CHAPTER FOUR

Compound Verbs, the Augment and Enclitic Pronouns

1.1. As has already been pointed out (I.1.3-4), the distinction between simple and compound verbs was fundamental to the grammar of Old Irish. It has already been seen (II.1.2/7-9) that the use of so-called 'preverbs' to modify the lexical meaning of the verbal root in various ways is a widespread phenomenon in Indo-European languages that had undoubtedly been inherited from Proto-Indo-European itself. Nevertheless, this device seems to have been exploited to a remarkable extent in Insular Celtic, particularly Old Irish, where anything up to three preverbs may be readily compounded with the verbal root and sequences of four or even five are not unknown (see *KPV* 82-4 for a convenient summary of the preverbs found in Celtic). In this way a single root may constitute the base of a considerable number of compounds, as in the case of OIr. *gairid* 'calls' (< **gar-ye-ti*) plus some twenty further derivatives (see *KPV* 331-2; *de* below stands for both *de* and its variant *dī*), notably *ad-gar-* 'summon, sue' (*ad:gair*), *ar(e)-gar-* 'forbid' (*ar:gair*), *com-gar-* 'cry out, summon' (*con:gair*), *frith-gar-* 'answer, reply' (*fris:gair*), *in-gar-* 'call in, herd' (*in:gair*), *to-gar-* 'summon' (*do:gair*), *ath(e)-to-gar-* 'recall' (*ad:togair*), *de-in-gar-* 'name' (*do:ingair*), *de-uss-gar-* 'shout' (*-díucair*), *ess-com-gar-* 'enjoin' (*as:congair*), *fo-uss-gar-* 'announce, proclaim' (*fo:ocair, -fócair* or *-fúacair*), *for-com-gar-* 'command', (*for:congair*), *imb(i)-frith-gar-* 'correspond' (*imm:fre-cair*), *to-ad-gar-* 'plead' (*do:acair*), *to-ar(e)-gar-* 'forbid' (*do:airgir*), *to-imb(i)-gar-* 'asks (for), claims' (*do:imgair*), *ar(e)-fo-uss-gar-* 'give notice, warn' (*ar:fócair*), *for-de-in-gar-* 'express' (*for:dingair*), *to-ar(e)-in-gar-* 'promise' (*do:airngir*), *to-fo-uss-gar-* 'enjoin, proclaim' (*do:fócair*).

A general impression is given by the more or less exhaustive collection of Old Irish compound verbs made by Rossiter (2004, 171-342), whose list of 1213 such verbs comprises 730 with a single preverb as against 351 with two,108 with three, 21 with four and 3 with five preverbs. Not surprisingly, the proportion of compound to simple verbs in Old Irish is unusually high. As far as primary verbs are concerned, slightly more than 10% of some 150 Old Irish roots listed by Schumacher (*KPV* 189-711) occur only as simple verbs (e.g. *airid* 'ploughs', *damnaid* 'subdues', *marnaid* 'betrays', *maraid* 'lives'), while no less than one sixth of the total is attested only in composition (e.g. *-cí* 'sees', *-eim* 'takes', *-gnin* 'perceives', *-ic* 'reaches' with some 12, 5, 5 and 14 compounds respectively). Overall, at least 500 Old Irish compound primary verbs are to be found in Schumacher's corpus, the upshot being that there are over three compound verbs to every simple verb in this category on average. Almost a third of the former are accounted for by a handful of verbs such as OIr. *-cí, -ic, gairid, beirid* 'bears', *benaid* 'beats, cuts', *gaibid* 'seizes', *orgaid*

‘strikes’, *reithid* ‘runs’, *téit* ‘goes’ and *feidid* ‘leads’, each of which serves as the base for a dozen or more separate compounds.

The present writer has made the tentative suggestion (*EIV* 89-90) that at a relatively early stage two, three and occasionally more preverbs could be prefixed to a verbal root in accordance with a fairly rigid positional hierarchy, a process termed ‘primary’ composition and exemplified by the likes of OIr. *ar:díb†dai (ar(e)-de-bād-), ar:fóem (ar(e)-fo-em-), ar:neat (ar(e)-ne-sed-), ar:neget (ar(e)-ne-gud-) as:rochoíli (ess-ro-coil-), as:indet (ess-in(de)-fēd-), as:ingaib (ess-in-gab-), as:comlai (ess-com-lu-), ad:opair (ad-uss-ber-), ad:cosnai (ad-com-sni-), con:os†na (com-uss-an-), con:utaing (com-uss-di(n)g-), do:écci (de-in-ci-), do:rochoíni (de-ro-coin-), do:ingaib (de-in-gab-), do:essuirg (de-ess-org-), do:róscai (de-ro-uss-scuch-), fo:ácaib (fo-ad-gab-), for:aith†minedar (for-ath(e)-men-), for:cumai (for-com-o-), fris:ind†lea (fris-in(de)-ell-), imm:fol†ngi (imb(i)-fo-long-), imm:fresnai (imb(i)-frith-sni-), ind:ár†ben (in(de)-ad-ro-uss-be(n)-), do:etarrat (to-eter-reth-), do:im†thiret (to-imb(i)-ath(e)-reth-), do:ind†naig (to-in(de)-aneg-), do:fuiben (to-fo-be(n)-), do:air†chain (to-ar(e)-can-), do:im†chella (to-imb(i)-cell-), do:aith†chren (to-ath(e)-cre(n)-), do:aid†lea (to-ad-ell-), do:ec†malla (to-in-com-ell-), do:formaig (to-for-mag-)*. These and other examples pointed to the provisional scheme below of ordering from left to right within the chain of preverbs in primary compounds, with the proviso that preverbs in the same vertical column were not necessarily equal in this respect but rather could not be securely ranked in relation to each other on account of inadequate or contradictory evidence.

1	2	3	4	5
to	*for*	*ad*	*com*	*uss*
	fris	*ath(e)*	*ro*	*ne*
	eter	*ar(e)*		
	imb(e)	*de*		
	ess			
	fo			
	in(de)			

It was proposed (*EIV* 90-91) that at a later stage this gave way to what was termed ‘secondary’ composition and defined as the prefixing of a preverb to an already existing compound that was treated as a single unit without regard to the above sequence. Calques on Latin compound verbs provided particularly obvious examples of this process, a case in point being the use of Old Irish *do:beir, -tabair* ‘gives’, once equated for this purpose with Latin *dat* ‘gives’, as the base for native equivalents of the latter’s compounds: e.g., OIr. *fris:tabair, fo:tabair* and *imm:tabair* calqued on Lat. *ob-dit, sub-dit* and *circum-dat* respectively. Old Irish *con/com* was particularly prone to be equated with the formally and semantically

close Latin *com-/con-* in such formations, e.g. *con:toí = con-vertit (do:soí, -toí* = Lat. *vertit), con:túairc = con-terit (do:fúairc, -túairc* = Lat. *terit), con:foírea = com-parat (fo:fera, -foírea* = Lat. *parat), con:fodaim = com-patitur (fo:daim, -fodaim* = Lat. *patitur).* Further examples with other preverbs include *fris:tairissedar* = Lat. *ob-sistit (do:airissedar, -tairissedar* = Lat. *sistit), imm:díben* = Lat. *circum-cidit (do:ben, -díben* = Lat. *caedit), fris:tét* = Lat. *ob-it (téit, -tét* = Lat. *it,* with a simple verb as base in this case). There are also cases where Latin compounds without a corresponding simplex were nevertheless given a suitable equivalent preverb in an Old Irish calque, e.g. *eter:díben* (*inter-imit* 'destroys', the Lat. simplex *emit* having a different sense), *fris:oirg* (Lat. *of-fendit,* with no surviving simplex), *eter:déccai* (*intro-spicit,* the Lat. simplex *specit* being confined to archaic usage).

It was further argued that this type of composition was not confined to calques but could occur in native compounds too, although this was inevitably harder to detect. Among likely instances displaying deviation from the provisional sequence of 'primary' composition above were *con:di-eig* 'requests' (see McCone, 1994/5), *con:im-chlai* alongside *imm:cloí* 'changes', *con:im-thet* 'goes around with, accompanies' alongside *imm:tét* 'goes around', *con:é-tet* 'agrees with' alongside *in:tét, -é-tet* 'follows' (rare), *con:éi-rig* 'arises (together)' (possibly a calque on Lat. *con-surgit*) alongside *a-t:reig, -éi-rig* 'arises', and *imm:tic* 'comes about, protects' alongside *do:ic, -tic* 'comes'. This essentially follows the approach adumbrated by Dillon (1962, 125-6) with reference to 'a few verbs in which *to* comes second: *as-toasci* 'espresses'; *con:toí* 'turns'; and compounds of *tíag-, con-táeg* gl. coeo, *ar-táet...* 'takes the place of', *fris-táet* 'opposes' The first is a mere translation of Latin 'exprimit', the second of 'convertit' and the third of 'coeo'. The last two must date from a time when *do-tét, -táet* had become fixed as a perfective verb meaning 'comes, arrives', to which other prepositions could then be prefixed'. Whatever the precise details, secondary composition was thus envisaged as a relatively late stage in which one of a restricted range of preverbs could be prefixed where appropriate to inherited compounds now perceived as relatively inflexible units.

1.2. The idea that 'primary' composition as defined above was the main process in the formation of compound verbs in the earlier prehistory of Old Irish has been called into question by Rossiter's (2004) study, which finds that removal of the first preverb leaves an actually attested Old Irish compound in the case of some two thirds of all multi-preverb compounds in the language. The compounds of *gar-* listed in 1.1 above are a case in point, in that the seven two-preverb compounds *ad:to-gair, do:in-gair, as:con-gair* plus *for:con-gair, imm:fre-cair, do:a-cair* and *do:air-gir* can be reduced in this way to attested one-preverb *do:gair, in:gair, con:gair, fris:gair, ad:gair* and *ar:gair* respectively. A trio of three-preverb compounds, namely *ar:f-ó-cair* plus *do:f-ó-cair* and *for:d-in-gair,* likewise yield two-preverb

fo:o-cair and *do:in-gair* respectively. Just three forms with two preverbs (*-dí-u-cair*, *fo:o-cair*, *do:im-gair*) and a single one with three (*do:air-n-gir*) prove unamenable to such reduction. Significantly, the last four examples belong to one or other of the two main categories of exceptions discussed in 1.3 below, namely two-preverb compounds with *-uss-* as second preverb (some 35 examples, all non-reducible; Rossiter, 2004, 89 and 154-161) and multi-preverb compounds with *to* as first preverb (almost 140 instances, just under half of them irreducible and just over half reducible; Rossiter, 2004, 74-84). If these and just nine examples of two-preverb compounds with *-ne-* (< **ni*; see *GOI* 523) as second preverb (Rossiter, 2004, 152-3) are discounted, multi-preverb compounds resistant to straightforward reduction of the type just described amount to less than one sixth (under 80) rather than to about a third (c. 160) of the overall sample (c. 480).

Moreover, even in some cases where removal of the first preverb does not yield an actually attested compound finite verb in Old Irish, there are nevertheless pointers to the erstwhile existence of such a form. For instance, a base **de-saig* for *con:di-eig* could be inferred from OIr. *i ndegaid* '(in quest of,) after' < **de-saigid* (McCone, 1994/5, 157), *saigid* (fem. *i*-stem) typically being the verbal noun of S2 *saigid, -saig* 'seeks' and its compounds. OIr. *comarc* 'outcry, invocation' (MidIr. *comaircid* apparently being created from this rather than based upon an OIr. compound) and MW *cyfarch* 'enquiry, request, greeting' plus associated finite verb *cyfarchaf* 'I request, greet' leave little doubt that a whole series of OIr. compound verbs (notably *ad:com-airc, fo:com-airc, for:com-airc, fris:com-airc, imm:com-airc* and *do:com-airc* with verbal nouns *athcomarc... imchomarc, tochmarc*) were based upon an old compound **con:airc, *-com-airc* that had not survived as such into Old Irish (Rossiter, 2004, 132). OIr. *éices* 'poet' (probably < **in-k^{w}is-to-s* 'looked at, (well) regarded') seems to be based upon a finite compound *in-ci-* that was lost after forming the base of *de-in-ci-* (OIr. *do:é-ci* 'looks at'). Obviously cases such as these raise the distinct possibility that quite a few other Old Irish compounds with two or more preverbs that do not yield actually attested forms on removal of their first preverb were nevertheless derived from forms lacking the first preverb in question, these having then become obsolete and having disappeared without trace by the time of Old or Middle Irish.

On the whole, then, it looks as though the normal method of forming new compound verbs throughout the prehistory of Old Irish was by a process of step by step accretion entailing the prefixing of a single extra preverb to an already existing simple or compound verbal form. Where such accretion changed a single-preverb into a two-preverb compound and then on occasion the two-preverb into a three-preverb compound and so on, it seems best termed 'recomposition' (see II.1.10). It is, however, worth bearing in mind that this process differs merely in degree and not in essence from 'secondary composition' as rather more restrictively

defined in 1.1 above. Some quite impressive derivational chains of this type are attested (cf. *for:dingair ~ do:ingair ~ in:gair* above; Rossiter, 2004, 112-116 lists some thirty involving one to three preverbs and a further three involving one to four preverbs): e.g., *ad:ascnai* 'returns' (*ath(e)-ad-com-sni-*) or *imm:ascnai* 'meets' (*imb(i)-ad-com-sni-*) ~ *ad:co-snai* 'strives for, seeks' (*ad-com-sni-*) ~ *con:sní* 'contends'; *ad:tóirndea* 'carves' (*ad-to-fo-rind-*) ~ *do:foirndea* 'signifies' (*to-fo-rind-*) ~ *fo:rinda* 'expresses' (*fo-rind-*); *do:airmbir* 'attempts' (*to-ar(e)-imb(i)-ber-*) ~ *ar:imbir* 'intends' (*ar(e)-imb(i)-ber-*) ~ *im:beir* 'carries around, plies, plays'; *imm:tacmaing* 'encompasses' (*imb(i)-to-ad-com-ic-*) ~ *do:acmaing* 'reaches' (*to-ad-com-ic*) ~ *ad:cumaing* 'extends to' (*ad-com-ic-*) ~ *con:ic* '(attains,) can, is able'.

1.3. (a) This brings us to the main exceptions to the principle of reducibility (1.2 above), beginning with *-ne-* (probably < **ni* 'down' by lowering before *-s(s)a-* in the first instance and then spread by analogy to forms containing the other two roots in question). This preverb is of extremely restricted occurrence (Rossiter, 2004, 152-3; *GOI* 523), being confined to pre-radical position in a handful of two-preverb compounds containing the roots *sed-* 'sit' (*ar:ne-at* 'awaits', *ind:ne-at* 'waits'), *s(t)a-* 'stand' (*ad:ne-ssa* 'reproaches', *con:ne-ssa* 'tramples, spurns', *do:ne-ssa* 'spurns' with *de-*, *for:ne-ssa* 'tramples, strikes', *do:ne-ssa* 'sets foot on, tramples' with *to-*) and *guid-* (< **g^{w}ed-*) 'pray, beseech' (*ar:ne-get* 'prays'). The obvious explanation for the failure of *-ne-* to occur as a sole or first preverb in Old Irish would be that it ceased to be productive at an early stage of (Insular) Celtic or Primitive Irish and so survived only in a few more or less petrified combinations (particularly *-nessa* < **ni-stā-*) that were then liable to be lost, leaving behind only a number of case where a further preverb had been acquired by accretion.

(b) The preverb *-uss-* is the object of a detailed and fully referenced study by Russell (1988), who opts (1988, 116-125) for a dual origin < **uxs* 'up, out' and/or especially **uts* 'up(wards)' (cf. *GOI* 525-6). It resembles *-ne-* in virtually never appearing on its own in a finite compound and in never being the first preverb of a multi-preverb compound. Indeed, as Rossiter's (2004, 89-90) list of 35 two-preverb, 27 three-preverb, 4 four-preverb and 1 five-preverb Old Irish compound verbs certainly or probably containing *-uss-* indicates, it seems regularly to stand directly before the root after any other preverb(s) present. The only virtually certain instance of a finite verb with *uss-* as sole preverb surviving in normal Old Irish is *as:boind*, *-o-paind* 'refuses, rejects', and even here *as* has replaced **os* < **us* in pretonic position. The difficult *as:oilgi*, *-oslaici* 'opens' is ultimately derived from **uss-léic-* by Russell (1988, 106), perhaps with repeated **uss*, but an alternative might by to posit some analogical interaction between an **os:léici*, **-oilgi* (**uss-leic-*) and an *as:oilgi*, **-eslaici* (**ess-uss-léic-*) or simply the remodelling of the later to *-oslaici* (and similarly of the verbal noun to *oslucud*) under the influence of the stressed vowel of

as:oilgi. Be that as it may, the general irreducibility of compounds consisting of P-*uss*-V to to a corresponding *uss*-V is obviously connected with the almost complete absence of the latter in Old Irish finite formations, contrasting as it does with the more or less average reducibility of PP(P)-*uss*-V to a matching P(P)-*uss*-V. Moreover, Russell presents evidence suggesting that the virtual disappearance of *uss*- as sole preverb of finite compound verbs belongs to the rather recent prehistory of Irish: e.g., *ocbath* 'let him exalt' (*uss-gab-*) in the rhetorical *Audacht Morainn* §8 (1988, 103) for more normal *com-uss-gab-* (OIr. *con:o-caib* 'raises, exalts'); *osnad* 'sigh' (1988, 96, *uss-an-*; OIr. *com-uss-an-* in finite *con:os-na* 'takes a breather, rests', vn. *cumsanad*); *osn(d)ae* 'illumination' (1988, 97-8, *uss-and-*; OIr. *for-uss-and-* in finite *for:os-n(d)ai* 'illuminates', vn. *fursundud*); *omlithe* 'smoothed, polished' (1988, 108, *uss-mel-*); *únach* 'washing, cleansing' (1988, 110, *uss-nig-*; OIr. *de-uss-nig-* in finite *do:fo-nig* 'washes, cleanses', vn. *díunach*).

