form corresponding to inherited abs./rel. 1pl. *-ammar*, 3pl. *-atar* in the suffixless preterite. It so happened that this was only supplied by the deponent with rel. *-ammar*, *-atar*

versus *-(a)immir*, *-(a)itir* (but see 1.9.5 below). Secondly, a deponent source is clearly indicated by the palatal *-mm-* and *-t-* of suffixless preterite forms with palatal *-r* and a retained or restored predesinential vowel (see *EIV* 75-7) such as *fichimmir*, *memdaitir* and *táchaitir* above, since **wi(w)ikom(m)or-es*, **memadontor-es* and **tāk^wontor-es* with a particle would have resulted in **fichem(m)(a)ir*, **memdat(a)ir* and **táchat(a)ir* respectively. Given the already discussed (1.8.3 above) lack of a motive for remodelling such perfectly distinctive endings to *-immir* and *-(a)itir*, adherents of a particle seem to have no obvious alternative to accepting that they were for no apparent reason reshaped on the model of the present deponent, which Schrijver has designated above ‘a highly questionable source’ by virtue of being ‘morphologically and semantically quite different from a 3pl. preterite’.

1.9.5. Schriver’s lack of ‘worry about innovated 3pl. *-atar* around 800 and preserved *-atir* a century later in the stressed verb’ not only rather squeezes the dates concerned but also fails to pay due heed to the simple fact that unstressed *-atar* is the only suffixless pret. 3pl. abs. of normal stressed verbs that is securely attested in texts emanating from the Old Irish period, *-(a)itir* first being found in texts or stages of transmission from and after the tenth century that marks the transition from Old to Middle Irish. Attention has been drawn elsewhere to the evidence provided by *Féilire Óengusso* and *Fíacc’s Hymn* ‘both datable to c. 800 A. D. and offering the following oldest attestations of the 3pl. suffixless preterite guaranteed by the unanimity of several later manuscripts: *ráthatar* (Fel. Sept. 18), *damdatar* (Fél. Oct. 15), *lotar* (Fél. Aug. 2 and Fiacc 1.37), *gádatar* (Fiacc 1.17)’ (McCone, 1985b, 264).

Further evidence is provided by a group of particularly early tales, namely *Compert Con Culainn*, *Echtrae Chonnlai*, *Immram Brain* and four tales concerning Mongán, most of which are probably pre-Wb. as regards date of composition and at any rate securely datable on overall linguistic grounds to the eighth century at latest (see Thurneysen, 1912, 28-9 = 1991, 613-4, and *EC* 29-47). All of these display significant affinities in transmission and apparently derive ultimately from the famous lost manuscript *Cín Dromma Snechtai* (see Thurneysen, 1912, 23-30 = 1991, 608-15, and *EC* 27-9 and 67-70). However, there is a vital difference in transmission between *Echtrae Chonnlai* (which unfortunately contains no examples of the 1 or 3pl. abs. of the suffixless preterite) and *Immram Brain* on the one hand and the rest on the other. The first two are found in an originally separate part of that manuscript sometimes referred to as *YBL* ‘proper’ (a designation used here purely for convenience), which clearly constitutes an independent branch of the stemma and opposes a few crucial Old Irish forms to later typically Middle Irish forms on the other side of the stemma (*EC* 16-29). It thus seems clear that the *YBL* ‘proper’ text and the remainder descend by separate routes from a lost eighth-century archetype (quite likely *Cín Dromma*

Snechtai) and that the latter group derives from this via a probably tenth-century sub-archetype (also lost and possibly *Cín Dromma Snechtai*) responsible for the introduction of a number of shared linguistic innovations (*EC* 25-6). Since neither *Compert Con Culainn* nor the Mongán tales occur in *YBL* ‘proper’, the aforementioned tenth-century archetype is as far back as we can get with them in strictly stemmatic terms, notwithstanding the almost certainly earlier date of composition of the material itself. If so, the presence of occasional later forms in all of the manuscripts in question need cause no more surprise than it does in the case of the non-*YBL* ‘proper’ side of the stemma of *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Immram Brain*. As far as the 1/3pl. suff. pret. abs. *-mir/-tir* is concerned, it is worth reiterating that the empirical evidence suggests that the tenth century was precisely the period of their greatest use alongside *-mar/-tar*.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, particular significance attaches to the sole relevant example in *Immram Brain*, where *lotar* ‘they went’ is undoubtedly to be read at §62 (and thus ascribed to the eighth-century archetype) on the strength of *lotar* /*lodər*/ in the three earliest manuscripts, including *YBL* ‘proper’ standing alone on one side of a crucial stemmatic divide, plus *lotor* and *lotur* (both trivial alternative spellings of /*lodər*/) in two more (*lotd-* in another being indeterminate) versus *lotir* in just one (the late 16th. cent. RIA 23N10; see *EC* 8-9 and Mac Mathúna, 1985, 12, 44 [l. 274], 111-113 and 210).

Compert Con Culainn (extant in five mss.) contains four examples of the same form (one in §2 and three in §3 of Thurneysen, 1912, 34-8 = 1991, 619-23 with a full apparatus of variant ms. readings): 1 *lotar* vs. 2 *lotir*, 2 *lotar* vs. 0 *lotir*, 2 *lotar* vs. 1 *lotir*, 2 *lotar* vs. 0 *lotir* (in order, excluding in each case any ms. with an indeterminate abbreviation such as *lot-*). There can be little or no doubt that the archetype contained *lotar* in the last three instances, particularly in view of the fact that the earliest ms. (*LU* in M’s hand of c. 1100 A.D.; see *EC* 1-3) has *lotar* in each case. In the first, *lotir* may well have stood in the tenth-century archetype (but note *LU lotir* with ‘ $\dot{\lambda}$ a [*add. above line, possibly by a later hand, and retraced*]’ according to Best and Bergin, *LU*, 320; one possible reason for this would be the scribe’s realisation that he had written a form differing from that in the ms. from which he was copying;). That said, it does not follow that it rather than *lotar* was in the probably eighth-century original. In §5 *fétir* ‘they spent the night’ (*LU* and Eg. 1782; *feit/dir* 23N10 and H.4.22; *it-* Eg. 88) quite certainly stood in the archetype but cannot possibly be the regular outcome of **wewosontor-es* or the like with a particle, which would surely have been **féotir* with the same diphthong as conj. *-féotar* or *-feótar* < **wewosontor* or the like. This, in the present writer’s view, was also the preform of independent *féotár*, *feótár* otherwise found in *LU* (with typical *éo* > *eó* and a tendency towards *-tár* for *-tar* discussed in

EIV 178-9; see *KPV* 702 for the relevant examples and 705 and the doubtless correct reconstruction of an OIr. 3pl. **féotar* incompatible with a particle). 3pl. *fé(i)tir* or *feitir* must, then, be analogical to the 3pl.deponent abs. (so too *KPV* 706) along the lines suggested above and as such seems quite unlikely to have stood in the original Old Irish version of this tale.