It seems most likely, then, that at a certain (in part at least, Insular Celtic) prehistoric stage *uss*-, which is not attested as a preverb outside Celtic, became rather productive and formed compounds with quite a few verbal roots. Subsequently, however, this productivity would seem to have declined with the result that compounds with *uss*- eventually ceased to be created. Like the appreciably less numerous compounds containing *ne*-, old *uss*-V compounds were liable to undergo accretion by the prefixing of a further preverb first to P-*uss*-V and then on occasion to PP-*uss*-V and so on. By the time of Old Irish most finite *uss*-V formations had disappeared (sometimes leaving telltale traces, as indicated above) in favour of accretions in which a reflex of *uss* was preceded by more productive and synchronically tangible preverbs. In the final analysis Insular Celtic *uss* displays certain typological affinities with *ā_* in Indo-Iranian (II.1.11) insofar as both were quite common, were regularly placed directly before the verbal root and were particularly prone to occur in combination with further preverbs.

(c) The case of *to*, the most statistically frequent Old Irish preverb by some margin, could hardly be more different. Rossiter (2004, 306-339) records no less than 229 compounds of which it is the first preverb (88 as sole preverb, 92 with one, 44 with two, 4 with three and 1 with four further preverbs). Rossiter (172-342 *passim*) records some 55 instances of *to* as a second preverb (18 in a two-preverb, 26 in a three-preverb and 11 in a four-preverb compound). However, almost all of these involve the prefixing of a particularly productive preverb (notably *com* 12, *fo* 6, *fris* 5, *imb* 17) to a preexisting compound with *to* as first preverb in the manner envisaged by Dillon in 1.1 above, a calque on a Latin compound verb not infrequently being involved. So marked is the proclivity of *to* towards first place in the preverb chain of older compounds and so elusive is its semantic contribution to these on occasion that Dillon (1947, 22-4; 1962, 120-122; 1972) doubted whether it was an etymologically obscure preverb in origin and instead compared it with the

regularly initial Old Hittite sentence connective *ta*. In this he was followed by Watkins (1963, 13-14) but, although derivation of both the Old Irish and the Old Hittite form from a preform **to* is formally unimpeachable, it is problematical in other respects.

For Watkins (1963, 16) this and other initial connectives (notably Hitt. *nu,* OHitt. *šu,* Luw. *a*) 'are all deictic pronominal stems, but formally on an older level than the inflected pronouns themselves, **(e)no-*, **to-*, **so-*, **e-*. They show the bare stem alone. Sturtevant [1939] was, I think, quite justified in his view that the Hittite sentence connectives showed the earliest state of the demonstrative pronoun appearing (*inter alia*) in Greek ὁ ἡ τό and cognate forms; but his utilization of the comparison was limited by his commitment to his Indo-Hittite hypothesis, and the desire to retain Brugmann's system of Indo-European essentially unchanged. Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* III 416, has called attention to the joining of sentences and clauses by epiphoric pronominal forms....; this represents in my opinion a later type in Indo-European than the joining of sentences and clauses by a fixed connective with enclitic pronominal element. In this respect the Celtic and the Anatolian languages have preserved an older stage of Indo-European than the other members of the family.' However, since these words were written, an inflected *so-* pronoun cognate with the **so-/*to-* form of Greek, Indo-Iranian etc. has turned up in classic epiphoric contexts in Celtiberian (see VI.1.1 below and Schrijver, 1997, 9-16), which must have inherited it via Proto-Celtic from 'standard' Proto-Indo-European. That seems to rule out the possibility of an archaic or even 'Indo-Hittite' bare-stem connective **to* surviving in Celtic, particularly when such a form should have been invariably clause-initial and pretonic like OIr. *no* (I.1.6-7) rather than participating in normal OIr. deuterotonic/prototonic oppositions of the type *do:claid* 'digs up', *ní:to-chlaid* 'does not dig up' (see I.1.4).

Whatever its origin, *to* was evidently productive as a preverb in Insular Celtic and seems to have remained so for a considerable time thereafter, its enduring popularity securing for it a prominent role in the continuous processes of verbal composition and recomposition (see the end of 1.2 above) by prefixing a preverb to an existing simple or compound verb respectively. This productivity had apparently more or less come to an end by the time of Old Irish with the result that *to*-compounds themselves could then become the base for recomposition by means of one of a relatively small number of preverbs still productive at the late prehistoric and early historic stage characterised by so-called 'secondary composition' (1.1 above). As for the unusually high proportion (just under half of the total; see 1.2 above) of multi-preverb compounds beginning with *to* that do not yield an actually attested compound when the first preverb is removed, the preverb's already mentioned lack of an obvious semantic contribution to many compounds (cf. Dillon, 1962, 121-2) may have made older compounds to which it had been prefixed particularly prone

to disappear (e.g. *do:aith-big* or *do:ath-boing* ‘breaks up’ probably based upon an erstwhile *ath-beg-/-bong-* implied by the noun *athbach* ‘redivision, respite’; Rossiter, 2004, 137-8). It also seems possible that the status of *to* as a normally initial preverb was so well established that a further preverb was on occasion placed after rather than before it during its productive phase (e.g., perhaps, rare *do:aith-bir* ‘takes back’ in relation to extremely common *do:beir* ‘takes’; Rossiter, 2004, 138).

The foregoing does not, of course, preclude the possibility that two or more preverbs were on occasion combined more or less simultaneously with a verbal root. Whether analysed as *to-imbi-de-ret-* or *to-imb(i)-athe-ret-*, the irreducible OIr. compound *do:im-thi-ret* (prot. *(-)timthiret*) ‘serves’, literally ‘runs to, around (and) from/back’, may well be a case in point but, if so, the order of the preverbs was presumably determined by the nature of the action envisaged rather than by any positional hierarchy governing them as such. On the whole, however, this type of process seems to have played no more than a marginal role in the creation of Insular Celtic verbal compounds.

1.4. Although the British (principally Old Welsh) record preserves no more than vestiges of differences in the grammatical behaviour of simple and compound verbs (see I.2.1), there is no shortage there of verbs that may be securely analysed as old compounds on etymological grounds. Schumacher’s (*KPV* 189-711) corpus of primary verbs gives some 330 instances. Well over half of these contain just one preverb, about 115 two preverbs, a mere 27 or so three, and a solitary example four. Verbal composition thus appears to have been widespread enough in British but somewhat less so than in Irish. A crude comparison of the statistics for primary verbs in both branches would then indicate the quite extensive prefixing of one, less frequently two and occasionally even three preverbs (but hardly more) to verbs at an earlier shared Insular Celtic stage (III.3.1-3).

That said, exact correspondences are rather few and far between: for example, OIr. *ro:ic* ‘reaches’ (*ro-*), *con:r-ic* ‘encounters’ (*kom-ro-*) have counterparts in MW *reingk* ‘reaches’, *kryfreing* ‘encounters’ (see *KPV* 200-202); OIr. *ar:beir* ‘uses’(*are-*), *con:beir* ‘receives, conceives’ (*kom-*) correspond to MidW *aruer* ‘uses’, *kym(m)er* ‘receives, accepts’; OIr. *con:ben* ‘hacks’ (*kom-*), *do:ben* (prot. *-díben*) ‘cuts off’ (*dī-*), *fo:ben* ‘strikes at, attacks’ (*wo-*) prefix the same preverbs to **bi-(na-)* ‘strike’ as MW *kymyn* ‘hacks’, *dibyn* ‘cuts up’, *gofyn* ‘cuts down’ (*KPV* 226-8); OIr. *for:tá* ‘be superior to’ and MW *gorfot* ‘overcome, oblige’ are both based upon a compound of **wor-* ‘upon’ with the substantive verb (*KPV* 242 and 245); OIr. *ad:daim* ‘acknowledges’ (*ad-*), *fo:daim* ‘suffers’ (*wo-*) match MW *adef* ‘admits’, *godef* ‘suffers’ *(KPV* 260-262); OIr. *fo:gní* ‘serves’ and MW *gweinyd* ‘serves’ (*KPV* 339-341) could both continue Ins. Celt. **wo-* ‘under’ + *gni-* ‘do’; OIr. *imm:goin* ‘fights’ (*ambi-* ‘around, mutually’) corresponds to MidW

ymwan ‘fights’ (*KPV* 363-4); OIr. *for:cain* ‘teaches’ (*wor-*), *fo:cain* ‘accompanies (musically)’ (*wo-*), *do:aurchain* ‘prophesies’ (*to-are-wo-*) may be equated with MW *gorchan* ‘teaches’, *gogan* ‘praises, satirises’, *darogan* ‘prophesies’ (*KPV* 387-390); OIr. *fo:ceil* ‘conceals, buries’ (*wo-*) is comparable with MW *gogel* ‘protects’ (*KPV* 394-5); OIr. *fo:cren* ‘purchases, hires’ (*wo-*), *do:aithchren* ‘buys back, redeems’ (*to-ate-*) match MidW *gobryn* ‘earns’, MidBr. *dazprenaff* ‘I redeem’ (*KPV* 438-440); OIr. *do:immuirc* ‘presses, constrains’ contains the same two-preverb sequence (*to-ambi-*) and root (*org-*) as MW *-damorth* ‘struck down’ (*KPV* 498-9); OIr. *do:comairc* ‘requests’ (*to-kom-*), *fris:comairc* ‘asks’ (*writ(s)-kom-*) match MW *dy-m-kyfeirch* ‘asks me’, *gwrthgyfarch* ‘asks’ (*KPV* 511-512); OIr. *fo:reith* ‘helps’ (*wo-*), ipv. *to-n:fóir* ‘help us’ (*to-wo-*) correspond to MW *gueryt* ‘rescues’, *dy-m-gwaret* ‘rescues me’ (*KPV* 538-540); OIr. *con:sní* ‘strives for’ (*kom-*) correlates with MW *kynnyd* ‘increases, conquers’ (*KPV* 599-600); similarly OIr. *fo:sern* ‘bestrews’ (*wo-*) can be equated with MW *guassarn* ‘strews beneath’ (*KPV* 601-2); OIr. *do:fich* (prot. *-deich*) ‘punishes, avenges’ (*de/dī*) corresponds to MW *diwc* ‘restores’ (*KPV* 683-4). Finally, the equation between OIr. *for:cenna* ‘ends, finishes’ and MW *gorfen* ‘ends, finishes’ may well point to an Insular Celtic compound **wor-k^{w}ennāt* ‘ends, finishes’ of a derived verb. While the finite verbs may have been derived independently in the two branches from the outcome of an Insular Celtic noun **work^{w}ennom* ‘end, finish’ (OIr. *forcan, forcenn,* MW *gorfen*), the most economical approach is to ascribe the development of a factitive compound verb from this to a shared Insular Celtic phase.

Although the possibility of separate parallel creations can hardly be excluded in some cases, on the whole it seems reasonable to take examples such as the above as good evidence for a nucleus of verbal compounds with one, sometimes two and very rarely three preverbs in Insular Celtic. Needless to say, the vicissitudes of verbal composition are such that Insular Celtic verbal compounds are unlikely to have been restricted to those cases where precise correspondences are attested in both Irish and British. For instance, the fixed Old Irish expression *aig taig* ‘going (and) coming’ points to the erstwhile existence of a compound **to-aig* matching MW *daw* ‘comes’ (**to/u- + ag-*; *KPV* 190). Moreover, the argument above (1.2-3) that multi-preverb compounds typically arose by adding a further preverb to an existing compound verb would suggest that the British compounds **kanta-ambi-ad- + ag-* (MW *canhymdaant* ‘they go around with, accompany’) and **wor-ambi-ad- + ag-* (MW *gorymda(a)* ‘goes around’) were based upon **ambi-ad- + ag-* (MW *ymda* ‘goes (around)’; see *KPV* 190) and that this in turn was based upon earlier **ad- + ag-*. Although there is no reflex of this last form in British, it does underlie OIr. *ad:aig* ‘drives to, thrusts’ and this makes it reasonable to derive the latter from an Insular Celtic **ad- + ag-* ultimately lost in the prehistory of British after forming the base for **ambi- + ad-ag-*. As pointed out in the previous paragraph, the correspondence between OIr. *fo:cren* and MW *gobryn* points to an Insular Celtic **wo-k^{w}ri(-na-)*

'buy in' (OIr. *crenaid* 'buys', MW *pryn* 'buys' < **k^{w}ri-na-t(i)*) but the further compound **are-wo-* is confined to British (MW *arobryn* 'earns') and Irish has only **to-are-wo-* (OIr. *do:aurchren* 'purchases in advance, enfeoffs'). It thus seems likely that **are-wo-k^{w}ri(-na-)* 'buys in ahead' had already come into existence in Insular Celtic, surviving in British but being lost in Irish after forming the base of the further compound **to-are-wo-k^{w}ri(-na-)*.

Nevertheless, even when due allowance is made for factors such as these, it must be admitted that, on the whole, the correspondence between Irish and British compounds is not particularly impressive in detail. To begin with, some roots that form a considerable number of compounds in one branch do not exist in the other. For instance, there is no British equivalent of OIr. *-cí* 'looks, sees' (**k^{w}is-*, *KPV* 431-3; not found as a simplex but contained in some dozen compounds), *dingid* (**di-n-g-*, *KPV* 276-7; simplex and some five compounds), *léicid* 'leaves' (**li-n-k^{w}-*, *KPV* 455; simplex and some seven compounds) or *saigid* 'seeks' (**sag-*, *KPV* 555-6; simplex and some nine compounds), and conversely there is no Irish equivalent of MW *deily* 'holds' (**delg-*, *KPV* 271-2; simplex and some six compounds) or *dwc* 'leads, brings' (**duk-*, *KPV* 286-8; simplex and some half dozen compounds). The erstwhile existence of a simplex **k^{w}is-* is indicated by Gaulish *pis-síiumí* 'I shall see' and, in the quite likely event that Gaulish *appisetu* reflects the **ad-*k^{w}is-* underlying OIr. *ad:cí, -acci* 'sees' (see *KPV* 431-3, esp. (a)), this compound will have arisen at a pre-Insular Celtic stage and survived through Insular Celtic into Old Irish. The lack of any simple or compound reflex of **k^{w}is-* in British indicates that this verb did not form more than a compound or two in Insular Celtic, namely **ad-k^{w}is-* and perhaps the **en-k^{w}is-* inferred in 1.2 above from OIr. *éices* 'poet'. That being so, the further creation of some five two- or three-preverb compounds from *ad-ci-* and of four three-preverb ones from *de-en-ci-* (itself probably based on since lost **en-ci-*) was almost certainly exclusive to Old Irish.

Certain roots such as *gar-* 'call' (1.2 above) and *gab-* 'seize, take' (*KPV* 318-321) form numerous compounds in Old Irish (at least 20 in each case) but only a couple in British. Conversely, *reg-* 'stretch, raise' (*KPV* 530-522) is found only in composition with *exs-* plus a further trio of two-preverb compounds based on this in Old Irish but occurs as a simplex plus over a dozen further compounds (with one, two or three preverbs but apparently never *exs*) in British. The roots **ber-* 'bear' (*KPV* 218-222) and **ret-* 'run' (*KPV* 538-543) are about the only ones to form a large number of compounds in both Irish (some 20 and 18 respectively) and British (some 21 in each case), but even here precise correspondences are confined to at most five compounds of **ber-* (all with just one preverb) and just five or six of *ret-* (three with one, two with two and a more doubtful single case with three preverbs). As noted above, the preverbs **kom-*,**dī-* and **wo-* are attested in composition with **bi(-na-)* 'strike' in both Irish and British, thus making it likely

that these three single-preverb compounds already existed in Insular Celtic. Thereafter, however, the two branches diverge (*KPV* 226-8): no more than three further compounds are attested in British (notably with **ati-* in OBret. 1sg. *etbinam* and MW 3sg. *eduyn*, with **to-kom-* and perhaps **wo-en-*) but in Irish there are no less than nineteen further compounds differing from these, five with a single preverb (**exs-, *onku-, *tu-, *wor-, *writ-*), ten with two preverbs (four based on **dī-*, one each on **wo-*, **wor-* and **exs- + *bi(-na-)* and three irreducible), two with three preverbs (one with **to-* plus attested **ambi-dī- + *bi(-na-)*, the other with **wo-dī-uss-*) and one each with four (irreducible **ande-ad-ro-uss- + *bi(-na-)*) and five preverbs (with **wo-* prefixed to the foregoing). It seems rather obvious that all or at least most of this further compounding took place at various stages in the separate prehistories of Irish and British. A similar picture emerges elsewhere. For instance, the root **dlig-* 'be entitled/obliged' is attested only as a simplex in British (e.g. MW 3sg. *dyly*) but in Old Irish also forms some four single-preverb compounds (*KPV* 282) that seem unlikely to have existed as early as Insular Celtic. It has already been seen that **dam-* 'suffer' could probably already be compounded with **wo-* and **ad-* in Insular Celtic. The only further development in Irish was the creation of a two-preverb compound (*con:fo-daim* glossing and doubtless calqued upon forms of Lat. *com-patitur*) from the former, while in British a different two-preverb compound was based upon the former (MW *di-o-def*) and two such compounds upon the latter (MW *ym-a-def* and *kyf-a-def* with **ambi-* and **kom-* respectively) plus a further three-preverb compound (MW *gogyfadef* by prefixing *go-* < **wo-* to *kyfadef*).

The foregoing should suffice to demonstrate that verbal composition in Insular Celtic was a multilayered process, the various strata of which reflect a more or less uninterrupted development through and from Common Insular Celtic right down to Old Irish and the earliest attested records of British. A number of precise correspondences between Irish and British exemplified above leave no reasonable doubt that single-preverb verbal compounds were quite widespread, two-preverb compounds already established, if infrequent, and three-preverb compounds at best a considerable rarity in Common Insular Celtic. That said, it seems equally obvious that many of the actually attested compounds, including the vast majority of those with two or three preverbs and all of the small number with four or five, were first created after that phase of development at various stages (some quite recent) in the separate prehistories of the Irish and British branches thereof. It has also emerged that throughout this long period the overwhelmingly predominant means of forming new compounds in Common Insular Celtic, Irish and British was a process that is best termed accretion or recomposition and entailed the addition of a single preverb to an already existing verb, simple or compound as the case might be. Multi-preverb compounds, then, seem usually to have arisen by successive stages of accretion according to a basic sequence P + V (from Proto-Indo-European onwards), then P

+ PV (from Common Insular Celtic at least, along with further instances of P + V) and subsequently P + PPV (no more than nascent in Insular Celtic and mostly developed in the separate prehistories of Irish and British, along with further instances of P + PV and P + V) followed on occasion by P + PPPV (almost entirely confined to Irish) and then rarely even by P + PPPPV (in late prehistoric Irish only).

This step by step evolution from a stage where verbal composition involving more than one preverb was no more than embryonic to one characterised by the not infrequent occurrence of more complex combinations of two, three or even more preverbs with the verb corresponds closely enough to developments observable in Greek and Latin (see II.1.11). That being so, multi-preverb sequences in Indic and Old Irish are not directly comparable with each other and so, *pace* Wackernagel and others (II.1.10), do not constitute evidence for the existence of such sequences in Proto-Indo-European itself. It was suggested in the final paragraph of II.1.11 that, apart from the special and quite restricted case of iterative reduplication responsible for the likes of **pro pro*, combinations of more than one preverb with a verb were virtually non-existent in PIE. Nevertheless, it was felt that a final decision on this question should await an examination of the Insular Celtic evidence. This has now turned that suggestion into a near certainty and it seems safe to conclude that the compounding of two or more different preverbs with a verb was to all intents and purposes inadmissible in PIE. If so, no positional hierarchies between different preverbs in combination with a verb could have been inherited from that stage and it would seem that the ordering of such multi-preverb sequences in various daughter languages was the outcome of recomposition as illustrated in 1.1-4 and in II.1.10-11 rather than being due to a hierarchy of the type tentatively envisaged in 1.1 above. It also follows that there was no inherited PIE 'template' for the application of tmesis to two different preverbs and that agreement between Old Indic and Old Irish regarding #P(E).(..)P_2(P_3)V(..)# in relation to #.(E).(..)PP_2 (P_3)V(..)# is due to parallel independent extrapolation from inherited #N(E).(..)PV(..)# in relation to #.(E).(..)NPV(..)# rather than to direct inheritance from PIE (see II.1.2/10-11). It remains to consider such evidence as is available from Continental Celtic with a view to hazarding a guess at the status and extent of verbal composition in Proto-Celtic.

1.5. The limited corpus of attested Celtiberian verbs includes a number of compounds, notably finite *uer-zoniti*, *ambi-tiseti*, *usa-bituz* (*uxsa-* or perhaps **uxs-a(d)-*?), *a-sekati* (*a(d)*), *tin-bituz* (probably *d(e)-in-*), *ro-biseti* (see Eska, 1994, 11 and Jordán Cólera, 2004, 141-7) and non-finite *(to-)[u]er-taunei*, *ti-zaunei* (*dī-*), *kon-skilitom*, *ambi-tinkounei* on Botorrita I (see entries in the glossary of Meid, 1993, 79-128). Single-preverb compounds of a type ultimately inherited from PIE (I.1.2/7/10-11) thus constitute a significant proportion of the verbal forms attested so far in this branch of Celtic but there is only one probable instance (plus a further

one or two possible ones) of a compound containing two preverbs.

There is a dearth of secure examples of a finite verb combined with one or more preverbs in Gaulish but *de-uuor-buetid* is an undoubted case of a two-preverb compound (see McCone, 1996, 110 and *LG* 146). *Appisetu* on the Thiaucourt ring (*LG* 126) may well reflect *ad-pis-* < **ad-k^{w}is-* (> OIr. *ad:cí* 'sees'; see 1.4 above), while *uoderce* and *nitixsintor* on the Larzac inscription are taken by Lambert (*LG* 167) as 2sg. ipv. of cpd. *uo-derc-* and 3pl. opt. mediopassive of cpd. *ni-tig-* respectively. The form *tomezeclai* on the Voltino bilingual has been taken as Gaulish and interpreted as *to-med-ec-lai* (i.e. **to-ek(s)-* + *la-* with infixed 1sg. pron. *med* comparable with Lat. *med*; see Meid, 1989, 17-26) or more recently as *to-me-d(e)-ec-lai* (i.e. **to-me-d(e)-ek(s)-* + *la-* with more straightforward 1sg. enclitic *me*; Eska and Weiss, 1990, followed by *KPV* 444-5) with two (if Eska and Weiss are right to take *ec-* as a 'perfective preverb' or augment; see 2.1-2 below) or three lexical preverbs. Since, however, it is uncertain that the form in question is either Gaulish or verbal (the dat. sg. in *-ai* of a fem. *ā*-stem noun being a formally obvious alternative), it hardly constitutes reliable evidence. Fortunately, some welcome additional evidence may be gleaned from outside the verbal system. For instance, acc. sg. *adgarion* (l. 4 of the Chamalières inscription; *LG* 151 and 155-6, and McCone, 1995b, 5) is clearly based upon a compound verb **ad-gar-* and various Gaulish personal names seem to contain originally verbal elements, including derivatives of compound verbs such as **a(d)-sed-* (*Assedo-*, *Aθθedo-*, *Aððedo-*; *GPN* 130 and 253), **ad-beg-* (*Adbogius*; *GPN* 129 and 153), **ande-kom-beg-* (*Andecombo[gius]*; *GPN* 138), **uer-kom-beg-* (*Vercombogius*; *GPN* 153 and 280), **ate-gna-* (gen. sg. *Ategnati*; *GPN* 143), *e(x)s-k_ng-* (Εσκιγγο-, *Escingus*; *GPN* 178 and 202), *uer-kıng-* (*Uercingeto-*; *GPN* 178), **uo-ret-* (*Uoreto-*; *GPN* 126-7). Compound verbs were, then, undoubtedly present in Gaulish and some of these at least seem to have contained two preverbs.

Be that as it may, single-preverb compounds are to be found in all attested Celtic languages and clearly also existed in Proto-Celtic as a feature essentially inherited from Proto-Indo-European. Moreover, some of the combinations of this type seen in Gaulish have precise correspondences in Insular Celtic, notably *a(d)-pis-* vs. OIr. *ad:cí* (prot. *-acci*) 'sees', *ad-gar-* vs. OIr. *ad:gair* (prot. *-acair*) 'sues, accuses', *a(d)-sed-* vs. OIr. *ad:suidi* (prot. *-asti*) 'stops, detains' (causative implying **ad-sed-* 'sit (still)'), *ate-gna-* vs. OIr. *ad:gnin* 'recognises', *uo-ret-* vs. OIr. *fo:reith*, MW *gue-ryt*. Moreover, Gaulish *de-uor-b(w)i-* and *ande-/uer-kom-beg-* can be plausibly taken as recompounds of a **uor-b(w)i-* and a **kom-beg-* directly attested in OIr. *for:bí* 'is (wont to be) over/upon' and *con:boing* 'breaks' (OIr. *-big* < **beg-* and *-boing* < **bu-n-g-* being more or less interchangeable; *KPV* 216-7 and 238-9). Two-preverb compounds seem likewise to be attested in all known branches of Celtic but there are no precise correspondences between Insular and Continental

Celtic (hardly surprising in view of the inadequate attestation of Gaulish and Celtiberian), and the Gaulish examples at least seem likely to be the result of recomposition specific to that language. The question of whether the combination of two preverbs with a verb was already possible in Proto-Celtic must be left open on present evidence but this phenomenon can hardly have been more than embryonic at so early a stage, given its apparent infrequency in Common Insular Celtic as opposed to the later separate prehistories of Irish and British (see 1.4 above). The existence of compounds with three (let alone more) preverbs in Proto-Celtic must be regarded as most unlikely.

2.1. Although the primary function of preverbs was as semantic modifiers of the verb at the lexical level, a few of them also acquired a modificatory function that belongs to the grammar of Old Irish rather than to its lexicon. Since the latter usage relates to the tense and mood system, it seems reasonable to speak of an 'augment' despite appreciable differences between this Old Irish category and the familiar Greek augment. It appears that any tense or mood apart from the imperative could be augmented in Old Irish, although in practice use of the augment was only at all frequent with the preterite, the present or past subjunctive and the present indicative. A detailed treatment will be found in *EIV* 91-161 and here a summary will suffice.

Apart from a few simple and rather more compound verbs in which the formal distinction is either entirely lacking (e.g. compounds of *-ic* such as *do:ic, con:ic* or those already containing *ro* such as *ro:saig*) or is only defectively present (e.g. *ad:cí* with augm. *ad:condairc* vs. unaugm. *co:n-accae* in the independent preterite only), the vast majority of Old Irish verbs can be furnished with an augment and a handful of particularly common ones replaced by another augmented verb when the syntax so requires.

The latter process is seen in three simple verbs and about half a dozen compounds where acquisition of an augment is accompanied by a change of verbal root technically known as suppletion: e.g., pret. *birt* 'carried' vs. augm. pret. *ro:u(i)c* 'has carried', pret. *luid* 'went' (itself suppletive to pres. *téit* 'goes') vs. augm. pret. *do:co-id* 'has gone' *(de-kom-fed-),* pret. *fo:caird* 'put' (pres. *fo:ceird* 'puts') vs. augm. pret. *ro:lae* 'has put'. In the unique case of *do:beir* suppletion alone differentiates the two sets and is accompanied by a likewise unique split into two separate augmented stems (McCone, 1999, 355), whence pret. *do:bert* 'brought/took, gave/imposed' but augm. pret. I *do:u(i)c* 'has brought/taken' (McCone, 1999, 355-360), II *do:rat* 'has given/imposed' (probably *to-r(o)-ad-dā-*; McCone, 1999, 360-4).

However, the augmented form normally has the same verbal root as its unaugmented counterpart and the augment takes the form of an additional preverb or, very rarely,

two such preverbs. Half a dozen simple verbs use a miscellany of one or two different preverbs, e.g. pret. *ibis* ‘drank’ vs. augm. pret. *as:ib* ‘has drunk’ (+ *ess-*) of *ibid* ‘drinks’, pret. *tethaig* ‘swore’ vs. augm. pret. *do:cui-tig* ‘has sworn’ (+ *to-kom-*) of *tongid* ‘swears’, augm. pret. *do:o-mmalg* ‘I have milked’ or pass. *do:o-mlacht* ‘has been milked’ (+ *to-uss-*) of *mligid* ‘milks’. Otherwise the augment of simple verbs is regularly *ro,* e.g. pret. *gabais, -gab* ‘seized’ vs. augm. pret. *ro:gab, -rogab* ‘has seized’ of *gaibid* ‘seizes’. Twenty or so compound verbs use *com* as an augment, e.g. pret. pass. *do:ind-*†*nacht* ‘was bestowed’ vs. augm. pret. pass. *do:é-com*†*nacht* ‘has been bestowed’ *(to-in(de)-**com**-aneg-,* pres. *do:ind-*†*naig).* Compounds with *com* as first preverb followed by a lexical component (whether the verbal root itself or another preverb) beginning with a consonant almost invariably use *ad* as augment, e.g. pret. 3sg. *con:toil,* 3pl. *-co-t*†*laiset* ‘slept’ vs. augm. pret. 3sg. *con:at-tail,* 3pl. *-com-*†*-tal*†*sat* ‘has/have slept’ *(com-**ad**-tu(i)l-). GOI* 344 notes that ‘the double compound **con·dieig** (*di-sag*) ‘seeks demands’ has pf. **con·aitecht**, prototonic ·**comtacht**. The 3pl. of this verb is once (Wb. 8^{a}14) written **con·oitechtatar**; similarly **con·meil** ‘grinds’ has pf. **cot·n-omalt** LU 9072 besides **con·ammelt** Corm. 833 (L). This seems to suggest that at one time the prep. **oss- uss-** could be used in this way’. A pair of isolated slightly deviant spellings such as these hardly constitute reliable evidence for the erstwhile co-occurrence of *uss-* beside well attested *ad* in this particular context, and *to-uss-mlig-* above remains the only certain instance of *-uss-* as augment. Be that as it may, all other compound verbs take *ro* as their augment, e.g. pret. *as:bert, -epert* ‘said’, pres. *a-t:beir* ‘says it’ vs. augm. pret. *as:ru-bart, -é-r*†*-bart* ‘has said’, augm. pres. *a-t:ro-bair* ‘can say it’ (*ess-**ro**-ber-*). It can, then, be clearly seen that *ro* as by far the most widely used augment of Old Irish verbs, whether simple or compound.

Whatever its precise formal realisation, the basic function of the augment is to view a verbal action from a non-contemporary standpoint, either the moment of speaking (or writing) or another verbal action. This view may be directed towards the future as a prospective or towards the past as a retrospective. In the former case the augment marks an action as potential, i.e. as not actually or necessarily happening at the moment but as in various degrees likely to happen or capable of happening, e.g. pres. *as:beir* ‘says’ vs. augm. pres. (potential) *as:ro-bair* ‘can say’. In the latter case the action of an augmented verb is taken to have been already completed and is viewed as a result, e.g. pret. *as:bert* ‘said’ vs. augm. pret. (resultative) *as:ru-bart* ‘has/had said’. A resultative augment could be added to any syntactically predetermined non-future tense or non-imperative mood in a subordinate clause for unambiguous designation of that action’s completion before the main clause action took place. It was also added to main clause preterites for designation of completion before the moment of speaking. With the apparent exception of the preterite (where the semantic difference between, say, punctual ‘did’ and ‘was able to do’ = ‘managed to do’ will have been so negligible as to be virtually undetectable), the

formally identical potential augment could be combined with any syntactically predetermined tense (including future and conditional) or mood (apart from the imperative) in a subordinate or a main clause.

Cognates of OIr. *ro* in the British languages such as Middle Welsh *ry* show a range of uses more or less identical overall with those of the Irish augment just mentioned (see I.2.1c, *VKG* II, 275-82, and *LP*, 255-8). This evidence shows that the predominance of *ro* (the only surviving British augment) and a fully developed resultative/potential system of augmentation goes back at least as far as the Insular Celtic ancestor of Irish and British (see III.3.1-3).

2.2. A common source for the synchronically divergent resultative and potential meanings of the Old Irish (and British) augment is to be sought in an originally perfectivising function. Verbal actions may be classified for aspect as imperfective if importance is attached to their repeated occurrence (iterativity) or to their duration (durativity) over a certain period of time, however short, and as perfective if it is not. Aspect is most conveniently treated as a binary grammatical opposition that is more consistently expressed in some languages such as Russian and Modern Greek than in others such English and Old or Modern Irish. At the lexical level a verb can be classified according to its 'mode (of action)' (German 'Aktionsart'), which is closely connected with the aspectual dichotomy insofar as the aforementioned 'iterative' and 'durative' modes, say, can be viewed as different subcategories of imperfective aspect.

A verb can be described as lexically durative if its action is susceptible to representation as a continuing process, as in 'he is drinking the coffee (at the moment)' or 'the army is (currently) retreating'. Grammatically, however, the action of such verbs may easily be telescoped from line to point, so to speak, and represented perfectively as, say, 'he drank the coffee' or 'the army retreated'. When they are used imperfectively, the action of such verbs is taken to be actually unfolding at the time of utterance or of some other happening from which it is viewed, e.g. 'he was drinking the coffee (when I came in)', and is of necessity not yet completed. Even when perfectivised to 'the army retreated' or the like, such actions do not automatically entail completion, although this can be implied by other means, as in 'the army retreated to the river (and made a stand there)'.