White's (2005) recently completed Ph.D. thesis on the four early *Mongán* tales supplies the following details (pages and lines as in Meyer, 1895, 42-58). *Compert Mongáin* has no examples of the 1 or 3pl. abs. but §4 (p. 48, l. 10) *in tan (m)báatar* 'when (they) were' is worth noting, since it is very probably a (nasalised) 3pl. relative form (see Ó hUiginn, 1986, 46-7, cols. C/D on the overwhelming preponderance of a nas. rel. with verbs other than the copula in *in ta(i)n* clauses in Wb., Ml. and Sg.). The 3pl. rel. was undoubtedly *-(a)tar* in Old Irish (see *GOI* 423 and 433) and this is duly supported by *in tan batar* or like in three mss. versus unquestionably innovatory *in d/tand bat(a)ir* in 23N10 and one other. *Scél as-a:mberar* §12 (p. 48, ll. 4 and 5) contains 1pl. *bámar-ni* twice on the evidence of five mss., including *LU* and *YBL* (not the 'proper' part), versus one only with *bamair-ne*, while in §13 (p. 48, l. 7) *fichimmir* 'we fought' is confined to *LU* and opposed by *fichim(m)ar* in *YBL* plus two others and *fic(h)emar* in the remaining two. In *Scél Mongáin* §10 (p. 54, l. 2) a 3pl. abs. copula *batar* is supported by five mss. (including *LU* and *Y*) versus *batir* in just one, while *Tuait Baile Mongáin* §3 (p. 56, l. 12) and §8 (p. 57, l. 4) offers two examples of the 3pl. abs. substantive verb *báatar* supported by four mss. (including *LU*, *Y*) versus 23N10 alone with *batir*.

On the above evidence there must have been a clear preponderance of abs. 1pl. *-m(m)ar* and 3pl. *-tar* in the roughly tenth-century archetype of these tales (including the non-*YBL* 'proper' side of *Immram Brain*). The only *-tir* form that can be ascribed to that stage with confidence is 3pl. *fé(i)tir*, which cannot possibly be the direct outcome of a 3pl. ending **-ontor-es* or the like with a particle, and a case can be made for one occurrence of 3pl. *lotir* plus just conceivably one of 1pl. *fichimmir* (but only on the strength of a dubious argument that the *-i-* of the *fichimmar* variant would point to *fichimmir* rather than *fichemmar* in the archetype). Against this must be set six secure examples of 3pl. abs. *-tar* (*lotar* 4x, *báatar* 2x) and two of 1pl. abs. *bámar*. The obvious explanation for this state of affairs is that *-tar* and *-mar* were found in the eighth-century Old Irish originals of these tales (as could be proved in the case of *Immram Brain*'s one example, *lotar*) but were occasionally (in at least one, perhaps two and just possibly three instances) replaced by later *-tir* or *-mir* in the approximately tenth-century archetype from which all extant versions seem to derive (with the solitary exception of the *YBL* 'proper' branch of *Immram Brain*'s stemma, which leads back to an early eighth-century archetype). Thereafter, *-tir* and *-mir* were

sometimes introduced at a still later stage in transmission confined to one or two mss., some significance attaching in this respect to the aforementioned substitution of *bat(a)ir* for very probably rel. *bátar* in *Compert Mongáin* by two witnesses.

Whatever the precise details, the stematically secure ascription of *lotar* to the archetype of *Immram Brain* proves conclusively that 3pl. abs. *-tar* (and presumably 1pl. abs. *-m(m)ar* too) with a non-palatal *-r* was already in existence in the early eighth century. The obvious inference is that this was the original form of the 3pl. abs. of the suffixless preterite, which thus derives from **-ontor* without a particle, and that in the course of the eighth century a palatalised version *-tir* (and presumably also *-m(m)ir*) was introduced in order to differentiate the non-relative from the corresponding relative form. The fact that this form is first attested in the proclitic copula *batir* (Wb. and Ml.), where it must have been an analogical replacement of *batar* (Ml.) for the reasons given earlier, may be a coincidence but may equally well be due to the fact that the need to differentiate the non-relative from the relative ending was most strongly felt in this particularly common form with the result that it acquired the new distinctive absolute ending first. Be that as it may, 1/3pl. abs. *-m(m)ir/-tir* had obviously established themselves in normal stressed verbs too alongside *-m(m)ar/-tar* by the beginning of the tenth century but thereafter tended to fall victim to the erosion of distinctions between absolute and conjunct endings in a preterite that was increasingly coming to be augmented (see 1.9.4 above).

Further precision about the development of these forms may be gleaned from the Old Irish Life of St. Brigit, which is to be dated to the ninth rather than the eighth century (see Ó hAodha, 1978, xxv-xxvii). Although only surviving in a single late sixteenth-century copy, it contains very few specifically Middle Irish forms, quite likely as a consequence of being a direct copy from a ninth-century exemplar (see Ó hAodha, 1978, xxvii). Obviously this text must be used with some caution, since the possibility of the insertion of innovatory forms by the later scribe can hardly be excluded completely, but on the whole it seems reasonable to accept it as a pretty fair reflection of ninth-century Old Irish linguistic norms. In accordance with an editorial policy whereby ‘the expansion of abbreviations has only been indicated by italics when points of grammar were involved, particularly in terminations’ (Ó hAodha, 1978, xxvii), pret. 3pl. abs. (with underlining substituted for Ó hAodha’s italics), subst. verb *bátar* (ms. *bat-*; ll. 145 and 464 of Ó hAodha’s text), *lotar* (l. 283), and cop. *batar* (l. 535) must be left out of account here as inconclusive since an inspection of online images of the ms. indicated a general suspension mark that could equally well be expanded to *-ar*, *-air* or *-ir*. That leaves just four orthographically unambiguous examples, namely *lotir* (l. 87), *gádatar* (ms. *gatatar*; l. 208), cop. *batir* (l. 316) and subst. verb *bátir* (ms. *batir*; l. 376). The fact that three of these contain *-tir*

and only one *-atar* seems at first sight to offer some encouragement to adherents of a particle but cop. *batir* is hardly surprising in view of the attestation of this undoubtedly analogical replacement of *batar* as early as Wb. (see 1.9.4 above), *lotar* in *Immram Brain* constitutes an appreciably earlier attestation than *lotir* here and *bátir* is the 3pl. pret. of the substantive verb, which is closely linked to the copula. On the other hand, *gádatar* suggests that *-atar* after a stressed syllable had not yet been optionally remodelled to *-aitir* at this stage.