Some verbal actions are, however, intrinsically punctual because they have an in-built starting or finishing point, and are commonly called 'telic' on account of the goal (Greek *télos)* upon which the action is focussed. Thus English verbs such as 'drink up' or 'leave' are telic by virtue of an in-built point for the finish or start of the action and so can never be represented as going on at the same time as another action or the moment of utterance. Consequently 'he is drinking the coffee up', 'he

was drinking the coffee up (when I came in)', 'the army is leaving' or the like are statements to the effect that the all-important defining point of the action may reasonably be expected to be realized in the near future. Whereas in the durative category 'he is drinking the coffee' and 'he is about to drink the coffee' are semantically distinct, telic 'he is drinking the coffee up' is a mere paraphrase of 'he is about to drink the coffee up' for the simple reason that it is a prospective and not a true present. On the other hand, the perfective past of a telic verb differs from that of a durative verb as illustrated in the previous paragraph by automatically entailing completion of the action, as in 'he drank the coffee up' or 'the army left/departed'. Telic action cannot be expanded from point to continuous line and represented duratively, but it is compatible with the discontinuous series of repeated points that in effect constitutes iterative imperfectivity, as is clear from examples like 'he used to drink his coffee up (before the bell sounded)' or 'the army leaves every day (for exercises)'. Telic action can, then, never be truly contemporary with the moment of speaking or some other point of reference, because the implementation or otherwise of its goal marks it as either already or not yet completed. Typically it can be viewed either prospectively as about to take place or retrospectively as already completed but never contemporaneously as actually happening at the moment. There is an obvious correlation between this state of affairs and the basic semantics of the Old Irish augment as defined above.

Grammaticalised augmentation in Old Irish displays affinities with lexical processes such as spatio-temporal modification of the verbal action by a change of root and, above all, composition with preverbs or the like that are not uncommonly linked with shifts from an atelic to the telic mode. This point may be conveniently illustrated by English pairs such as atelic 'damage' vs. telic 'destroy' entailing change of root or atelic 'drink', 'sit', 'move' vs. telic 'drink up', 'sit down', 'remove' respectively entailing the addition of spatio-temporal modifiers. Moreover, the preverbs found as augments in Old Irish correspond to counterparts elsewhere with more or less marked telic tendencies. For instance, Latin *bibere* 'drink' (atelic) vs. *e-bibere* 'drink up' (telic; cf. German atelic *trinken* vs. telic *aus-trinken)* shows telic use of the preverb *e(x)* cognate with the Old Irish *ess* 'out of' used to augment *ibid* 'drinks' (see above). Similarly, Latin *com* and *ad,* which are cognate with the OIr. preverbs/augments *com* and *ad,* often have telic force as in *edere* 'eat' vs. *com-edere* 'eat up', *venire* 'come' vs. *con-venire* 'come together, meet' or *ad-venire* 'arrive' and *urere* 'burn' vs. *com-burere* 'burn up' or *ad-urere* 'set on fire'. The commonest OIr. augment *ro,* which also occurs as a lexical preverb, is directly cognate with Lat. *pro,* the telic effect of which is seen in *ferre* 'bear, bring' vs. *pro-ferre* 'bring forth, produce', but is semantically reminiscent of its somewhat more distant relative Lat. *per* 'through', which has particularly strong telic tendencies seen in *facere* 'do' vs. *per-ficere* 'accomplish', *ferre* vs. *per-ferre* 'carry through', *venire* vs. *per-venire* 'reach' etc.

Likely Old Irish pairs of atelic and telic verbs where the principal differentiating factor was the root are *fo:daim* ‘undergoes, suffers’ vs. *fo:loing* ‘holds out against, endures’ and *do:tét* ‘comes, moves towards’ vs. *do:icc* ‘comes, arrives’. Change of preverb(s) seems to be the key factor in *do:é-ci* ‘looks at, beholds’ vs. *ad:cí* ‘sees, perceives’, *fichid* ‘fights’ vs. *do:fich* ‘avenges’ (prot. *-deich*), *saigid* ‘seeks, strives after’ vs. *ro:saig* ‘reaches, attains’, *do:saig* ‘approaches, makes for’ vs. *do:ro-ig* ‘reaches, arrives’, and *as:luí* ‘flees, goes off, evades’ vs. *as:com-lai* ‘sets out, decamps’. The last three examples are particularly interesting since they present tolerably clear instances of *ro* and *com*, the most widely used augments, in lexical telic function.

A further indication of the telicising origins of the augment lies in the fact that virtually all the verbs such as the numerous compounds of *-ic(c)* and *-gni(n)*, *ad:co-ta*, *-é-ta* ‘gets’, *(ro)-finnathar* ‘finds out’, *(ro)-laimethar* ‘dares’ and *(ro)-cluinethar* ‘hears’ that do not formally differentiate between unaugmented and augmented forms in Old Irish (2.1above) are inherently telic. The last four examples have *com* or *ro* in the independent form only, perhaps because at some stage an accessory telic marker reinforced the positive forms but not the negative ones, which were atelic in the sense that ultimate attainment of the goal was not envisaged. If so, negative usage presumably set the pattern for other dependent forms.

There are thus good reasons for believing that the attested Old Irish system of resultative/potential augmentation has its origins in the telicising or perfectivising effects of certain additional preverbs upon a number of atelic simple and compound verbs. The prevalence of *ro* in this context seems to have been due to an especially broad telic applicability rooted in a rough meaning ‘forward/through (to the end)’, which would give rise to constellations such as *gni-* or *de-gni-* (OIr. *gniid* or *do:gnî*)‘do, make’ vs. *ro-gni-* or *de-ro-gni-* ‘do/make to the end, accomplish’ and *sag-* (OIr. *saigid*) ‘strive for/seek’ or *to-sag-* (OIr. *do:saig*) ‘make for/seek’ vs. *ro-sag-* (OIr. *ro:saig*) or *to-ro-sag-* (OIr. *do:ro-ig*) ‘strive for/seek to the end, attain/reach’. The foundations of the system attested in Old Irish were presumably laid by a tendency to match a given atelic verb with a telic counterpart. One possible way of implementing this was the pairing of two verbs with different roots (plus any preverb(s), especially in the case of the telic member): e.g., *ber-* vs. *ro-uc-* underlying OIr. *beirid* vs. *r(o:)uccai* or *(to-)tég-* vs. *(to-)de-com-fed-* underlying OIr. *téit*, *(do:)-tét* vs. *do:co-at*, *(do:)-dichet* (*EIV* 127). However, an evidently far commoner alternative entailed no more than the addition of a preverb (notably *ad*, *com* and especially *ro*) or (rarely) preverbs to an atelic verb. This process has considerable affinities with the tendency in various Slavic languages to evolve a more or less pervasive dichotomy between imperfective and perfective verbs (see, for instance, the references to *Verbalaspekt* in the index of Rehder, 1986), the latter often being differentiated from the former by a preverb

(e.g. Old Church Slavonic *nes-ti* ‘carry’ vs. *pri-nes-ti* ‘bring’, *i-ti* ‘go’ vs. *pr(i)-i-ti* ‘arrive’). However, whereas in Slavic the morphological process was a two-way affair entailing the derivation of imperfectives from perfectives as well as *vice versa* in order to create the pairs in question, perfective telic verbs seem not to have generated imperfective atelic counterparts in the first instance. As a result, a number of them remained outside the pairing system as a group of Old Irish verbs resistant to augmentation.

If *ro* had been the sole augment in Insular Celtic as in British (end of 2.1 above), it would then be difficult to account for the dislocation of this straightforward state of affairs on the way to Old Irish. If, on the other hand, *ro* was no more than the commonest of several methods of augmentation at that stage as still in Old Irish, its subsequent generalisation in British would be easy to motivate, particularly since *ro* showed an equally understandable tendency to displace other types of augment in Middle Irish (*EIV* 183-9). It thus seems safe to posit that, whatever the precise details, the Insular Celtic system of augmentation was broadly similar to that still observable in Old Irish insofar as use was made of a variety of preverbs (occasionally accompanied by suppletion of the verbal root) but of *ro* above all.

It has already been pointed out that, unlike imperfective or atelic counterparts, perfective or telic actions situated prior to the moment of utterance or some other point in time are automatically completed and hence anterior or resultative from that standpoint. It was but a short step from a system dominated by an aspectual dichotomy between perfective and imperfective to one geared to the hitherto subordinate features of anteriority or resultativity (‘perfect’) inherent in past or otherwise prior perfective actions and of potentiality rooted in the prospective nature of non-iterative telic presents referred to above. The difference of nuance between a present expectation and a less definite present potential is slight enough in the affirmative (e.g., ‘he is accomplishing his task’ = ‘he is about to accomplish his task’ and therefore ‘can accomplish his task’) and almost non-existent in the negative (e.g. ‘he is not accomplishing his task’ = ‘he cannot accomplish his task’)’. Not only are the presents of certain telic verbs virtually synonymous with a potential even in the affirmative, (e.g. ‘I see/hear it’ = ‘I can see/hear it’) but the negatives of all tenses and moods of telic verbs can be paraphrased as negated potentials by virtue of denying attainment of the in-built goal: e.g., ‘he will not accomplish it’ = ‘he will not be able to accomplish it’, whereas atelic ‘he will not do it’ etc. is no mere paraphrase of ‘he will not be able to do it’ etc. Potential meaning could thus easily arise and spread as a characteristic of (originally telic or perfective) augmented as opposed to corresponding (originally atelic or imperfective) unaugmented forms (see Lafon, 1944, 28 and 35-6 on a similar atelic/telic dichotomy underlying Basque auxiliary verbs and the assumed atelic origins of the potential forms thereof).

Once resultative/potential connotations had ceased to be a mere function of telic mode or perfective aspect as such, it will have become possible to augment even basically telic verbs. This further extension may well already have taken place in Insular Celtic itself but, even if it first occurred separately in the Irish and British branches on the basis of the foundations laid at that earlier phase, the upshot in Old Irish was that only a handful of the commoner old telic roots in composition plus a few lexical *ro*-compounds in Old Irish had managed to resist the drive towards a separate augmented resultative/potential form. Consequently the augment is found with such manifestly telic verbs as OIr. *orgid* 'kills, slays' (e.g. augm. pret. *ro:ort*), *marbaid* 'kills' (e.g. augm. pret. *ro:marb*), *a-t:baill* 'dies' (e.g. augm. subj. *-é-r†-bala*), *do:fich* 'avenges' (e.g. augm. pret. *do:ru-ich, -de-r-aig*), *ar:foím* 'accepts, (e.g. augm. pret. *ar:róet*), *do:lugi* 'forgives' (e.g. augm. subj. *d-a:ro-l†gea*) and so on.

2.3. It remains to consider certain formal aspects of the augment's behaviour that may have a bearing upon the system's origins. The augmentation of simple verbs seems straightforward enough. Atelic simple verbs will initially have tended to be paired with telic counterparts, typically single-preverb compounds based upon the same root (e.g., *ib-* 'drink' and *exs-ib-* 'drink up' or *sag-* 'strive for' and *ro-sag-* 'attain') but occasionally compounds based upon another (telic) root (e.g., *ber-* 'bear (towards)' and *ro-unk-* 'make to arrive', causative to *ro-ink-* 'reach'; McCone, 1999, 355-360) and/or employing more than one preverb (e.g., *t_g-* 'go' and *de-kom-wed-* 'head off (together)', *leg-* 'lie' and **de-en-leg-* 'lie down (in)'). The preverb *ro* seems to have been sufficiently common in single-preverb telic compounds to become productive as the system developed along the lines sketched in 2.2 above. As a result unaugmented simple V and C:V were (if atelic, at least) in most cases opposed to augmented compound *ro*:V and C:*ro*-V (deuterotonic and prototonic respectively in the normal way) by the end of the Insular Celtic phase.

Whereas the suppletive augmentation of compound verbs (e.g. of *wo-kerd-* and *to-kor-* 'put, cast' underlying OIr. *fo:ceird* and *do:cuirethar* by *ro-la-* and *to-ro-la-* 'put/cast through' underlying OIr. *ro:lá*, *do:rala*; *EIV* 134) is no different in principle from that of a simple verb, certain questions are raised by the positional behaviour of the single augments *kom*, *ad* and above all what *GOI* 339-40 terms 'movable' and 'fixed' *ro* in combination with a compound verb. The crucial point is that none of these augments of compounds may be proclitic and/or precede the first lexical preverb except for 'movable' *ro* in the case of a dependent compound verb preceded by a conjunct particle: ***com*** directly precedes the root in the twenty or so compounds involved (e.g., *do:ind-nacht* '(was) bestowed' vs. *do:é-**com**-nacht* 'has (been) bestowed' in 2.1 above), ***ad*** is placed in the stressed part of the verb straight after *com* (e.g., *con:toil, -co-tail* 'slept' vs. *con:**a**-tail, -com-†-tail* 'has slept' and *con:di-acht, -cuin-decht* 'requested' vs. *con:**a**i-techt, -com-†-tacht*; see 2.1

above) and ‘fixed’ *ro* directly precedes the root except that a lexical preverb *com*, *uss* or *ne* intervened between them in the case of multi-preverb compounds containing one of these (e.g., *as:bert, -e-pert* ‘said’ vs. *as:**ru**-bart, -é-**r**†-bart* ‘has said’, *do:e-c†-mal†sat* ‘(they) gathered’ vs. *do:e-**r**†-chom-†lasat* ‘have gathered’, augm. *t*-pret. *do:**r**-ó-sat, -to-**r**-†-sat* ‘has begotten’ of *do:f**uis**-sim* ‘begets’; *EIV* 138-9).

Pedersen (*VKG* II 267-8) distinguishes an original rule, often still valid in Old Irish, whereby *ro* was regularly placed at the end of the preverb chain directly before the verbal root from later tendencies, which had already made themselves felt in Old Irish, to place *ro* in second position in the verbal complex in order to protect it from truncation. Thurneysen’s (*GOI* 339-41) doctrine is essentially the same: ‘Movable **ro** always comes after the last pretonic preverb, whether this be a preposition or a conjunct particle. Hence when the preposition comes under the accent owing to the addition of a conjunct particle in front of it, **ro** shifts its position accordingly. Examples: **im·rui-d-bed** ‘has been circumcised’, neg. **ní-ro·im-di-bed**; **as·r-in-gabsat** ‘they have exceeded’, with **năd**: **nad·r-es-n-gabsat** Ml. 122^{d}8; **con·r-os-an** ‘has ceased’, interrog. **in-ru·chum-s-an**.... Movable **ro**, which thus always stands in second place, usually remains unstressed after a conjunct particle (other than **năd**), rarely after a preposition..... Fixed **ro** has an invariable position, normally after the other prepositions and immediately before the verbal stem..... There is no general rule governing the distribution of fixed and movable **ro**... Movable **ro** is more frequent, and occurs with compounds of every kind. Fixed **ro**, which is doubtless the older of the two, is found especially, though not exclusively, with compounds of strong verbs. Sometimes both types are found with the same verb; e.g. **ni-ru·tho-gaítsam**.. ‘we have not deceived’ Wb. 16^{a}22 beside **ni-m·tho-r-gáeth** ‘has not deceived me’ Ml. 38^{a}13’.

In a contribution prefaced with the eminently justified statement that, ‘in spite of much discussion, the problem of fixed and movable *ro* in Old Irish has not yet found any very satisfactory explanation’ Ahlqvist (1975) has proposed two quite different origins for these formally identical positional variants, accepting the conventional derivation of the former from a preverb **pro* in the case of but tracing the latter back to a PIE enclitic **r̥* ‘which has long been known to have given Greek ῥα and ἄρα as well as Lithuanian *ir*̃’ (Ahlqvist, 1975, 165). Enclitic origins are invoked in order to explain the gravitation of Thurneysen’s ‘movable’ *ro* to second position in the complex but its failure to be invariably proclitic (e..g. *con:r’osan* above) is then rather awkward. Ahlqvist (1975, 165-6) goes on to acknowledge further formal difficulties (*r̥* > PC and OIr. *ar, ri* or *ra* according to *GOI* 130-1, but it now seems clear that *ra* only arose from preconsonantal *r̥H*; *RChron.* 49-50 and 52-3) and to express justified doubts about its semantic suitability for development into a marker of perfectivity. The former call for the *ad hoc* postulate of an unmotivated change

of vocalism ‘under the influence of fixed *ro*’ (Ahlqvist, 1975, 165) and the latter call for the hypothesis that ‘once the two particles had become homophonous, movable *ro* began to take over the grammatical functions of fixed *ro*, while at the same time retaining its own syntactic properties’ (Ahlqvist, 1975, 167). In the final analysis, this approach is too elaborate and problematical to be convincing.