On the whole, it looks as though abs. *-tir* (almost certainly with non-palatal *-t-* in the first instance) first came into being as a replacement of CV-*tar* in the pret. pl. of cop. *ba-tir* ‘were’, subst. verb *bá-tir* ‘were’ and *lo-tir* ‘went’, quite possibly because pressure to distinguish an abs. *-tir* from rel. *-tar* was particularly strong in the case of three such common verbs. The copula may well have led the way with *batir*, probably more or less in tandem with the substantive verb with *bátir* (which, if slightly the earlier of the two, would have provided a stressed form for the copula to imitate), and then came *lotir* for *lotar*. It certainly looks as if all three similarly shaped and common forms were well established by the ninth century (cop. *batir* at least already being in existence by the middle of the eighth). That being so and in view of the non-palatal *-t-* specifically in the 3pl. abs. of these three forms with an ending *-tar/-t(a)ir* rather than later *-atar/-a(i)tir* elsewhere, a closer source than the deponent present is available as the trigger for the initial analogical creation of abs. */-r’/* versus rel. */-r/* in the suffixless preterite. This, of course, is the *s*-preterite with a regular inherited opposition between abs. */-s’/* and rel. */-s/* (VI.3.1-2) seen in 3sg. *gabais* ‘took’, *marbais* ‘killed’ versus *gabas* ‘who took, which (s)he took’, *marbas* ‘who killed, whom (s)he killed’ and so on. It is hardly a coincidence that these *s*-preterite forms typically have same structure CVCVC^(’) as the three suffixless preterites influenced by them. There is, then, an obvious analogical proportion:

pret. 3sg. rel. *gabas* : abs. *gab(a)is* = 3pl. rel. *bátar* : x (x = *bát(a)ir*).

In view of CV-*tir* in these three forms in *Bethu Brigitte*, the occurrence of *-atar* with *gádatar* is surely significant, indicating as it does that *-C-aitir* (fully assimilated to the 3pl. deponent pattern) had not yet established itself as a variant of *-C-atar* in the majority suffixless preterite 3pl. type formed by less common verbs. The obvious conclusion is that these were not affected by the initial analogy with the *s*-preterite for the simple reason that their typical shape was not CVC*tar* but CVC*atar* with an unstressed vowel before the *-tar*. That being so, the 3pl. deponent present with rel./conj. *-atar* versus abs. *-(a)itir* provided the formally obvious trigger for the creation of suffixless a pret.3pl. abs. *memdaitir*, *táchaitir* corresponding to rel./conj. *(-)memdatar*, *(-)tachatar* (likewise 1pl. rel./conj. *-am(m)ar*, abs. *-(a)im(m)ir*; see VI.3.3 below and 1.8.3-4 above). Since, however, the semantic distance between the

suffixless preterite and the present deponent was appreciably greater than that between it and the *s*-preterite, the analogy with the former operated somewhat later than the more limited one with the latter.

At all events, abs. 3pl. *-tir* and *-aitir* (as well as 1pl. *-mir* and *-(a)im(m)ir*) can only be satisfactorily explained as well motivated optional analogical replacements of abs. (also rel.) *-tar*, *-atar* (as well as *-mar* and *-am(m)ar*). The former now seems to have established itself with three common verbs ending in *-tar* in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries by means of a formally and semantically obvious analogy with another preterite form. The latter, however, had a shape that was not suited to this model. Consequently *-aitir*, for which there is still no evidence before the tenth century, was first created by a slightly later analogy based upon the formally apposite but semantically distant present deponent. It goes without saying that the **-atair* that should have resulted from **-ontor-es* with a particle is entirely lacking in support.

Insistence upon a main-clause particle **-es* or the like entails 1pl. **-am(m)(a)ir* and 3pl. **-at(a)ir* as the original forms subsequently hypercharacterised as *-a(i)m(m)ir* and *-a(i)tir* on the analogy of the deponent (itself already hypercharacterised from the active here according to Boling in 1.8.3 above) not long before they began to be displaced by conjunct *-am(m)ar* and *-atar* owing to the lack of a distinction between absolute and conjunct in the singular of the suffixless preterite (an anyway problematical assumption in the case of the 2sg. form combined with the alleged particle, as pointed out in 1.9.3 above). Unlike the reverse process just posited, such a development would be anything but well motivated, since it would obliterate a useful distinction (retained in the OIr. 3sg. suffixless pret. with abs. *luid* vs. rel. *luid-e* and so on; *GOI* 433) between a relative and a non-relative ending. Moreover, undoubted *lotar* in *Immram Brain* necessitates the assumption on this scenario that 3pl. abs. *-tir* was already giving way to a *-tar* indistinguishable from the 3pl. rel. by the early eighth century at least, although this is precisely the period when inherited 3pl. cop. *batar* must have developed an analogical byeform *batir* that can only have been motivated by the desirability of distinguishing the 3pl. abs. and rel. forms. Not only, then, is there no good empirical evidence for *-m(m)ir/-tir* as older 1/3pl. abs. forms of the suffixless preterite than *-m(m)ar/-tar* but positing this situation in accordance with the dictates of a putative particle also engenders a tissue of improbabilities. As if this were not enough, with a by now familiar lack of economy it still calls for analogical influence from the deponent in order to account for the invariably palatal *-m(m)-* and *-t-* of the forms in question after post-tonic vowel (e.g. OIr. 3pl. *memdaitir* ‘they broke’ instead of **memdat(a)ir* < **memad-ontor-es*).

The conclusion must be that the suffixless preterite never contained a suffixed enclitic

particle **es* or the like in Insular Celtic main clauses, where its absolute and conjunct paradigm was thus simply the 1sg. **-a*, 2sg. **-as*, 3sg. **-e*, 1pl. **-amor*, 2pl. **-ate*, 3pl. **-ontor* that yield the actually attested Old Irish forms without the slightest difficulty. Recognition of this fact is alone sufficient to disprove the generalisation of any conceivable main-clause particle in Insular Celtic, even if it had not already emerged at various points that any version of the particle hypothesis is prey to a host of other more or less intractable problems.

2.1. Since the foregoing treatment has perforce been somewhat extended, owing in no small measure to the sheer diversity of scholarly views on the absolute/conjunct question (particularly, it is fair to say, those invoking a particle of some sort that is plainly more trouble than it is worth), it may be useful at this point to summarise the central hypothesis advanced above with a view to highlighting the straightforward assumptions on which it is based.

(a) There are good reasons for reconstructing the following almost entirely symmetrical (except for the them. 1sg.) Proto-Celtic system of primary and secondary endings inherited from Proto-Indo-European, allowing for certain well motivated modifications to the 1 and 2 pl.: **prim.** sg. 1 **-mi* (them **-ū*), 2 **-si*, 3 **-ti*, pl. 1 **-mosi*, 2 **-tesi*, 3 **-nti*; **sec.** sg. 1 **-m*, 2 **-s*, 3 **-t*, pl. 1 **-mos*, 2 **-tes*, 3 **-nt*.

(b) Readily applicable as it is to otherwise difficult problems in both the verbal (abs./conj.) and the nominal system (the ‘short’ dat. sg. of consonant stems), an early Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* can be (and by now usually is) regarded as an established fact. In the absence of insuperable obstacles (of which there are none), it is clearly methodologically desirable to take this to have been a regular sound change across the board in absolute final position rather than allowing various irregular exceptions to or gratuitous restrictions upon its operation. However, since enclitics (E) and the word to which they were attached (X) formed a single accentual unit (X-E), *-i-* was naturally shielded from apocope when followed by such an element.

(c) Due allowance being made for the blocking effect of enclitics (an assumption also made by most versions of the particle hypothesis), application of this apocope to the primary endings above directly generates Insular Celtic sg. 1 **-m/*-ū* vs. **-mi-E/*-ū-E*, 2 **-s* vs. **-si-E*, 3 **-t* vs. **-ti-E*, pl. 1 **-mos* vs. **-mosi-E*, 2 **-tis* vs. **-tisi-E* (see 1.5.2 on IC **-esV(-) > *-isV(-)*), 3 **-nt* vs. **-nti-E*. The set without *-i-* could occur with a verb in any position but were doubtless a good deal less frequent statistically at the head of the clause or sentence, which was marked for topic/focus by a generally accepted rule of PIE word order that is well preserved in various daughter languages, than in unmarked or neutral position further back. By contrast, the

set with **-i-* was restricted to marked initial position in the clause or sentence by the application of another generally accepted rule of PIE word order still attested in key daughter languages, namely Wackernagel's Law restricting sentential enclitics (including direct and indirect object pronouns) to second position in the clause or sentence directly after its initial stressed word (X). Schematically, then, 3sg. pres. *#beret(...)#* and *#*bereti-E(...)#* with the verb in topic/focus position vs. *#X(-E)(..)*beret(..)#* with a pragmatically neutral verb.

(d) Pressure towards at least some degree of formal homogenisation of the above variants would be eminently understandable. Since the **-i-* of the *#*bereti-E(...)#* type was a useful device for breaking up heavy consonant clusters that would otherwise arise if ending and enclitic were directly juxtaposed, there was good reason to regard it as an indispensable constituent of a set of forms still bound to initial position by the continuing application of Wackernagel's Law. That being so, the only available avenue for homogenisation was the spread of **-i* from initial forms with following enclitic(s) to the corresponding initial forms without one, the upshot being a clear-cut opposition between an initial topic/focus form *#*bereti(-E)(....)#* (> OIr. abs. *#beirid (...)#*, *#beirth-i (...)#* etc. quite regularly) with **-i* as an accessory morphological marker of emphasis and a neutral non-initial form *#.E(..)*beret(..)#* (> OIr. conj. *#.E)beir (...)#* quite regularly).

(e) Since no thematic category with secondary endings would seem to have survived into or long in Insular Celtic (see 1.9.2 on the probably early inflectional merger of one or two arguably thematised old root aorists with the suffixless preterite), the only thematic conjugation available after the apocope in *c*, which anyway must have eradicated any meaningful distinction between primary and secondary inflection, will have been sg. 1 **-ū(-E)*, 2 **-is(i-E)*, 3 **-et(i-E)*, pl. 1 **-omos(i-E)*, 2 **-etis(i-E)*, 3 **-ont(i-E)*. After *d* the opposition between forms with and without **-i* will have been determined by emphatic (for topic/focus) initial vs.(/) neutral non-initial: sg. 1 **-ū/*-ū*, 2 **-isi/*-is*, 3 **-eti/*-et*, pl. 1 **-omosi/*-omos*, 2 **-etisi/*-etis*, 3 **-onti/*-ont*.

(f) As so often happened with athematic paradigms inherited from the parent language, regular sound change will have produced an utterly bewildering paradigm in the Insular Celtic descendants of the *s*-aorist with probable sg. 1 *-V*-ham*, *-R*-r/lam* (< **-s-m*), 2 *-V*-s(s)*, *-R*-r/l* (< **-s(-s)*), 3 *-V*-ss*, *-R*-t* (< **-s-t*), pl. 1 *-V*-mmos*, *-R*-mos* (< **-s-mos*), 2 *-V*-sses*, *-R*-tes* (< **-s-tes*), 3 *-V*-hant*, *-R*-r/lant* (< **-s-nt*). Small wonder, then, that the base 3sg. *-V*-ss* and *-R*-t* should have been analysed as stem plus zero ending and made the springboard for a new split (between *s*- and *t*-preterite) paradigm formed by simply adding the statistically prevalent thematic endings to this in the remaining persons, whence 1sg. **-ss-ū* and **-t-ū*, 2sg.

*-*ss-is(i-E)* and *-*t-is(i-E)* redistributed (or, if formed after *d*, directly created) as *init./non-init.* *-*ss-isi/-is* and *-*t-isi/-is*, 3sg. *-*ss* and *-*t*, 3pl. *-*ss-ont(i-E)* and *-*t-ont(i-E)* redistributed (if not directly created) as *-*ss-onti/-ont* and *-*t-onti/-ont*, and so on. In this way the *s-* and *t-*preterite acquired the makings of an absolute/conjunct opposition not by analogical spread of the features in question as such but as a virtually inevitable concomitant of extremely well motivated thematisation. If this occurred before *d* above, 3sg. *-*ss(i-E)* and *-*t(i-E)* will have arisen by an analogy motivated by the usefulness of *-*i-* as a glide to attach enclitics. If it occurred after *d*, then the 3sg. will have acquired a formally and semantically motivated opposition between emphatic initial *-*ssi/*-ti* and neutral non-initial *-*ss/*-t* by analogy.

(g) That is as far as things seem to have gone in the Insular Celtic (normal) active at least. Quite simply, an embryonic absolute/conjunct opposition had come into being in three categories (present indicative, present subjunctive, desiderative/future) with inherited active primary endings as a result of regular sound change followed by limited but well motivated redistribution of the doublets in question to yield a clear-cut opposition between emphatic initial + *-*i* and neutral non-initial without it. It had also arisen in two more categories (the *s-* and *t-*preterites) through the acquisition of reflexes of the active primary endings as a direct result of thematisation outside the 3sg. and had then been spread by adequately motivated analogy to the latter. It is to be stressed that the 3sg. of the *s-* and *t-*preterites is the only active form to which the distinction between an ending with *-*i* (> OIr. abs.) and a corresponding one without it (> OIr. conj.) was spread directly by analogy and not as the result of some other development - thoroughly well motivated thematisation in the case of the only active categories to acquire it secondarily, namely the *s-* and *t-*preterites. Since *-*i* was no more than an accessory marker serving to provide morphological reinforcement of a verb's status as topic/focus that was already adequately indicated at the syntactic level by initial position, it is hardly surprising that it did not spread as such to other active paradigms, notably those of the imperative and the suffixless preterite, in which it had failed to get a foothold owing to their lack of personal endings with an *-*i* liable to apocope unless shielded by an enclitic (see 1.9.1-5).