The rather vague proposals of Pedersen and Thurneysen likewise fail to provide either adequate motivation for or a coherent account of the rise of so-called ‘movable’ *ro*, which actually does undergo truncation in the common pattern with elision seen in *as:r’-in-gab†sat, -r’-es-†n-gab†sat* etc. Neither account can explain why this type of *ro* is sometimes attached to a proclitic but otherwise begins the stressed portion of the verbal complex. Moreover, examples like *fo-t:r’-a-c†bus* ‘I have left thee’ (Wb. 31b1) vs. *ar-na:fa-r†cab†tis* ‘lest they be left’ (31d13), apparently reflecting *fo-**ro**-ad-gab-*, conform fully to the rules of neither ‘fixed’/ ‘preverbal’ nor ‘movable’ *ro* and are ascribed by *VKG* to a tendency to insert *ro* between the first lexical preverb and remaining lexical elements that had come to be felt as indivisible. If so, it seems strange that this applies only to a few verbs with a couple of lexical preverbs and not to the vast majority. Indeed, even in manifest cases of secondary composition (1.1 above), the norm seems to be to follow the pattern of augmentation already existing in the base compound, as in *con:toí* ‘converts’ = Lat. *con-vertit* (base *do:soí, -toí* equated with Lat. *vertit* ‘turns’) with augm. pret. 3sg. *con:toroe* ‘converted’ (cf. *do:roí* ‘(has) turned’). The peculiar augmentation of *im:dí-ben* ‘circumcises’ = Lat. *circum-cidit* (base *do:ben, -dí-ben* equated with Lat. *caedit* ‘cuts’) seen in *imme:rui-d†bed* ‘who had been circumcised’ vs. *ní-ro:im†dibed* ‘had not been circumcised’ (both Wb. 18d9) looks at first sight like an exceptional instance of the process posited by *VKG*. In this case, however, the base *do:ben, -díben* used non-productive *com* as augment and so provided no pattern for the insertion of productive *ro* into the new compound derived from it. That being so, it would seem natural enough to place *ro* between the first lexical preverb *imm* and a base *-díben* taken as equivalent to the Latin simplex *caedit.*

2.4. Problems such as the foregoing suggest the need for a better motivated and more generally applicable explanation of the quite plentiful instances of *ro*’s failure to conform to ‘fixed’ or preverbal behaviour (see *EIV* 149-157) as defined in 2.3 above, namely placement after any lexical preverb except *com, uss* or *ne*, if present and not the first preverb in the lexical chain (impossible for *ne* and nearly so for *uss*; see 1.3a/b above). Since preverbal *ro* not infrequently caused major modifications of compound verb forms (e.g., 3pl. pret. *do:sluind†set, -dí-l†tiset* ‘denied’ vs. augm. *do:rí-l†tiset, -de-r†-lind†set* ‘have denied’, 3sg. subj. *do:aid†lea* ‘let visit’ vs. augm *do:ái-r-†lea* ‘may visit’, 3sg. pret. *for:cechain* ‘instructed’ vs. augm. *for:ro-íchain* ‘has instructed’ or *do:int-ai* ‘turned’ vs. augm. *do:int-arr-ai* ‘has turned’), a quest for some means of ameliorating such inconveniences would be easy to understand.

What may be termed ‘prevocalic’ *ro* can be defined for present purposes as standing in the stressed portion of the verb directly before a vowel-initial preverb that preverbal *ro* would be expected to follow, as in augm. pret. 3pl. *as:r-in-gabsat, -r-es-n-gabsat* ‘have exceeded’ (*EIV* 149-154). It is, then, usually prefixed in a predictably elided form to the tonic portion of a verbal complex that would begin with a vowel if unaugmented, further examples from Wb. including deuterotonic *do:r’-a-cart*†*mar* ‘we have argued’ *(to:**r**’-ad-gar-*, 3sg. pres. *do:a-cair*) and *do:r’-air-*†*n-gert* ‘has promised’ (*to:**r**’-ar(e)-in-gar-*, as opposed to the preverbal type in *do:ar-r*†*-chet* ‘has been prophesied’ reflecting *to-ar(e)-**ro**-can-*).

The innovatory nature of this pattern is particularly evident where it is in competition with already illustrated preverbal augmented forms. Sometimes prevocalic *ro* seems to have failed to make inroads upon preverbal *ro* even where conditions were conducive to its development, as in the 3sg. augm. pret. pass. *do:á-r*†*-bas* ‘has been shown’ of *do:ad-bat* ‘shows’, *do:ar-r*†*-chet* ‘has been prophesied’ of *do:air-chain* ‘prophesies’ and so on. On other occasions, the Glosses supply attestations of the preverbal alongside the prevocalic type of *ro* in conditions favourable to the latter, e.g. augm. subj. 2sg. *-im*†*-fo-r*†*-lainge* ‘thou mayest cause’ *(-imb(e)-fo-**ro**-long-)* etc. vs. isolated 1sg. *-r-im*†*-fo-l*†*ngar* ‘I may cause’ (*:**r**’-imb(e)-fo-long-*; *im:fo-l*†*ngi*), augm. pret. 3sg. *do:a-r*†*-chiúir* vs. *do:r’-ad*†*-chiúir* ‘has redeemed’ *(do:aith-chren), do:int-arr-ai* vs. *do:r’-int-ai* ‘has returned’ *(do:int-ai).* Prevocalic *ro* can even replace *com* (2.1 above), as in augm. pret. pass. 3sg. *do:rr’-ind-*†*nacht* (Wb. 20d15) vs. normal *do:é-com-*†*nacht* ‘has been bestowed’ *(do:ind-*†*naig)* and 3pl. prot. *-r’-es-arta* vs. deut. *as:com-arta* ‘have been smitten’ *(as:oirc).* Indeed, this expansion of prevocalic *ro* where the stressed part of a compound verb began with a vowel presumably explains the restriction of *ad* as augment to verbs with *com* as first lexical preverb followed by a consonant (2.1 above): where a vowel followed, it had already been replaced by prevocalic *ro* to yield OIr. *con:r’-air-leic* ‘has allowed, *(con:air*†*-leici), con-id:r’eirb* ‘(when) he had entrusted himself’ *(con:erbai)* etc. Because prevocalic (unlike preverbal) *ro* did not occupy the same position in the chain as the lexical preverb *ro,* it could be pressed into service to give *ro*-compounds with a vowel-initial tonic portion a previously lacking (see 2.1) distinctive augmented form: e.g., 3sg. (formally unaugmented) pret. deut. *as:ro-choíli* ‘has determined’ (Wb. 10b20, referring to *indicavit*) but augm. pret. prot. *dia-nd:r’-e-r*†*-choíl* ‘to whom he has decreed it’ (Ml. 46c7, *ess-ro-coí1-*). In the case of *ind:á-r*†*ban* ‘banishes’ *(in(de)-ad-ro-uss-be(n)-)* both deut. and prot. forms could accommodate prevocalic *ro* as augment, whence 3sg. augm. pret. *a-ta:r’-á-r*†*-bi* ‘has banished them’ and similar forms in Ml. as well as *na-chim:r’-ind-a-r*†*-pai* ‘that he has not banished me’ in Wb. However, not many *ro*-compounds were partially or totally compatible with prevocalic augment *ro,* and sometimes even forms which were did not develop it: e.g., consistent (formally

unaugmented) pret. 3pl. *as:roi-†lliset, -á-r†-il†set* ‘have earned’ etc. *(ad-ro-sli-)* in the Glosses notwithstanding vowel-initial prototonic forms.

Compounds with first and second lexical preverbs beginning with a vowel were unusual in being compatible with prevocalic *ro* in both deuterotonic and prototonic forms, as *as:r’-ingab* vs. *-r’-es-n-gab* and *ind:r’-á-r-pai* vs. *-r’-ind-a-r-pai* or the like above show. These apparently classic instances of ‘movable’ *ro* are, however, just as amenable to explanation in terms of prevocalic usage as defined above. In the more frequent instances where only one of these preverbs was vowel-initial either the deuterotonic or the prototonic form (but not both) might prefix an augment *r’-* to the stressed portion, as in the case of augm. pret. 1pl. *do:**r’**-a-cart †mar* vs. 3sg. *-t’-a-**r**†-gart* (*to-ad-gar-*, *do:a-ccair* ‘pleads’; see above for further examples). Such alternations do not, of course, conform to the rules for ‘movable’ *ro* but can be accounted for neatly as part of a tendency to introduce prevocalic *ro* where possible. The same explanation can then be applied straightforwardly to cases like augm. (preverbal) 3sg. subj. *eter:ro-sc†ra* vs. augm. (prevocalic) 3sg. pret. *-r’-etar-scar*, or augm. pret. 1sg. *in:rúa-lad* (unaugm. 3sg. *in:o-laid*; *in(de)-**ro**-uss-tég-)* vs. 2sg. *-r’-ind-úa-lad* with preverbal and prevocalic (but note the telltale *-úa-*) *ro* respectively, although these appear at first sight to be good examples of ‘movable’ *ro*.

A major weakness of the vague ‘movable’ theory is its failure to account for the consistency with which alternations of this type within the tonic portion of the verb involve unaugmented counterparts with an initial vowel. The serious formal repercussions of preverbal augmentation upon compound verbs illustrated above provide an obvious motive for the rise of prevocalic *ro* under suitable conditions at the expense of preverbal augments, since the rule for the derivation of such augmented forms from their unaugmented counterparts was simplicity itself, namely the prefixing of elided *r’-* to an initial stressed vowel without further knock-on effects such as syncope. Typical synchronically straightforward processes of this type are OIr. 3sg. pret. unaugm. *do:int-ai* > augm. *do:r’-int-ai* (encroaching upon *do:int-arr-ai*), unaugm. *do:ind-†nacht* > augm. *do:r’-ind-† nacht* (encroaching upon *do:é-com-†nacht*), unaugm. *do:a-cart* > augm. *do:r’-a-cart* (ousting *do:á-r†-gart*), unaugm. *as:in-gab, -es-†ngab* > augm. *as:r’-in-gab, -r’-es-†n-gab* (replacing putative **as:é-r†-gab, *-es-†-ra-gab*) and so on.

The admittedly incomplete thrust towards synchronic simplification of the system is obvious, and prevocalic *ro* remains within the broadest parameters of preverbal augmentation of compound verbs by virtue of invariably staying in the tonic portion of the verbal complex. That said, its placement before the first lexical preverb in prototonic forms like *-r’-etar-scar* breaches a major positional constraint upon strictly preverbal augments (see 2.3 above).

A few verbs such as *do:é-ci* ‘looks at’, *fo:á-caib* ‘leaves’, *do:é-rig* ‘foresakes’ and *do:e-c†m-alla* ‘collects’ with deuterotonic forms conducive to standard prevocalic *ro* seem to retain the same sequence anomalously in prototonic forms that do not begin with a vowel: e.g., deuterotonic augm. pret. 3pl. *do:r’-é-catar* (*-c-* for *-c(h)†ch-* by syncope and delenition) or *do:r’-é-cach†tar* (reduplication restored on analogy of prot. forms below), 1sg. *fo:r’-á-c†bus,* 2pl. *do:r’-é-rachtid*, 3pl. *do:r’-e-c†m-all†-sat* vs. prototonic augm. pret. 3sg. *-de-r†-cachae,* subj. 2sg. (dep.) *-de-r†-caither* (with *-derc-* implying *-de-**r**’-in-ci-* rather than *-der†ch-* reflecting *-d’-in-**ro**-ci-*), augm. past subj. 3pl. *-fa-r†-cab†tis* (implying *-fo-**r**’-ad-ga(i)b-* rather than *-f’-ad-**ro**-gab-* expected to yield **-f-á-r†-ga(i)b-*), augm. pret. 3pl. *-de-r’-e-rachtatar* rather than putative **-d-é-r†-racht-* (*d’-ess-**ro**-reg-*), augm. pret. 1sg. *-ta-r-com-†lus* implying *-to-**r**’-ess-com-ell-*. In the case of *do:rúa-rid (de-**ro**-uss-reth-), -de-rúa-rid,* the prototonic form has presumably been modelled on the deuterotonic to avoid the obfuscatory effects of syncope, and there is no difficulty in positing a similar relationship between *do:r-é-racht(-)* and *-de-r-e-racht(-)*. The prototonic forms of the others can likewise be ascribed to the influence of deuterotonic forms that had developed prevocalic *ro* in the normal way. In essence, it was simply a matter of substituting unlenited c = /g/ of the prevocalically augmented deuterotonic forms for lenited *ch* or *g* of the once preverbally augmented prototonic counterparts, the upshot being greater synchronic similarity. Since these apparent exceptions to the rule are almost certainly due to late analogical developments, there remains no obstacle to the view that the prevocalic augment *r’* originally came into being at the head of the otherwise vowel-initial stressed parts of compound verb forms for the simple and adequate reason that the elision of its vowel conveniently precluded any further formal complications in relation to corresponding unaugmented forms.

However, prevocalic *ro* could hardly operate beyond this quite limited environment and a more generally applicable strategy seems to have provided by a development in the augmentation of dependent simple verbs. Basically, the possibility of taking the augment of independent *ro:an, ro:gab* etc. as either a conjunct particle or a preverb seems to have triggered a drift away from prototonic *ní:rr-an†sam* ‘we have not remained’, *co:ra-g†baiset* ‘until they had taken’ etc. with typical preverbal patterns towards new and more synchronically straightforward (e.g. in relation to unaugm. *co:ngabsat*) proclitic structures like *co-rru:anat* ‘that they may remain’ or *ní-ro:gab†sam* ‘we have not taken’ in which *ro* behaved like a conjunct particle rather than a preverb (see *EIV* 129-130). At all events, this innovatory ‘proclitic’ *ro* attached to conjunct particles (*EIV* 154-5) shared with the prevocalic type described above the advantage of minimizing the formal consequences of augmentation upon the stressed part of the verb but could be applied over a significantly wider range.

Proclitic augmentation of dependent compound verbs frequently coexists with other dependent or independent patterns of the same verb. Thus augm. pret. 3sg. *in:r-etar-scar* vs. *in-ru:etar-scar* '(whether) it had departed' with prevocalic and proclitic *ro* respectively in one and the same gloss (Ml. 91c1), augm. (preverbal) subj. 3sg. *man[i]:é-r†-la* 'if he abscond not' (*CIH* 2011.14, *ess-**ro**-lu-*, pres. *as:luí*) vs. (proclitic) *ní-ro:hé-la* 'may he not escape' (Wb. 30a10), augm. (preverbal) pret. 3sg. *ní-m:tho-r†-gaíth* 'has not deceived me' (Ml. 38a13, *to-**ro**-gaíth-, do:gáetha*) vs. (proclitic) 1pl. *ní-ro:tho-gaít†sam* 'we have not deceived' (16a22). Addition of independent forms to the picture yields a third variant, augm. (preverbal) subj. 3sg. *eter:ro-sc†ra* 'he should separate', in the first set above as well as further alternations such as augm. pret. 3pl. (prevocalic) *fri-t:r-a-catar* 'had hoped for it' vs. (proclitic) *ní-ru:fres-†cach†tar* 'have not expected' (Ml. 131c10 & 26b25, *fris:a-cci*) and 2sg. (prevocalic) *con-id:r-air-leicis* '(than) thou hast permitted it' vs. (proclitic with remarkable insertion of *ro* into the composite infixed pronoun) *i-nda-ro-n:com-ar-lecis* 'into which thou hast let us' (Ml. 87a8 and 77d6; *con:air†-leici*). The last two sets opposing deuterotonic forms with prevocalic augment to prototonic ones with initial consonant and proclitic *ro* are particularly interesting because they show how the emergence of the latter type made it possible to dispense completely with the complexities of preverbal augmentation where only the deuterotonic unaugmented set began with a vowel.

The synchronically straightforward generation of augmented from corresponding unaugmented forms had now become possible for dependent prototonic compound verbs of any shape on account of the rise of proclitic *ro*, prevocalic *ro* being available in a similar function for independent deuterotonic forms with a vowel-initial stressed portion. However, where the tonic portion of deuterotonic forms began with a consonant, there was still no viable alternative to the formal intricacies of the preverbal augment. An obvious solution was to attach *ro* to the proclitic preverb in such cases by extension of the above rule allowing *ro* to be joined in proclisis to a conjunct particle (*EIV* 155-7). Most instances of this phenomenon in the Glosses involve the shift of *ro* from stressed second position in the preverb chain dictated by the rules of preverbal augmentation to proclitic second position as an attachment of the pretonic preverb: e.g., augm. pret. 3sg. (prevb.) *do-d:ro-lluind* (Tur. 118) 'which had denied him', 3pl. *do:rí-l†tisset* (Wb. 5c11, *rí-* for *ro-* on model of unaugm. prot. *-díl†t-*, cf. 2.5 above) 'they have denied' vs. 3sg. (procl.) *du-ru:sluind* (Ml. 93c8) '(when) he had denied', 3pl. *do-ru:sluind†set* (90b17) 'they had denied'. Its formal advantages in relation to unaugmented forms such as pret. 3sg. *do:sluind*, 3pl. *do:sluind†set* are obvious. Whether attached to a conjunct particle or a pretonic preverb, proclitic *ro*'s only formal impact upon a following stressed form was the trivial enough one of initial lenition. Although it is not always possible to distinguish proclitic from preverbal *ro* owing to Old Irish orthographic conventions, there are sufficient unambiguous instances to indicate

that its use with compounds liable to a preverbal augment in second position was a good deal more frequent than *GOI* 339 implies: e.g., augm. pret. 3sg. *ad-ro:neestar* (Wb. 4c25, *in(de)-**ro**-ne-sed-*; pres. *ind:ne-at*) 'he has endured', 1sg. *ar-ro-t: neithius* (Ml. 46b2, *ar(e)-**ro**-ne-sed-*; *ar:ne-at*) 'I have awaited thee', 3sg. *ar-ro:bert* (Wb. 29d23; *ar:berta*) 'he has designed', 1pl. pass. *do-ro-n:donad* (Wb. 16b17; *do:dona*) 'we have been comforted', 1pl. *for-ro:gel†sam* (Wb. 25d 20; *for:gella*) 'which we have testified', 1sg. pass. *for-ru-m:chennad* (Ml. 127c10; *for-cenna*) 'I have been finished off', and 3sg. *ad-ru:choisséni* (Ml. 69d 4, *ad-**ro**-com-sni-*; *ad:co-snai*) 'had striven'. Augm. pret. 3sg. (proclitic) *co-ru:thoí* (Ml. 55c22; *con:toí*) 'has converted' (contrasting with more normal preverbal *con:to-roe* at Ml. 123b7,; com-to-**ro**-so-) is a sporadic instance where the shift from preverbal to proclitic *ro* in a deuterotonic compound actually involved a change of position in the preverb chain in Old Irish.