(h) Given the lack of a functional difference between the deponent and the normal active, a form such as deponent 3sg. #**meditor-E...#* can be assumed to have already been replaced in Insular Celtic by a normal active #**mediti-E...#* (> OIr. *mit(t)-i(us)* '(s)he judges him/it(/her/they)') more compatible with transparent forms of enclitic pronouns. If so, most of the deponent paradigm (2sg., 3sg., 1pl., 3pl. and perhaps 2pl.) thus acquired the *-i-E* indispensable for the generation of an absolute/conjunct distinction. 1sg. initial #**medyū-E...#* versus #**medyūr...#* (OIr. abs. *midiur*;

non-initial #.(E)(..)**medyūr...#*, OIr. conj. *-midiur*) then provided a suitable trigger for the creation of new (probably emphatic) initial deponent forms consisting simply of the normal active endings plus *-r* where there was no following enclitic, notably (in place of #**meditor...#*, #**medyontor...#*) 3sg. #*meditir...#*, 3pl. #**medyontir...#* (OIr. abs. *midithir*, *miditir*) alternating with 3sg. #*mediti-E...#*, 3pl. #**medyonti-E...#* and 3sg. #.(E)(..)**meditor...#*, 3pl. #.(E)(..)**medyontor...#* (OIr. conj. *-midethar*, *-midetar*). However, 2sg. #**meditor...#* (OIr. abs. *mitter*; non-initial #.(E)(..)**meditor...#*, OIr. conj. *-mitter*) was unaffected because #**medisi-E...#* did not stand in a formally straightforward relationship to the form without attached enclitic. On the reasonable assumption that at this stage Insular Celtic still retained a formally undifferentiated mediopassive inflection, at least outside the preterite (e.g. *-mess* ‘was judged’ < verbal adj. **-messos* ‘judged’ < **med-tos*), the same opposition will have been acquired by passives inflected in the same way as deponents but incompatible with an object pronoun for obvious semantic reasons: e.g., 3sg. #**meditir...#*, 3pl. #**medyontir...#* (OIr. *mittir*, *miditir*) versus 3sg. #.(E)(..)**meditor...#*, 3pl. #.(E)(..)**medyontor...#* (OIr. *-mitter*, *-midetar*).

2.2. The next stage was the generalisation of an initial verbal complex, which indisputably occurred at some stage on the way to Old Irish (see I.1.9 and 1.1 above) and is with good reason widely acknowledged to have preceded the earliest British records (see I.2.1 and II.2.3). Considerations of economy combined with an evidently Insular Celtic date for proclisis of the copula (see II.2.1) strongly indicate that this crucial development had taken place before the end of the shared Insular Celtic phase of their evolution (see 3.1-3 below). Since this basic scenario can hardly be reasonably doubted, undue importance does not attach to the precise mechanism responsible for producing a regular initial verbal complex (see II.2.4) plus associated pendens and clefting patterns for topic/focus that almost certainly also date from the Insular Celtic period (see I.1.10 and I.2.1-2). That said, it seems legitimate to posit a stage at which the processes summarised in 2.1a-h above had taken place while inherited rules governing clause-initial position for a topic/focus and immediately post-initial position for sentential enclitics (Wackernagel’s Law) were still in force (cf. 1.6.4 above). This is summarised in the scheme below, which includes compound verbs for convenience while reserving discussion of significant further details pertaining to the creation of their initial forms to IV.3.1-3.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| (a) #* <i>bereti</i> (E)(...)# | (V as topic/focus -simple verb) |
| (b) #P(E)(..)(P)* <i>beret</i> (..) | (P(P)V as topic/focus - see II.1.2/7) |
| (c) #N(E)(..)(P)* <i>beret</i> (..)# | (N as topic/focus) |
| (d) #C(E)(..)(P)* <i>beret</i> (..)# | (C as topic/focus) |
| (e) #X(E)(..)(P)* <i>beret</i> (..)# | (neutral order or X, e.g. a noun, as topic/focus) |

The direct precursor of the actually attested state of affairs in Old Irish (and vestigially in British) can then be generated from this by means of two straightforward innovations that are still preserved well in Old Irish and quite well in the early British record, namely (i) ‘univerbation’ of ‘tmesis’ patterns bringing the rest of the verbal expression into direct contact with initial P(E), N(E) and C(E) in a direction determined by the continued application of Wackernagel’s Law (a process perhaps already begun or even completed before the Insular Celtic period) and (ii) the introduction of pendens and clefting constructions with #(cop.)X# directly to the left of a clause-initial V, P or N in order to make X the topic/focus. In whichever order these are applied, the following patterns would have resulted (the optional copula being represented by 3sg. pres. **essi* ‘it is’ for convenience).

Without cleft/pendens:

- (a) #*bereti(E)(...)#
- (b) #P(E)(P)*beret(...)#
- (c) #N(E)(P)*beret(...)#
- (d) #C(E)(P)*beret(...)#
- (e) #.(E)(.)(P)*beret(..)#

With cleft/pendens and X as topic/focus:

- (a²) #(*essi) X#*bereti(E)(...)#
- (b²) #(*essi) X#P(E)(P)*beret(...)#
- (c²) #(*essi) X#N(E)(P)*beret(...)#

It seems reasonable to assume that formal ‘univerbation’ was matched by an increasing perception of the initial verbal complex as a single semantic unit and that this status was underlined when the whole complex acquired a single stress through the proclisis of originally stressed initial P, N or C to the initially stressed component after the (E) slot. As a result c and d above would have ceased to entail topicalisation/focus for the simple reason that they were not only felt to constitute a single semantic unit but were also the only patterns available for these particular constellations. In the likely event that the enclitic relative marker **-yo* could only be attached to a part of the verbal expression (see VI.1.5), relative clauses will already have been routinely headed by initial V, P or N (> clause-initial verbal complex after univerbation) + **yo* (as apparently in Gaulish too; see VI.1.1/5). The introduction of the cleft constructions in a²-c² with X as topic/focus functioning as subject or object antecedent to a following relative verb will have significantly increased the frequency of this pattern with an invariably clause-initial verb, which seems also to have been applied to cases with a topic/focus standing in some other relationship to a following non-relative verb (see I.1.10).

It is easy enough to envisage the neutral order with non-initial verb in e simply fading away in the wake of this erosion of the status of initial N, C, V (or P + (P)V) as topic/focus. This process may well have been completed by the end of the Insular Celtic period in view of serious doubts as to whether ‘tmesis’ and ‘Bergin’

constructions in certain registers of Old Irish are genuine archaisms (see II.2.1), although it is just about conceivable that the ‘tmesis’ types b-d and the ‘Bergin’ type d in the first table of this section survived in poetic usage right down to the Old Irish period as increasingly stylised variants of the normal verb-initial types a-d in the second table. Whether they are viewed as remarkable archaic survivals or as relatively late learned artificial creations from patterns a-d in the second table, the conjunct endings associated with ‘tmesis’ and ‘Bergin’ constructions in Old Irish accord fully with the present explanatory model.

Be that as it may and whatever the precise mechanism(s) involved, the generalisation of an initial verbal complex undoubtedly led to the establishment of patterns a-d as the norm in Old Irish and automatically combines with the developments just sketched in 2.1 above to yield the actually attested Old Irish distribution of the absolute (with initial simple verbs) and conjunct endings (elsewhere).

2.3. A central feature of the present hypothesis is that an absolute/conjunct opposition only arose in those categories characterised by a core of endings with **-i-E* (owing to Wackernagel’s Law only possible with initial simple verbs after the Insular Celtic apocope of unshielded **-i*), namely in the present indicative, present subjunctive (cf. Cowgill, 1975, 64) and desiderative/future active with old primary endings, in the *s-/t*-preterite with primary endings acquired as a concomitant of thematisation and in the deponent (as well as, by extension, the still for the most part formally identical passive) as a result of the motivated introduction of normal active **-i-E* in all but the 1sg. However, an absolute/conjunct distinction was not developed by the suffixless preterite (in the first instance) or the imperative (or, for that matter, the anyway regularly conjunct imperfect endings of the imperfect indicative, past subjunctive and conditional; see *EIV* 85-6 and McCone, 1986b, 240-1) for the simple reason that their paradigms lacked the indispensable trigger of forms in **-i*. This matches the actual distribution of the absolute/conjunct system in Old Irish quite exactly. By contrast, the presence of asseverative **es < *esti* ‘it is (so)’ in the subjunctive is problematical, as is the absence of **et(i)* ‘and’ in the imperative, and no version of the particle hypothesis can cope satisfactorily with the lack of any reflex in the earliest attested independent simple forms of the suffixless preterite in Old Irish, not to mention the 1/2sg. deponent.

As far as individual forms are concerned, the conjunct endings proposed in the various derivations in 1.5 and 1.8 above are virtually all the same as those employed by Cowgill, notwithstanding a few differences of detail due chiefly to the entirely regular apocope of **-i* posited here, and yield the attested Old Irish endings without significant difficulty. The absolute endings are, of course, the real test as far as the respective

claims of a particle and of the present alternative based on **-i-* shielded by any following enclitic are concerned. In the normal active the derivations proposed in 1.5 can generate the attested OIr. endings throughout the 3sg., 1pl. and 3pl., in almost all of the 2sg. as well as in part of the 1sg. and the 2pl. (pres. cop. *adi* with what must be a reflex of once general **-thi*) directly by regular sound change. Historically irregular reflexes in a couple of 2sg. types (1.5.4) and in the 2pl. outside the pres. copula (1.5.5) are covered by well motivated analogy aimed at securing paradigmatic cohesion or functionally important formal distinctions between the different personal endings (abs., rel. and/or with suffixed pronoun, as the case might be). Only in the 1sg. (1.5.3) was a particle found to be capable of directly yielding some absolute forms for which the alternative had to invoke formally straightforward analogy geared to the absolute/conjunct distinction as such (but only once it had been regularly established in the other persons of the paradigms in question). Even here, however, the particle was not free of difficulty and some quite trivial analogical tidying up in this corner could be plausibly accounted for in terms of the rarity and hence synchronic unacceptability of bare-stem absolutes (as opposed to conjuncts).

It emerged (1.8.1-4) that no particle of the shape **ed/t/s* or the like could account for a single Old Irish deponent ending by regular sound change or even plausible analogy, whereas the present hypothesis could generate the required preforms without undue difficulty and also be applied more straightforwardly than a particle to the passives with a dental in the ending (1.8.4). Admittedly, if a form like 3sg. conj. pass. *-fedar* ‘is led’ without a desinential dental was < **-wedor*, absolute *fedair* could directly continue **wedor-es* with a particle. However, this was by no means inevitable, given the availability of both model and motive for a relatively late prehistoric analogical creation aimed at distinguishing the non-rel. abs. from rel. *fedar* ‘who/which is led’. Finally, without a particle the passive preterite 3sg. abs. *brethae* ‘was carried’ could hardly be other than an old relative pressed into service as new absolute in place of bare-stem **breth* < **britos* (cf. some 1sg. abs. forms in the previous paragraph) but anyway it was far from clear that such a form could be the direct outcome of **britos-es* with a particle.

In conclusion, the present hypothesis accounts for the distribution and form of the absolute endings with appreciably greater efficacy than any explanation based upon a generalised main-clause particle. Furthermore, by no stretch of the imagination does it entail ‘massive analogy to create and develop the absolute-conjunct distinction of Insular Celtic’ (Schrijver, 1997, 147; see 1.6.1 above), a number of 1sg. abs. endings and the 3sg. abs. of the pass. pret. being the only forms that can be fairly put down to the ‘analogical spread of a redundant morphological distinction’ (Kortlandt, 1979, 35) as such. These seem a small price to pay for release from the morass of problems

associated with a generalised main-clause particle, and anyway the objections just cited would, for instance, apply with a good deal more force to the eventual analogical spread of the reflexes of an erstwhile asseverative particle **es* ‘it is (so)’ to the whole of the manifestly non-asseverative subjunctive (see II.3.2c).

3.1. As has been seen, it is now generally accepted with good reason that early loss of *-i* was an indispensable foundation for the positionally determined differentiation of a set of absolute from a corresponding set of conjunct endings within whole or part of the Celtic branch of Indo-European. This almost certainly correct view has a potentially major bearing upon the way in which the basic relationships between what are currently recognised as the main subdivisions of Celtic itself (namely Irish, British, Celtiberian, Gaulish and arguably also Lepontic) are to be envisaged. Since the shape of the Celtic ‘family tree’ in turn has a crucial effect on the depth of certain morphological reconstructions centring upon Irish and British as the family’s only adequately documented representatives to date, it seems desirable to address this issue before proceeding further.

3.2. It is well-known that the IE interrogative/indefinite pronoun displays two main stems, namely **k^wo-* and **k^wi/e-* (to which might be added **k^wu-* in certain adverbial formations). It seems unlikely that these correlated with indefinite and interrogative function, since this dichotomy seems to have been realised solely by accent in PIE as in Ancient Greek, the indefinite being enclitic and the interrogative accented (e.g. Szemerényi, 1989, 220; Beekes, 1995, 203). Despite significant differences of detail in their reconstructions Szemerényi (1989, 220-1) and Beekes (1995, 203-7) both argue that the original pronominal stem was **k^wi/e-* with a distribution matching that of the anaphoric pronoun **i-/(h₁)e-* (Szemerényi, 1989, 218-20; Beekes, 1995, 202-3 and 205; Schrijver, 1997, 51-70): e.g., sg. m./f. nom. **k^wi-s* (**k^we* according to Beekes), acc. **k^wi-m*, n. nom./acc. **k^wi-d*, m./f./n. gen. **k^we-s(y)o* and so on. Szemerényi (1989, 221) ascribed the development of **k^wo-* to a tendency to replace thematic looking *e* with *o* from corresponding demonstrative **to-* forms, whence gen. sg. **k^wo-syo* on the model of **to-syo* and so on. Beekes (1995, 203), on the other hand, speculated that **k^wo-* was the adjectival counterpart of pronominal **k^wi/e-* in PIE and that later ‘in different languages **k^wo-* took the place of masc./fem. **k^we*, **k^wim*, **k^we-*, while the old form was retained in the neuter’ (Beekes, 1995, 207). To note just two further recent proposals, Rix (1976, 186-7) posited nom./acc./instr. **k^w(e)i-* but an opposition in the other cases between animate **k^wo-* and inanimate **k^we-*, while Meiser (1998, 164-6) opts for interrogative-indefinite **k^wi-* versus exclusively interrogative **k^wo-*.