Since proclitic *ro* inevitably occupies second place in the frame of the verbal complex and the same position is likewise central to prevocalic *ro*, 'movable' *ro* (see 2.3 above) seems at first sight to be involved wherever both deuterotonic and prototonic forms of a verb are augmented by prevocalic *ro,* proclitic *ro* or any viable combination of the two. However, the postulate of prevocalic and proclitic *ro* has considerably greater explanatory power as regards not only fluctuations between proclisis of *ro* and its placement in the tonic portion but also alternations such as (preverbal, second in the chain) *do:rí-l†tisset* vs. (proclitic) *do-ru:sluind†set*, the apparent conformity of which to Thurneysen's definition of 'movable' *ro* is belied by prototonic augm. subj. 1sg. (prevb.) *-de-r†-lind* (Wb. 10c14) 'I may deny'.

Like prevocalic *ro* above, proclitic *ro* showed some tendency to encroach upon rarer preverbal augments like *com* as well as upon *ro,* and also had some capacity to supply compounds containing *ro* as a lexical preverb with distinct augmented forms that they had originally lacked. Thus augm. pret. 3sg. *for-t:[c]hu-i* (Ml. 33a18) 'has completed it' shows the original *com*-augmentation of *for:fen* (see 2.3), but in *for-ru:chu-i* (121c24) 'has completed' proclitic *ro* has been added as a more easily recognised augment. Formally unaugm. pret. 3pl. *do:ro-choínset* (Ml. 131c9, *de-ro-coín-*, pres. *do:ro-choíni*) 'they had despaired' vs. augm. pret. 3sg. *ní-ru:de-r†choín* (44a1) 'he did not despair' is an example of proclitic *ro* supplying a *ro*-compound with an augment for part of its forms at least.

2.5. As adherents of 'movable' *ro* or the like also concede (see 2.3 above), it is evident that the only type of *ro* inherited into Irish as an augment was the one termed 'fixed' or 'preverbal' and that the rise of the divergent patterns designated 'prevocalic' and 'proclitic' in 2.4 above was due to quite recent prehistoric developments that continued to gather pace during the Old Irish period itself. That being so, the principal Insular Celtic augments (*ro* as well as rarer *ad* and *kom*) were

originally normal preverbs not only in form but also, apart from the rule prohibiting their occurrence at the head of a sequence of preverbs (see 2.3 above), in basic behaviour. It remains to consider how this positional constraint may have come about in the context of the augment's shift from lexical to grammatical function as a marker first of perfectivity and then of resultativity ('perfect') or potentiality (2.1-2 above).

Building upon *GOI*'s tentative suggestion regarding *uss-* as augment cited in 2.1 above, Russell (1988, 125-6) 'would argue that the perfective force of this preverb was originally far more widespread but has been lexicalized in a wide range of verbs. The idea of perfectivity, of pairs of 'telic' and 'atelic' verbs has recently undergone detailed analysis and discussion from McCone [*EIV* 119-36]. He draws attention to the capability of certain preverbs, notably *ro* and *com*, of making an atelic verb telic, and in particular how some verbs contained preverbs in 'a lexicalised telic function'. This is precisely the function which **ut-s* seems to have had: in the following pairs there is a regular semantic shift from an atelic to a telic verb marked by the addition of the preverb **ut-s*: *ber-* 'carry' : *ut(s)-ber-* 'bring' (modified by other preverbs), *la-* 'go' : *ut(s)-la-* 'reach' (modified by other preverbs), *li(n)-* 'fill' : *ut(s)-li(n)-* 'fill up, flood', *mel-* 'grind' : *ut(s)-mel-* 'consume', *nig-* 'wash': *ut(s)-nig-* 'cleanse', *saig-* 'keep' : *ut(s)-saig-* '?find, keep', *scuich-* 'move' : *ut(s)[-]scuich-* 'change', *sel-* 'move' : *ut(s)-sel-* 'fall', *tíag-* 'go' : *ut(s)-tíag-* 'reach' (modified by other preverbs). It seems likely that **ut-s* and possibly **uk-s* had both a spatial function and a function as a marker of perfectivity. The latter is detectable only in those compounds where it has become lexicalized; most other cases will have been lost due to the formal ineptness of the preverb'.

As intimated above (2.1-2), the origins of the Insular Celtic system of augmentation are clearly to be sought in the telic or perfective tendencies of certain preverbs and verbal roots. In the first, instance this was a lexically conditioned semantic component but eventually atelic or imperfective verbs came to be paired as a rule with a particular telic/perfective counterpart, a relationship still visible in examples such as OIr. (atelic/imperfective) *saigid* 'seeks' (*sag-*), *do:saig* 'makes for' (*to-sag-*) and (telic/perfective) *ro:saig* (*ro-sag-*) 'reaches', *do:ro-ig* 'reaches' (*to-ro-sag-*). Before the end of the Insular Celtic period the difference between the two (one preverb or rarely two, sometimes in combination with a different verbal root) had generally been grammaticalised in whole or part as an 'augment' denoting resultativity ('perfect') or potentiality, a role that had originated in the retrospective and prospective functions respectively of perfectivity but henceforth became increasingly independent of this aspectual conditioning (see 2.2. above). In this way *ro-sag-* and *to-ro-sag-* 'reach, attain' became resultative/potential counterparts of *sag-* and *to-sag-* 'seek' respectively as 'can seek, has sought' or the like while also retaining their aspectual distinctiveness as separate telic/perfective lexical items

meaning ‘reach, attain’. It seems, however, to have been more usual for the latter to have been lost in such cases. For instance, a similar constellation can be posited in relation to atelic/imperfective *bi(na)-* ‘cut, hack’, *de-bi(na)-* ‘cuts/hacks/takes away’ (OIr. *do:ben*) and *kom-bi(na)-* ‘cuts up, fashions’ (lit. ‘cuts together (in pieces)’, cf. Lat. *con-cidere* ‘cut up, dismember’ in relation to *caedere* ‘cut’; OIr. *con:ben* with well attested verbal noun *cumbae,* later *cumma(e)*), *de-kom-bi(na)-* ‘cuts off (in pieces)’) except that the fourth of these is only attested in Old Irish as the augmented counterpart (*do:cum-bi* ‘has taken away’) of *do:ben* and not as a separate lexical item too. One may further speculate that an arguably Insular Celtic opposition between atelic/imperfective *org-* ‘smite’ (OIr. *orgid* ‘smites, ravages, kills’) and telic/perfective *kom-org-* ‘smite together, crush, kill’ (OIr. *con:oirg*; cf. MW *dy-gyf-wrw* ‘destroy’ with *tu-kom-org-* according to *KPV* 499 and 502) underlies the opposition between unaugmented *org-* compounds such as OIr. *as:oirg* ‘cuts down’ (pret. *as:ort*) and augmented counterparts such as *as:com-art* ‘has cut down’ (see 2.1 above). A similar opposition, this time entailing suppletion as well as a preverb (*ro*), between atelic/imperfective *(to-)kor-* ‘puts, throws’ and *(to-)ro-la-* ‘puts/throws away’ might underlie OIr. 3sg. pret. *(do:)-corastar* ‘put, threw’ (pres. *(do:)-cuirethar*) vs. 3sg. augm. pret. *(do:)-ra-lae* ‘has put/thrown’, and so on.

Once the semantic distinction between an unaugmented and a corresponding augmented form had essentially become one of neutral or unmarked versus marked for resultative/potential, it would be natural enough for an augmented form to acquire atelic/imperfective meanings (e.g. OIr. *ro:siacht* ‘has sought’ as well as ‘(has) attained’) from an unaugmented counterpart and *vice versa* (e.g. OIr. *do:ben* ‘cuts from/off’ as well as ‘cuts away’) through semantic accommodation between the two as the opposition became increasingly grammaticalised. Such developments would inevitably blur original aspectual distinctions between an unaugmented verb and its augmented counterpart to a greater or lesser extent. Be that as it may, the processes envisaged in the previous paragraph raise the distinct possibility that placement of the augment in its oldest (preverbal) form after a minimum of one lexical preverb was due at least in part to the type of recomposition by accretion identified in 1.2-4 above as the major factor in the growth of multi-preverb compounds in Insular Celtic.

This, however, need not have been the only factor involved. Russell’s remarks on *uss* quoted earlier in this section might be taken to imply placement between certain preverbs and the root merely in order to perfectivise the action. While it is true that Rossiter (2004,154-161) counts some four to six instances each of the two-preverb sequences *ar(e)-uss-*, *com-uss-*, *dī-uss-*, *fo-uss-*, *in(d)-uss-* and *to-uss-*, the examples taken mostly from Russell’s treatment in 1.3b above indicate that accretive recomposition of earlier *uss*-V was responsible for at least some of these. Thus,

although it can hardly be disproved, there is no firm evidence to support the suggestion that an erstwhile major function of *uss* was as perfectivising augment. The fact is that, *pace* Thurneysen (see 2.1 above), the only definite instance of *uss* as an augment in the full sense is provided by 3sg. augm. pret. pass. *do:o-mlacht* 'has been milked' in relation to *mligid* 'milks', and here the most probable explanation is accretion with augm. *to-uss-mlig-* presumably reflecting *to-* + older *uss-mlig-* 'milk up' in the manner envisaged for various *uss* compounds in 1.3b above (cf. *in(d)-uss-mlig* underlying OIr. *in:o-mlig* 'mulcts').

Neverthless, there is something to be said for the idea that the semantic effect of attaching a preverb such as *ro* to certain other preverbs or prepositions might have included telic completion (see II.1.10-11 on ἐξ or πρό, the latter cognate with OIr. *ro*, as what may be termed the 'completive' final component of compound prepositions or preverbs in Homeric Greek). Significantly, the sequences **exs-ro-* and **de-ro-* (MW *dir-* < **dī-ro-*, thus implying Ins. Celt. **de/ī-ro-*) are attested in the substantival (> OIr. *ér-*, *der-* 'so, very, extremely', lit. 'out/from through' = 'right out/from' or 'beyond'; e.g. OIr. *der-már*, MW *diruawr* 'very great', OIr. *ér-adblam* 'very/so prone/ready') as well as in the verbal system: e.g., OIr. *-de-r-ban* 'hinders, prevents' (*de-ro-bi(na)-*), *do:ro-choíni, -de-r-choíni* 'despairs (of)' (*de-coin-*), *do:roi-mnethar, -de-r-mainethar* 'forgets' (*de-ro-man-*), *do:r-ó-scai, -de-r--scaigi* 'stands forth, excels, is preeminent' (*de-ro-uss-scoch-*), *as:ro-choili. -é-r-choili* 'defines, determines' (*ess-ro-co(i)l-*), *as;roi-nni, -é-r-nai* 'escapes' (*ess-ro-sni-*). The essentially completive telic function of *ro* in relation to the preceding preverb can be inferred with some plausibility from the contrast between *de-bi(na)-* 'cuts/takes away' (OIr. *do:ben* 'cuts/takes away (from), deprives of') and *de-ro-bi(na)-* 'takes right away (from), hinders, prevents from', *de-uss-scoch-* 'moves/gets up (from)' (OIr. *-díusc(h)i* 'wakes'; augm. pret. *-dersaig* etc. presumably remodelled in order to avoid ambiguity with pret. *-derscaig* etc. of *do:róscai*) but *de-ro-uss-soch-* 'gets/stands right up, stands out, excels'. A similar relationship between a since lost **de-coin-* 'deplores' (OIr. simple *coínid* 'laments') or **de-man-* 'thinks (away) from, neglects' and *de-ro-coin-* 'laments/deplores utterly, despairs (of)' or *de-ro-man-* 'neglects completely, forgets' seems quite conceivable, although in cases such as these or *ess-ro-sni-* 'struggles right out, escapes' in relation to simple *sni-* (OIr. *sniid* 'twists, struggles'; **as:sní* apparently unattested) it is also thinkable that an already combined *de-ro-* or *ess-ro* have been prefixed directly to a simple verb (cf. the remarks on Greek διᾰ-πρό etc. in II.1.10).

Be that as it may, it seems likely that a significant role in the creation of the Celtic or Insular Celtic system of augments was played the possibility of attaching a preverb such as telic *ro* to certain others such as *de* 'from' or *ess* 'out' in order to bring out the completed nature of the action implied. For instance, a *de-log-* (*log-* originally causative to the *leg-* underlying OIr. simple *laigid* 'lies')

originally meaning something like ‘lay aside, ignore’ might well have developed a completive counterpart *de-ro-log-* ‘lay aside completely, forgive’, which then predominated semantically as an unaugmented/augmented opposition between the two stems evolved (OIr. *do:lugi* ‘forgives’, augm. pres. *do:ro-lgi* ‘can forgive’, augm. *s*-pret. *do:ro-laig* ‘has forgiven’). Similarly, perhaps, *de-gni-* (OIr. *do:gní* ‘carries out, performs, does’; simple *gniid* ‘makes, performs, does’) and *de-ro-gni-* ‘carry out fully, complete’, which ultimately became the former’s augmented counterpart (see 2.2 above). Given its basic meaning ‘up to, as far as’, a similar function can be envisaged readily enough for *ad* in relation to *com* ‘together’: e.g., *bu(n)g-* ‘strikes, smites’ (OIr. *bongaid*), *com-bu(n)g-* ‘strikes together, breaks, crushes’ (OIr. *con:boing*) and *com-ad-bu(n)g-* ‘strikes right together, breaks/crushes completely’ (OIr. *con:a-bbaing* ‘can break’, augm. counterpart of *con:boing*). It is to be emphasised that, in the likely event that this and other similar collocations of *com* and *ad* were due to the latter’s completive tendencies in the first instance, their restriction in Old Irish to environments involving a following consonant must be due to a later formal constraint, the emergence of prevocalic *ro* being the obvious culprit (see 2.4 above).

Although many of the precise details are by now hardly recoverable, indications such as the foregoing provide a reasonable starting point for the development of certain preverbs, especially *ro,* with telic semantic tendencies originally belonging chiefly to the lexical sphere into grammatically conditioned augments which could never precede the first lexical preverb, whether this was unaccompanied or not by another lexical preverb (or very rarely by two such preverbs at this early stage; see 1.4 above). At all events, preverbs grammaticalised as augments were placed directly before either the verbal root itself or a strictly limited group of non-initial lexical preverbs (notably *ne*, *uss* and sometimes *com*) that were particularly prone to precede the root directly. Striking correspondences between Irish (I.1.5/9) and British (I.2.1c) leave little doubt (see 2.1 above) that the basic formal (notably inability to stand at the head of a sequence of preverbs) and functional (lexico-semantic telic > grammaticalised perfective > resultative or potential) features of this system had been fully established by the end of the Insular Celtic period (see III.3.1-3) at latest. That being so, simple verbs and lexical compounds with one (apparently quite common) or more (sometimes two, rarely three) preverbs (1.4 above) could already be converted by the addition of a further grammatically conditioned preverb appropriately termed ‘augment’ into single-preverb compounds and into two-, three- or (rarely) four-preverb units respectively with resultative/potential meaning in Common Insular Celtic.

There remains the possibility that these basic formal and (as far as the pairing of perfective with imperfective stems at least) grammatical aspects of the system had been developed still earlier at a Gallo-Insular or even Proto-Celtic stage. As has

been seen (1.5 above), *tomezeclai* on the Voltino bilingual has been interpreted as Gaulish *to-me-d(e)-ec-lai* with two lexical preverbs (*to-de-*) plus a perfective or resultative augment *ek(s).* However, this speculation must be regarded as quite uncertain. The only secure Continental Celtic example of a verbal form containing *ro* to date is Celtiberian *ro-biseti* in a relative clause dependent upon a main clause with a probably 3sg. ipf. verb *tatuz* 'let him give' (Meid, 1993, 117-8) on the first Botorrita inscription. Meid (1993, 107-8) makes the plausible suggestion that this is a *-se/o-* modal with potential or perhaps resultative *ro* (i.e. an augment) but a lexical compound containing *ro* as a normal preverb can hardly be ruled out. The matter must be left open on present evidence, but as yet there is no compelling reason to postulate a pre-Insular Celtic date either for the systematic exploitation of their precursors' perfectivising tendencies or for the subsequent evolution of resultative/ potential augments. It goes without saying that, in the event of both or just the second of these developments being confined to Insular Celtic, we may add them/it to the emergence of a clause-initial verbal complex in general and of an opposition between absolute and conjunct inflection in particular (III.2.1-3.3) as a further major modification of the verbal system dating to that highly significant evolutionary phase.