The extant IE languages, then, provide no conclusive evidence as to the distribution

of **k^wo-* and **k^wi/e-* in the parent language. Whether triggered by **so-/*to-* or some other mechanism, it is not even completely certain that **k^wo-* had begun to penetrate the paradigm of the interrogative/indefinite pronoun in PIE itself. If it had, this seems more likely to have occurred in oblique cases such as the genitive than in the nominative or accusative and **k^wo-* may well have been no more than an optional variant alongside an older **k^wi/e-* form at certain points in the paradigm (e.g. the m./f. oblique à la Rix). Two pieces of evidence have been offered in support of the contention that **k^wo-* was in competition with **k^wi/e-* everywhere except the NAsg. neut. or alternatively in the m./f. as opposed to the neut. paradigm in PIE. The first is an opposition in the singular of the Old Church Slavonic paradigm between a reflex of **k^wo-* referring to persons (e.g. nom. *kъ-to* ‘who?, anybody’, acc./gen. *kogo*) and a reflex of **k^wi/e-* referring to things (e.g. nom./acc. *čъ-to*, gen. *česo* ‘what?, anything’). The second is the Skt. particle *cid* (< **k^wid*) and NAsg. n. *kim* set against a paradigm otherwise entirely based on **k^wo/ā-*, namely sg. nom. m. *kas*, f. *kā*, acc. m. *kam*, f. *kām*, NA n. *kad* or *kim*, gen. m./n. *kasya*, f. *kasyās* etc. (interrogative; corresponding indefinite *kaś-cid* etc.). Since neuters are more liable to petrification than corresponding masculines and feminines, Skt. *cid* alone would merely confirm extra-Indic evidence for an earlier paradigm with a stem **k^wi-* and would hardly suffice to associate this specifically with the neuter. However, as a paradigmatic variant NAsg. n. *kim* (with non-palatalised *k-* spread from *ka-* < **k^wo-* and the thematic nouns’ neut. *-m* for pronominal *-d*, presumably in order to distinguish the form from *cid*) is more significant. That said, these OCS and Old Indic data need reflect no more than the particular resilience of the neuter, or its NAsg. at least, in the face of post-PIE innovation (cf. Beekes’ view quoted above) and fall well short of demonstrating PIE suppletion between neuter **k^wi-*, whether generally or just in the NAsg., and **k^wo-* elsewhere. Consequently the contention that such suppletion existed in Celtic must stand or fall on internal evidence, which might in turn prove to have a bearing on the wider question of the PIE paradigm.

Whatever their precise derivation, it seems clear that the mostly predicative nom.(/acc.) base forms of the interrogative/indefinite pronoun in Old Irish emanate from the **k^wi/e-* stem (see *GOI* 288-90 and 292). One may tentatively propose m./f. *cía* (MW *pwy*), unstressed *ce* or *ci* (the latter probably originating in hiatus) < **k^wē* < **k^we-i*, n. *ci* < **k^wid* and, bearing in mind the possibility of *cía* etc. < **k^wēh* < **k^wēss* < **k^wē’st(i)* with following copula on occasion, *cid* < **k^wiðeh* < **k^wid-est(i)*. However, predicative gen. sg. *coich* ‘whose’ may reflect penetration of **k^wo-* into the oblique cases insofar as it can be plausibly ascribed to a remodelling of **coí* < **k^wosyo* (cf. pred. *ái* ‘his, its’ < **esyō*; Schrijver, 1997, 57) under the influence of gen. sg. *neich* and/or *cáich* (cf. *GOI* 292). The OIr. pronouns *nech* ‘anyone, someone’, *cách* ‘everyone, each one’ with their British (e.g. MW *neb*, *pawb*) and probable Gaulish (*nep-on/-i*, *pap-on/-i*; *LG*

170-1 and 146) cognates clearly continue Proto-Celtic **ne-k^wo-* and **k^wā-k^wo-* respectively. Both obviously have indefinite **k^wo-* as their second element and this is equally obviously preceded by negative **ne* in the case of the former. The latter has no neuter and might be compared structurally with Lat. relative *quisquis* ‘whoever, everyone who’ (GOI 292) except that the reduplicated stem is indefinite **k^wo/ā-* in its (secondarily?) uninflected fem. and inflected masc. form respectively. If so, it can be interpreted as **kwā-* ‘anyone (f.)’ plus **k^wo-* ‘anyone (m.)’, i.e. ‘anyone at all’ or ‘everyone’. As pronouns both stems inflect solely as *o*-stems but as proclitic adjectives *cach* ‘every’ (or *cech*; MW *pob*) and *nach* ‘any’ they also had fem. *ā*-stem forms most clearly seen in gen. sg. f. *cecha/cacha*, *nacha* (*-cha* < *-che* in proclisis).

Nech and *nach* are particularly interesting because they have the quite irregular looking NAsg. neut. *ní* ‘anything, something’ and *na* ‘any’ respectively, these being sometimes combined as *na nní* ‘anything whatever’ (lit. ‘any anything’). Pedersen (VKG I, 245-6) reconstructed the preform of *ní*, *na* as **ne-k^wid* in the context of a discussion of the early loss of *-d* in Celtic but made no attempt to justify this derivation in detail and subsequently (VKG II, 212) hedged by positing neuter **ne-k^wod* or **ne-k^wid* alongside masc. **ne-k^wos*, again without going into specifics. Thurneysen’s fuller discussion reaches a similarly vague conclusion: ‘Neuter *ní*, pretonic *na* with gemination, is peculiar, suggesting as it does a basic form **nēq^w* instead of **neq^wod* (or *-q^wid*) which one would have expected. It is true that *-d* disappeared very early (§177), and a parallel instance of the loss of a final vowel is furnished by Gaulish *-c* (= Lat. *-que*, ZCP. XVI. 287), though this word, unlike *ní*, is always enclitic and unstressed. The length of the vowel (as against *nech*) is quite regular in Irish (§44 b); its quality (*-ī* instead of *-ē*) may be due to the influence of *an-ī*’ (GOI 311).

More recent developments in historical Celtic phonology make a satisfactory resolution of these problems and apparent inconsistencies possible. To begin with, Thurneysen’s tentative ascription of the vocalism of *ní* to the influence of *aní* (neut. article *a n-* plus deictic *-ī*) is eminently plausible, given that ‘a relative clause may be preceded by either *aní* (§ 474), *ní* ((a) above) or *nanní*; from these a hybrid form *anní* has developed as early as Ml. 90^b13’ (GOI 310). That being so, the original vocalism is likely to be reflected by proclitic *na* < **ne h-* (which did not mutate a following consonant but probably prefixed /h-/ to a following vowel). This would then continue **nek^w* rather than **nēk^w* and thus have the same short vowel as the **nek^w-os/-om* underlying masc. nom./acc. *nech* as well as the **nek^w-ī/-ū* underling masc./neut. gen. *neich* and dat. *neuch* respectively.