3.1. It has been argued in chapter III that the differentiation of absolute from conjunct endings in Insular Celtic can be accounted for quite easily without recourse to a highly problematical particle. That leaves the by now familiar associated problem of various apparent irregularities affecting pretonic preverbs. Earlier treatments of this question (McCone, 1979c, 1982 and 1985b) relied upon an already discussed rule (II.2.4/3.3b) restricting enclitics to placement after a part of the verbal complex as a prelude to a series of shifts in word order. Cowgill (1985, 110-111) objected to '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)'. It seems only fair to point out that the posited restriction on enclitic placement can be justified in the same way as a particle **es* or the like, for which there is likewise no direct evidence, namely in terms of its applicability to a range of otherwise intractable problems. That said, there are good grounds of economy for preferring an explanation that does not depend upon such supplementary hypotheses, although they are not necessarily excluded thereby. In the case of the absolute/conjunct dichotomy dealt with in the previous chapter, it was argued that an adequate explanation could be advanced on the basis of no more than an inherited restriction (conditioned by a generally

acknowledged initial slot for topic/focus and Wackernagel's uncontroversial law governing enclitic placement) of simple verbs followed by an enclitic to clause-initial position, combined with a demonstrable tendency (seen clearly, for instance, in OIr. *beirthi* 'bears it' < **ber´eθ´i* < **bereθi(y)-e* < **beretiy-e(d)* versus *beirid* 'bears' < **ber´eθ´* < **bereθi* < **bereti*) for a word plus attached enclitic(s) to behave as a single unit (III.1.4-6). A similar approach will now be applied to the problems associated with deuterotonic compound verbs.

After the presumed univerbation in or perhaps even before Insular Celtic (see II.2.4), compound verbs with attached enclitic(s) were restricted by Wackernagel's Law to clause-initial position as #PE(P)V...# corresponding to 'absolute' #V**i*E...# in the case of many forms of simple verbs. There is no obvious objection to placing the introduction of regular word-initial stress at least as far back as Insular Celtic. For this purpose a conjunct particle (such as the negative) and associated verb, whether simple or compound, must have been treated as two separately stressed words until the first of these became proclitic as part of a more general Insular Celtic process affecting syntagms such as preposition plus head noun or copula plus predicate (I.3.6 and II.2.1): e.g., simple **béret*(-*i*-E) and **nī́s*(-E) *béret* > **nīh*(-E)*:béret* (> OIr. *ní*(-E)*:beir* 'does not bear' or compound **tó-βeret, t'-áre-βeret* and **nī́s*(-E) *tó-βeret, *nī́s*(-E) *t'-áre-βeret* > **nīh*(-E)*:tó-βeret, *nīh:t'-áre-βeret* > OIr. *ní*(-E)*:tabir* 'does not give/bring', *ní*(-E)*:tairbir* 'does not bend'. The usual result in the case of compound verbs, then, will have been a so-called 'prototonic' pattern with stress on the first preverb, but it seems legitimate to postulate that both the first preverb and the following (further preverb(s) plus) verb retained their stress when separated by one or more enclitics, the upshot being (exclusively initial on account of Wackernagel's Law) **tó*-E *béret* or **tó*-E *áre-βeret* versus fully 'univerbated' **tó-βeret* and **t'-áre-βeret* otherwise.

A good typological parallel for this scenario is provided by the most widespread type of future in Romance languages, namely the one based on a Vulgar Latin periphrasis of the type *cantare habeo* '(I have to sing,) I am going to sing' consisting of stressed infinitive plus stressed auxiliary finite verb. This must have undergone univerbation to an indivisible single form with a single accent at a relatively early stage when the classical Latin quantity system was still in operation (Lausberg, 1972, 228-31). However, in Old Provençal, in Old Spanish and in Portuguese a clitic object pronoun was inserted between infinitive and auxiliary (Lausberg, 1972, 231). Crucially, accentual 'univerbation' was then impeded as in the case of the still surviving Portuguese contrast between 1, 2 and 3sg. *comprarei, comprarás, comprará* 'I, you, (s)he will buy' with stress on the personal ending (the erstwhile auxiliary) in the absence of a pronominal infix and corresponding *comprá-lo-hei* 'I will buy it', *comprar-mo-ás* 'you will buy me (*m(e)*) it (*l)o*)', *comprá-lo-á* '(s)he will buy it' with pronominal infix(es) and a binary stress pattern encompassing the

infinitive *-a(r)* as well as the personal ending (as can be most clearly seen in the third example, failure to indicate an accent on personal ending and infinitive respectively in the first two being due solely to spelling rules; see Cook, 1987, 112, 117-9 and 152; Tyson-Ward, 2003, 99-104).

As in the case of the simple verb (III.1.4), even in the absence of plausible functional motivation there would be adequate grounds for homogenising the clause-initial forms of compound verbs in favour of the double stress pattern (> deuterotonic by operation of the aforementioned Insular Celtic proclisis rule) inherited in conjunction with an enclitic (E). Indeed, as indicated above, in this instance a particularly obvious formal trigger will have been provided by the stress pattern of an initial verbal complex containing a conjunct particle such as the negative according to the following straightforward analogical proportion: **nī́h*-E*:béret* : **nī́h:béret* = **tó*-E*:béret* : x (x = **tó:béret*) or alternatively **nī́h*-E*:tó-βeret* : **nī́h:tó-βeret* = **tó*-E*:áre-βeret* : x (x = **tó:áre-βeret*) and so on. Subsequently the initial forms will regularly have become 'deuterotonic' **to*(-E)*:béret* or **to*(-E)*:áre-βeret* (like **nīh*(-E)*:béret* or **nīh*(-E)*:tó-βeret*) on account of the proclisis rule. The regular Early Old Irish outcome of these analogically created forms will have been deuterotonic *to:beir* and *to:airbir*, whence standard Old Irish independent deuterotonic *do:beir* but, as a result of the elision discussed in II.3.4.1, prototonic *tairbir* alongside deuterotonic *do:airbir*, the latter having not infrequently been restored as the independent counterpart of *-tairbir* on the analogy of the pattern prevailing with *do:beir*, *-tabair* etc. (McCone, 1979c, 8-9).

That said, it is worth considering a plausible scenario capable of providing a firm historical foundation for Isaac's (2001, 162) intrinsically reasonable claim (III.1.6.4) that 'deuterotonic forms can be be considered just as marked in opposition to the prototonic as the absolute forms in opposition to the conjunct'. To begin with, double-stressed clause-initial combinations such as **tó*-E *béret* or **tó*-E *áre-βeret* above would have been 'emphatic' or marked for topic/focus in relation to 'non-emphatic' or unmarked single-stressed non-initial **tó-βeret* or **t'-áre-βeret* and so on in much the same way as a simple verb would have opposed 'emphatic' initial **béreti*-E to 'non-emphatic' non-initial **béret* (see III.1.6.4). This parallellism would have extended to the existence of a single-stressed emphatic initial **tó-βeret* or **t'-áre-βeret* like emphatic initial simple **béret* without attached enclitic. In the case of the latter it was argued that the distinctive emphatic form **béreti-* originally used with a following enclitic was generalised in clause-initial position to yield a clear-cut opposition between emphatic #**bereti*(E)...# and non-emphatic #.(E)(..)**beret*(..)#. Application of the same principle to compound verbs would have entailed general emphatic initial double-stressed #**tó*(E) *béret*.(..)# or #**tó*(E) *áre-βeret*.(..)# versus single-stressed non-emphatic #.(E)(..)**tó-βeret*.(..)# or #.(E)(..)**t'-áre-βeret*.(..)#. Consequently, all that we need

to suppose is that, just as in the case of the 'absolute' endings of simple verbs, the specifically initial double-stressed (> deuterotonic) compound form that originated with an enclitic infix came to be generalised in that position even when no infix was present.

In such a system the (stressed > proclitic) first preverb would have been in initial topic/focus position but would have been displaced from this slot by a conjunct particle such as the negative and various interrogative elements or an anaphoric element such as **nu* prone to supply the focus or topic of a sentence (see II.2.4, including the Basque and Hungarian parallels presented there). A typologically comparable situation is found in Hungarian, where a so-called '**coverb**' (the functional equivalent of a preverb) is relegated by a negative, interrogative or other focus element from a position directly in front of the VERB to one directly after it: e.g., ***be****MEGYEK a szobába* 'I AM GOING **in**to the room' but *nem MEGYEK* ***be*** *a szobába* 'I AM not GOING **in**to the room' or ***fel****MEGY a hegyre* '(S)HE IS GOING **up** the mountain' but *ki MEGY* ***fel*** *a hegyre?* 'who IS GOING **up** the mountain' (Rounds and Sólyom, 2002, 127-8). The difference between this system and the one posited for Insular Celtic is essentially trivial. In Hungarian focus is indicated by placement directly before the verb (see II.2.4), thus necessitating relegation of a coverb from preverbal to postverbal position. By contrast, the Indo-European practice presumably inherited into Insular Celtic entailed clause-initial position for topic/focus with the result that a preverb displaced from this could be allowed to remain in front of the verb itself.

3.2. It remains to consider the absence of lenition after verb-final proclitic preverbs in the light of the account in the preceding section. The first point to bear in mind is that even as early as Insular Celtic a vowel could on occasion be followed by an unlenited or geminated rather than a lenited consonant, one relevant cause of this being Proto-Celtic assimilation of intervocalic *-sm-*, *-sn-* and *-rs-* to *-mm-*, *-nn-* and *-rr-* respectively (*RChron.* 45-6).

The following are the basic enclitic object pronouns of Old Irish and British as represented by Middle Welsh: 1sg. OIr. *-m(m)* < **mu* (for **me* under influence of 2sg.), MW *-m* (< **me* or **mu*), 2sg. OIr. *-t*, MW *-th* < **tu*, 3sg. m(/n) OIr. *-a*, MW *-e/-y* < **en(/*e(d))*, 3sg. f. OIr./MW *-s* < **sīm*, 1pl. OIr. *-n(n)*, MW *-n* < **snos*, 2pl. OIr. *-b*, MW *-ch* < **hweh* < **swes*, 3pl. OIr./MW *-s* < **sūs*. It is to be assumed that the 1pl. and 2pl. enclitics had the same initial consonant group as the corresponding independent pronouns OIr. *sní* and *sí* (< **sw_*; see 4.3 below). In British the original distinction between 3sg. *-e/-y* and *-s* has been lost with the result that in Middle Welsh the former functions as a general 3sg. and pl. pronoun in certain environments and the latter in certain others (see *GMW* 55-7). The most striking feature of this list is that all consonant-initial forms apart from the 2pl. are

invariably unlenited, whereas the 2pl. is invariably lenited, the obvious inference being that a single basic set had been established in Insular Celtic, regardless of whether the context was leniting or not.

The table below presents the presumed regular outcomes of the above preforms in various environments after Insular Celtic lenition of *m* and *s*. Bold italics denote those forms that yield the attested forms regularly and it is to be noted that different reflexes in Irish and British indicate that lenition of voiceless stops such as *t* did not take place until a later stage than that of the voiced stops and *s* (*RChron.* 81-92). It is to be presumed that, as an erstwhile copula form, neg. *nīh* (in place of **ne* - see above) employed those pronominal forms inherited in its original function except in the 3sg. m./n. **nīn/*nī_* < **nēm/*nēd* < **ne-em/*ne-ed* as these already had long *ī*.

(suffixed)	1sg.	2sg.	3gs. m./n./f.	1pl.	2pl.	3pl.
**bereti-*	*-μu*	*-tu*	***-en/-e/****-hin*	***-nnoh***	***-hwih***	*-huh*
(infixed A)						
**wo*	*-μu*	*-tu*	***-en/-e/****-hin*	***-nnoh***	***-hwih***	*-huh*
**ex(s)*	*[eγ]****-mu***	*[ex]****-tu***	*[exs]****-en/-e/-(s)in***	*[eγ]****-noh***	*[exs]-(s)wih*	*[exs]****-(s)uh***
**wor*	***-mu***	***-tu***	***-en/-e/****-rin*	***-noh***	*-(r)wih*	*-ruh*
**nī(h)*	***-mmu***	*-ssu*	***nīn/nī/****nī****-ssin***	***-nnoh***	***-hwih***	***-ssuh***
(infixed B)						
**eγ/wor-de-*	*-μu*	*-tu*	***-en/-e/-hin***	***-nnoh***	***-hwih***	***-huh***
(infixed C)						
**wo-ðe*	*-μu*	*-tu*	***-en/-e/-hin***	***-nnoh***	***-hwih***	***-huh***

It is immediately apparent that the negative (and possibly **nu(h)* and **ro(h)* too, if the hypothesis of Thurneysen and Sims-Williams in II.3.4.3 is accepted) scores particularly highly on the plausible assumption already made earlier in order to account for 3sg. neg. cop. **nīst* > **nīss* > **nīs* > **nīh* that tautosyllabic geminates were simplified before lenition of *s* to *h* to produce the second plural sequence **nīss/wis* > **nīs/wis* > **nīhwih* (cf. Boling, 1972, 87, and Kortlandt, 1979, 36). The score rises to one hundred percent in view of the almost inevitable replacement of anomalous and weakly characterised 2sg. **-ssu* by a **-ttu* based upon the **-tu* appearing elsewhere according to the proportion 1sg. *-m/μu* : 2sg. *-tu* = 1sg. *nī-mmu* : 2sg. *n*-x (x = *-ttu*). The inherited geminate in 1pl. *-nnoh* after a vowel-final preverb as well as the negative could easily have triggered 1sg. *-mmu* in both too and then created the momentum for the spread of other unlenited or geminate forms from **nī* to **wo* and so on. Further spread of this homogeneous set of simple infixed forms to the suffixing system would then be quite natural and we thus arrive at the actually attested forms without a problematic particle. The ultimate preference for forms containing connective **de* after consonant-final preverbs such as **exs* and **wor* was obviously conditioned by their complex reflexes in direct contact with the enclitic

pronouns themselves. Their somewhat different structure enabled the precursors of the Old Irish class B and C to retain a lenited initial in the third singular feminine and the third plural but at some stage their first and second persons singular acquired an unlenited initial from class A

Even after a vowel-final preverb like **wo*, then, the initial of the pronoun was normally unlenited or even geminated (the latter feature probably tending to be lost in conjunction with the rise of lenition as a phonemically redundant feature) if a consonant and unmodified if a vowel. These patterns were naturally transferred to the anlaut of the following segment in the new double-stressed (> deuterotonic) forms without infix, particularly since the base initial of an independent simple verb or a prototonic compound verb (independent forms of the latter presumably still being in existence at this early stage) was an unlenited consonant (e.g. **béret(i)*, **tó-βeret*) or an unmodified vowel (e.g. **aget(i)* > OIr. *agid* 'leads', **ád-ellāt* > OIr. *-aidlea* 'visits'). Hence, say, new initial deuterotonic **to:(b)béret* (> OIr. *do:(b)beir* 'gives, brings'), **wo-ttlínat* (> OIr. *fo:tlen* 'removes'), **to:áre-βeret* (> OIr. *tairbir* 'bends' by elision) with the pretonic preverb displaying the mutation pattern applying to a relevant infixed pronoun such as *-(m)mu* in **to-(m)mu:βéret* (> OIr. *do-m(m):beir* 'brings me'), *-ttu* in **wo-ttu:tlínat* (> OIr. *fo-t:tlen* 'removes you'), **en* in **to-en:áre-βeret* (> OIr. *d-a:n-airbir* 'bends him') and so on

That not only takes care of the non-lenition of infixed pronouns apart from the 2pl. and of a following consonant-initial tonic portion of the verb after pretonic preverbs with final vowel without recourse to an inordinately problematical particle but also accounts satisfactorily for the lack of the /h/ expected as a reflex of that particle between a vowel-final pretonic preverb and a following stressed vowel. All that now remains is the tying up of a couple of loose ends.

3.3. When a few preverbs lost their final consonants in main clauses as a result of the general apocope at a much later stage in Primitive Irish, these were simply restored from the main environment in which they had not been lost, namely relative clauses, in the interests of symmetry. Thus the regular retention of a form such as **wor* 'on' in main as well as relative clauses would have encouraged the replacement of main-clause **e* 'out' by relative **ess* (see VI.3.3) and so on, given that the two types of clause were adequately distinguished by the mutation (or lack of it) after the preverb.