Schrijver (1997, 56) reasons that ‘the general loss of final **-d* must have taken place before lenition in view of the fact that the infixed pronoun of the 3sgn. (< **ed*) causes

lenition in OIr. (Cowgill, 1975: 52...)' . Villar (1995) has demonstrated that the grapheme *z* represented the outcome of lenited *d* in Celtiberian, including in postvocalic final position as in 3sg. fut. ipv. *-tuz* < **-tōd* and demonstrative pronoun nom. sg. neut. *soz* < PC **sód* replacing PIE **tód* (thus vitiating Ziegler's, 1997, 636-8 derivation of Celtib. *to* < **tod*). This insight combines with Gaulish and Insular Celtic evidence to make it likely that lenition of voiced stops to voiced fricatives had already taken place in Proto-Celtic in the relevant environments (*RChron.* 81-7) while at the same time ruling out the possibility of Proto-Celtic loss of final postvocalic *-d* (probably [-ð]) as this would have resulted in Celtiberian **-tu* not *-tuz* and so on. If interpreted straightforwardly as *buet(i) id* 'let it become' (McCone, 1991, 118; cf. *LG* 157), Gaulish *buetid* on the Chamalières inscription shows that *-d* (probably [-ð]) was retained in Gaulish, at least after a short vowel. Even if the final *-tu* of the strange Gaulish 3pl. *biontutu* (Larzac) derived from fut. ipv. **-tōd*, which seems far from certain (see *LG* 66 and 170), this would only point to loss of *-d* after a long vowel there (cf. Lat. *id* 'it' or *illud* 'that' but 3sg. fut. ipv. *violato* from older *violatod*). Schrijver's (1997, 177) proposed derivation of *buetid* < **bueti-de* is directly contradicted by several attestations of Gaul. δεδε 'gave' (see *LG* 86-8) with retained final *-e*. His claim that *sosio* < **sosiod* on the Séracourt inscription proves loss of final *-d* in Gaulish is based upon a highly doubtful analysis of this form (cf. *LG* 137), which can simply be taken as gen. sg. of the **so-* (pre-Celtic **so-/to-*) demonstrative continuing PIE **tosyo* (Skt. *tasya* 'his' etc.) on the assumption that the name of the object would be otiose on an inscription inscribed around the neck of a vase (*LG* 136-7) and so easy enough to understand as *BUSCILLA SOSIO LEGASIT IN ALIXIE MAGALU* as 'Buscilla placed his (vase, offering or something equally obvious) in Alisia for Magalos' (or as 'his (beloved) Buscilla placed (it) in Alisia for Magalos' with Rubio Orecilla, 1997, 43-4).

On balance, then, the evidence currently available suggests that a voiced dental stop *-d* or rather fricative *-ð* still survived in Gaulish *id* and that the subsequent developments to **eð* and **e* (see Schrijver, 1997, 62-3 on the generalisation of the *e*-over the *i*-stem of this pronoun in Celtic) can be traced no further back than Insular Celtic. That being so, loss of **-ð* will have occurred after the probably Proto-Celtic lenition of voiced stops (*RChron.* 84-7) but before the lenition of the voiceless stops to the corresponding voiceless fricatives and voiced stops in Goidelic and British separately (see *RChron.* 83-4 and 87-92). As long as 3sg. n. **eð* had become **e* before lenition acquired (morpho)phonemic status, it might be expected to conform to existing sound patterns in the language and acquire the following lenis allophone characteristic of certain consonants after a vowel. If the argument that limited (morpho)phonemicisation of lenition could have occurred during the Insular Celtic period (*RChron.* 97-8; 1997, 390-3) is accepted, loss of *-ð* must have been an Insular

Celtic development. Even if it is not, an Insular Celtic date remains perfectly feasible.

This brings us to the above mentioned apocope of final *-i* (see *RChron.* 100-103). The unproblematical assumption that this crucial development was preceded by loss of $-\delta < -d$, which has already been seen to have been almost certainly confined to Insular Celtic, has the welcome consequence of solving the problem of OIr. proclitic neut. *na* ‘any’ at a stroke by positing $*nek^w i\delta > *nek^w i > *nek^w$ in Insular Celtic, whence $*ne\chi^w > *ne h- >$ OIr. *na* (non-mutating except for probable prefixing of *h-* to a vowel) by a well-known set of Primitive Irish developments. This derivation employs a set of generally acknowledged sound changes quite straightforwardly to the morphologically unexceptionable preform $*nek^w i\delta < *nek^w id$ by means of an uncontradicted relative chronology (1) $-\delta > -\emptyset$, (2) $-i > -\emptyset$. Its very success and the lack of a viable alternative provide strong grounds for adopting this chronology and for preferring $*nek^w id$ over $*nek^w od$ as the precursor of OIr. *na* (and stressed $*né < *ne$, allowing for remodelling to OIr. *ní* ‘anything’ in the manner described earlier).

3.3. It remains to consider the not inconsiderable further phonological and morphological ramifications. Celtiberian arguably underwent apocope of *-i* but, if so, this can hardly have been old and probably did not occur until after adoption of the Iberian script (*RChron.* 14-5). A direct connection with the similar Insular Celtic phenomenon thus never seemed likely and can now be regarded as impossible for the simple reason that the Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* was preceded by a loss of $-\delta$ that certainly did not take place in Celtiberian. It follows that neither $-\delta > -\emptyset$ nor $-i > -\emptyset$ was as early as Proto-Celtic. It has already been seen that loss of $/-d/ [-\delta]$ does not seem to have occurred in Gaulish and the contrast between Gaulish dat. (formerly loc.) sg. *-rigi*, *Atemaguti* and OIr. *óintu* $<$ IC $*oinotūt < *oinotūt-i$ (McCone, 1978 and *RChron.* 100-102) precludes Gaulish loss of *-i*. Since loss of $-\delta$ or *-i* in Gaulish can only be asserted on the basis of special pleading, our present state of knowledge regarding Continental Celtic leaves no serious alternative to the view that both of these sound changes as well as the highly circumstantial and far-reaching morphological innovation of absolute/conjunct inflection triggered by loss of *-i* were Insular Celtic innovations. Recognition of Insular Celtic as a shared genetic stage in the evolution of Goidelic and British to the exclusion of Continental Celtic (see the diagram in VII.1) then becomes quite unavoidable (see *RChron.* 79-81 and 98-104). A further probable major Insular Celtic innovation is the generalisation of VSO word order (plus associated clefting and *pendens* patterns for topicalisation/focus). Unparalleled as it is among other older attested IE languages, this phenomenon can hardly be dismissed as trivial (‘languages that have as their “basic” or “default” word order an order that puts the verb first in the sentence... make up about 10% of the world’s languages’ according to Carnie and Guilfoyle, 2000, 3). That being so, its occurrence in both Irish

an British is difficult to explain without recourse either to a substrate explanation countenanced by Schmidt (1990, 196: 'in Celtic the differences between Continental Celtic... and Insular Celtic... may be partly explained as the result of a pre-IE influence on Insular Celtic') and others (see I.3.5) or to the Insular Celtic hypothesis supported here. Further significant features that may be adduced in favour of a shared Insular Celtic phases of evolution are the development of preterites with *-ss-* or *-t-* as a suffix throughout (see McCone, 1992, 38-9 and *RChron.* 99), the evolution of a resultative/potential augment (see the end of IV.2.5) and significant modification of the pronominal system (see IV.4.1-3). This common stage of development would thus seem to have been quite protracted, a scenario easy enough to envisage in the quite conceivable event that the first migration of Celtic speakers to Britain took place some time in the first half of the first millennium B.C. and that a further migration thence to Ireland did not occur more than a century or two before its end.