Since it had inherited a peculiar set of endings different from the primary and secondary set, the imperative (like the suffixless preterite deriving from a PIE perfect likewise characterised by a separate set of endings) did not participate in the differentiation of absolute/conjunct inflection in Insular Celtic and used the same set of endings in all environments. At a much later stage most of these became

formally identical with conjunct forms of the present indicative as a result of the Primitive Irish apocope, e.g. 2pl. ipv. *(-)beirid* ‘carry!’ < **berete* with 2pl. pres. ind. *-be(i)rid* ‘you carry’ < **beretes(i)*. There was no ambiguity in the case of simple verbs, since a ‘conjunct’ looking imperative was opposed to a formally distinct absolute form of the present indicative such as 2pl. *beirthe* ‘you carry’ when independent and employed a different negative when dependent (e.g., 2pl. ipv. *na:beirid* vs. pres. ind. *ní:beirid*). However, there will have been considerable ambiguity in the case of independent compound verbs employing deuterotonic forms such as 2pl. **to:berʹeθʹ* in both imperative and present indicative. The use of what looked like dependent forms of independent simple verbs in the imperative would be an obvious trigger for the introduction of normally dependent prototonic forms into the independent imperative of compound verbs, whence 2pl. ipv. **taβʹrʹeθʹ* (> OIr. *taibrid* ‘bring!’) in place of **to:berʹeθʹ* identical with the corresponding present indicative (> OIr. *do:beirid* ‘you bring’), but the ambiguity still had to be tolerated in a minority of instances where the independent imperative contained an infixed pronoun incompatible with a prototonic form (e.g. OIr. 2pl. *d-a:beirid* either ipv. ‘bring it!’ or pres. ind. ‘you bring it’).

4.1. It remains to consider the antecedents of a further set of exclusively Old Irish pronominal enclitics that has been largely neglected up to this point, namely what *GOI* 252 terms *notae augentes* or emphasising particles (symbol A for ‘adjunct’; see I.1.9). Since these typically serve to highlight (often contrastively) various pronominal elements, including the personal endings of the finite verb, they are perhaps best termed ‘emphatic pronominal adjuncts’. Although synchronically enclitic in Old Irish, they are invariably attached to a stressed constituent (whether a substantive, an independent pronoun, a pronominal preposition or a verb), being for instance placed after its noun/adjective predicate rather than attached directly to the proclitic copula as in *am cimbid-se* ‘I am a prisoner’ (Wb. 27c22; #Cop.Pred.A#). Unlike the suffixed and infixed pronouns, then, they are by no means confined to second place in the sentence in conformity with Wackernagel’s Law and are, for instance, regularly placed right at the end of the verbal complex as in *d-a:gníu-sa sin* ‘*I* do that ’ (Wb. 14d26; #PE:VA .#, lit. ‘*I* do it, that’). It thus seems clear that their enclitic status is not on a par historically with that of the pronouns themselves and that their cliticisation as part of the verbal complex took place a good deal later than that of the pronouns.

These emphatic adjuncts were ‘enclitics of mainly pronominal origin’ according to Sims-Williams (1984, 151), who follows Thurneysen (*GOI* 282) in deriving a form like **bir-siu* < **beris-su* < **beris-tu* before remarking that ‘in Brittonic, on the other hand, the etymological *t-* of the pronoun has been restored, and has even merged with the verbal ending in forms such as Middle Welsh *kereist (ti)* ‘you loved’. A somewhat different proposal along these lines has been tentatively made elsewhere:

‘The doubling of personal pronouns is found as an emphatic device in both British (MW 3sg. f. *hi-hi*, pl. 1 *ni-ni*, 2 *chwi-chwi* and so on) and Irish: OIr. 1 pl. *sni-sni/si-nni*, 2pl. *si-si*. If such forms existed in Insular Celtic, it must be assumed that, apart from 2pl. *sib* ‘you’...., they were clarified by reshaping in both branches after the loss of final syllables (but before the lengthening of final stressed vowels in Irish...). It was difficult to double a vowel-initial pronoun and that is probably why *é* ‘he/him, they’ was strengthened by means of **-som* < **somo-* ‘same’ (Gk. ὁμός, Eng. *same* etc.; cf. expressions such as *Was it him? The same*.). It seems that 1 sg. **me-me*, 2sg. *tu-tu* were then altered to *me-se* ‘me’, *tu-su* ‘you’ under the influence of 3 sg. f. *-si*, 3sg. m.(/n.) and 3pl. *-som*, 2pl. *-si*, a development only resisted by 1pl. *-(s)ni* because two other persons already had *-si*. In this way, a series of emphasising particles came into being, apparently not long before the Old Irish period, and their use soon spread to verbs, pronominal prepositions.. and copula sentences’ (McCone, 1994, 189; translated from the original Modern Irish).

Schrijver (1997, 19-25) has made the following objections and proposal: ‘The assumption that **-st-* > **-ss-* took place across this type of morpheme boundary is not self-evident..... Moreover, **-st-* > **-ss-* is the regular development of the old word-internal cluster only; in **beres-tu*, however, **st* arose after the early apocope of **-i* (**beresi tu*). McCone (1994:189) explained the development of **tu* to *-su* (> *-so*) by analogy to the 3sg. and 2pl. personal pronouns, which began with **s-*. The motivation for this spread is obscure, however, especially because the contrastive semantics would be expected to maximize rather than minimize the formal differences..... An original identity of contrastive 2sg. *-so, -s(i)u* and deictic *-so* (‘this/that’..) is semantically and formally attractive (*LEIA* S-194) for the following reasons: .. Semantically, ‘contrastive 2nd sg.’ and deictic ‘this/that’ are reasonably close to one another.... Not only does ‘contrastive 2nd sg.’ have an allomorph *-siu* but deictic *-so* does too, viz. *-siu* in *í-siu*..... Hence, contrastive 2nd sg. *-so, -s(i)u* probably does not derive from the old 2sg. pronoun **tŭ*... Both deictic and contrastive 2nd sg. *-so, -s(i)u* can be derived from **so*, which probably is the petrified PIE pronominal Nsgm. **so*..... From a historical point of view, *(-)se/-sa* and *-so* undoubtedly have a different origin: in Wb., they are formally clearly distinct, and there seems to be no sound law or analogy that can derive the one from the other. Moreover, it is likely that *se/sa* ‘this’ may be identified with the emphatic particle *-se* after palatal sounds, *-sa* (after non-palatal sounds), which stresses a first person pronoun or verb and which contrasts not only formally but also semantically with *-so, -s(i)u* ‘contrastive 2nd sg.’..... What remains is clear evidence for the pronoun **sio*. This may be compared with Skt. *syá*, f. *syā́*, n. *tyád* ‘this, that (already known’..’.

Thurneysen (*GOI* 282) was prepared to envisage a dual origin as a cross between the personal and the demonstrative pronouns: ‘The emphasizing particles 1 **se**, **sa**, 2

so, su, **siu** are identical in form with the demonstrative particles (§ 475), and it is quite possible that **messe** literally means 'I here' and **tussu** 'thou there'. On the other hand, since enclitic forms of the personal pronouns are used as emphasizing particles in Britannic, and also in Irish for the 1 and 2 pl., **siu**, (**so**, **su**) may have had a different origin. A form like **as:bir-siu** 'thou sayest' could go back to *bheres-t_, *beressu*. The fortuitous coincidence of the last element with the demonstrative particle **(í)-siu**, **so** (§ 475) may in turn have led to the use of the similar particle **se**, **sa** to emphasize the 1sg.'

4.2. Whatever the precise details, it seems quite clear that the 3sg. f., 1pl. and 2pl. emphatic pronominal adjuncts were simply the 3sg. f., 1pl. and 2 pl. personal pronouns **sī*, **snī* and **swī* (on which see McCone, 1994, 187 and Katz, 1998, 51-106 or 1998b) in origin. Equally obviously, the difference between these and the corresponding independent prononuns (OIr. *sí*, *sní*, *sí*, MW *hi*, *ni*, *chwi*, see V.1.2 for Gaul. 1pl. *sni*) basically resided in the fact that the latter remained fully stressed in Irish whereas the emphatic forms lost their stress and became attached enclitically to the verbal complex at some stage after the roughly fifth-century A.D. shortening of most unstressed vowels (*RChron.* 110), whence their resistance to the apocope of c. 500 A.D., but before the sixth- or seventh-century shortening of remaining long unstressed final vowels (*RChron.* 132) changed them to actually attested *-si*, **-swi* > *-si*, *-ni*. Non-lenition of the *s-* can be put down quite straightforwardly to generalisation of the distinctive form occurring after the statistically preponderant conjunct verbal endings with a final consonant (3sg. *-et*, 2pl. *-etes*), while the loss of *s-* in the 1pl. can be plausibly ascribed to generalisation of the postvocalic form in reduplicated **snī-(h)nī* < **snī-snī* and 1pl. abs. **-mohi (h)nī* < **-mosi snī* (and quite likely abs. and conj. **-r nī_* < **-r snī_* in the deponent owing to the well known loss of *s* between *r* and another consonant in Insular Celtic; *RChron.* 99).

This brings us to the question of the status of the stressed independent forms of personal pronouns in Insular Celtic. In Old Irish, of course, these are largely confined to use as predicates of the copula (*GOI* 254) and can never function as the subject or object of a finite verb. In British, on the other hand, they and the identical or scarcely differentiated (merely by lenition in the 1 and 2sg.) 'affixed' forms (including their so-called 'conjunctive' counterparts ending in *-eu*) may be optionally used as subject or object of a verb, reduplicated forms also occurring in the latter context: e.g., MW *dygwch* ***ui*** *odyma* 'take me from here', *a atwaenost* ***di uiui*** 'do you recognise me?', *ny rodassyt* ***hi*** 'she had not been given', *pann welsant* ***ef*** 'when they saw him', *hyny elwyf* ***ui*** 'until I go' (see *GMW* 49-50 and 57). Like the Old Irish emphatic pronominal adjuncts, the affixed forms are usually placed after the predicate of the copula and can supplement another pronominal element, be it an infixed object pronoun, the pronominal form of a preposition or a possessive pronoun: e.g., MW *ot oed uawr* ***ef*** 'if he was big', *ny-ch gwarandawaf* ***chwi*** 'I shall

not listen to you', *genhyf* ***i*** 'with me', *arnunt* ***wy*** 'on them', *y uab* ***ynteu*** 'his son' (see *GMW* 57-8) comparable to OIr. *is Día-som* 'he is God' (Wb. 1a2), *ní-m:charat-sa* 'they do not love *me*' (Wb. 5c6), *frib-si* 'towards *you*' (Wb. 12c29), *ar n-orcun-ni* '*our* slaying' (Wb. 4b23).

In view of the emergence of independent subject and object pronouns in Middle Irish as an option alongside a system corresponding to the one inherited from Old Irish (*EIV* 175-8), it can reasonably be argued that the optional occurrence of the same in British is due to quite recent developments and that stressed independent personal pronouns were largely confined to use directly after the copula (as predicate or in a cleft sentence) in Insular Celtic as in Old Irish. If so, this major restriction on the use of inherited stressed personal pronouns constitutes a strong additional argument for an Insular Celtic phase (see III.3.1-3), since it rather obviously did not apply to Gaulish (see 4.3 below). Nevertheless, the array of functional correspondences noted above is impressive and hardly coincidental, when taken in conjunction with the earlier demonstration that the emphatic pronominal adjuncts of Old Irish almost certainly derive in part from originally stressed forms of personal pronouns which not only cannot have been cliticised and incorporated into a verbal complex any earlier than the fifth century A.D. (or much later than the sixth) but also have British counterparts corresponding to them precisely in form and closely in function. It thus seems reasonable to frame the working hypothesis that the Insular Celtic stressed personal pronouns securely reconstructed on the basis of obvious correspondences between Irish and British were not virtually confined to predicative use with the copula but could, under appropriate circumstances, enhance the personal endings of the verb (as subject), a suffixed or infixed enclitic personal pronoun (as object), an enclitic personal pronoun combined with a preposition (*GOI* 272-6, *GMW* 58-60) or a proclitic possessive pronoun (*GOI* 276-9, *GMW* 53-4).

4.3. Comparison between various daughter languages indicates that Proto-Indo-European possessed a full range of stressed personal pronouns inflected for all eight cases (e.g. Szemerényi, 1970, 186-191 and 195-203 or 1989, 224-34) but that enclitic forms of these conforming to Wackernagel's Law were available only in the accusative and dative, the nominative being adequately expressed by the personal endings themselves (cf. Garrett's remarks quoted in II.3.2a). This situation is reminiscent of the one obtaining in Basque, where only the grammatical cases absolutive, ergative and dative occur as clitic elements within the verb in essentially pronominal function (in this case compulsorily, even if one or more of these cases is also represented by a noun in the sentence) but the genitive (governed by a noun rather than a verb) as well as various local cases must be expressed by an independent pronoun, if required. Basque does possess independent absolutive, ergative and dative forms of the pronouns but, unlike the other case forms, these are

only used for emphasis: e.g., *gaztea **zara*** '**you** (abs.) **are** young' (emph. ***zu*** *gaztea zara baina **ni** zaharra naiz* '***you*** are young but ***I*** am old'; cf. Spanish *eres joven* 'you are young' versus *tu eres joven pero yo soy viejo* '*you* are young but *I* am old'), *gustatzen **zait*** 'it **is** pleasing **to me** (dat.), I like it' (emph. ***niri*** *gustatzen zait* '***I*** like it'; cf. Spanish *me gusta* 'it pleases me, I like it' versus *a mi me gusta* '*I* like it'), *ikusten **duzu**?* '**do you** (erg.) see **him/her/it** (abs.)?' (emph. ***hura*** *ikusten duzu?* 'do you see ***that (one)***?' or ***zuk*** *ikusten duzu?* 'do ***you*** see it?'; cf. Spanish *lo ves* 'do you see it?' versus *eso, lo ves* 'do you see *that*?', *tu lo ves* 'do *you* see it?') but basically neutral ***zurekin*** *joango naiz* 'I will go with **you** (comitative)', ***nire*** *laguna da* '(s)he is **my** (gen.) friend', *opari bat daukat **zuretzat*** 'I have a present **for you** (benefactive)'.

Presumably this was more or less how the Proto-Indo-European system worked: the stressed form of a pronoun had to be employed where the sense so dictated in all but the nominative (where the verb's personal endings sufficed), accusative and dative (where enclitic forms in Wackernagel position were available). Consequently the stressed personal pronouns will have conveyed no particular emphasis in the genitive or the local cases (loc., abl. instr.), where there was no alternative to employing them in the requisite grammatical circumstances, but will have had emphatic or contrastive function when used in the nominative in addition to the verb's semantically autonomous personal endings or in place of a neutral or unmarked enclitic pronoun in the accusative or dative. Rubio Orecilla (1997) has made a valuable study of possible to probable instances of enclitic pronouns in Continental Celtic, but the existence of such elements in Proto-Celtic is anyway assured by the more or less straightforward derivation of the Insular Celtic suffixed and infixed object pronouns from this PIE category. The role of Continental Celtic is, however, more crucial in the case of independent personal pronouns, since Gaulish offers a couple of quite clear examples of these forms in the accusative (1pl. *sni* on the Chamalières inscription; see V.1.2) and nominative (1sg. *mi* and 2pl. *sue* or *sui* in palpable contrastive function on the Châteaubleau inscription; see III.1.2.2). Since the verbal endings were clearly grammatically self-sufficient without an overt subject pronoun in Gaulish (e.g. 1sg. *delgu*; *LG* 139-140), this evidence combines with that of Insular Celtic to leave little doubt that Proto-Celtic had essentially retained the PIE system with regard to the basic emphatic/contrastive function of the nom., acc. and dat. stressed forms of the personal pronouns. It also appears that use of the originally acc. *mi* < **mē* as a nom. goes back at least as far as Gallo-Insular Celtic (see VII.1).

The probability that in Insular Celtic as in Old Irish the inherited case system had been reduced to nom., voc., acc., dat. and gen. implies a corresponding reduction in the personal pronouns to nom.(-voc.), acc., dat. and gen., of which only the first three are of concern here (see *GOI* 276-280 and *GMW* 53-5 on the independent

genitive forms and their proclitic possessive counterparts in Old Irish and British). The stressed nominative forms would naturally continue in their inherited function as optional adjuncts to the personal endings when these were felt to require (typically contrastive) emphasis: e.g., 3sg. (f.) abs. **ageti sī* ‘*she* drives’ > **aɣeti hī_* > OW *egit*/MW *eyt hi* ‘she goes’, *hi* being generalised from such contexts in British) and OIr. *agid-si* ‘*she* drives’ (with *-si* generalised from contexts such as the following), conj. **nīs:aget sī_* ‘*she* does not drive’ > **nīh:aɣet sī_* > OIr. *ní:(h)aig-si* ‘*she* does not drive’ and MW *nyt a hi* ‘she does not go’ (with analogical *hi*; see V.3.1 on the form of the negative here). The striking innovation (apparently confined to Irish and British) of attaching enclitic and/or cliticised accusative or dative personal pronouns to prepositions (see I.3.6) undoubtedly took place at least as far back the Insular Celtic period and probably occurred no earlier than that stage. This development will inevitably have greatly reduced the use of stressed acc. and dat. personal pronouns, which then seem to have disappeared completely. However, once these so-called ‘conjugated’ pronominal forms of prepositions had come into existence, it was surely natural enough that the pronouns used to emphasise the personal endings of verbs should come to perform a similar function in relation to the personal forms of prepositions, whence, say, 3sg. **tares-siyan sī* > OIr. *tairse-si* ‘over *her/it* (f.). From this it was but a small step to their deployment in order to emphasise the enclitic pronominal object of a verb, as in **tu-nnos:beret (s)nī* > OIr. *do-n:beir-ni* ‘he brings *us*’ and so on, and then likewise the proclitic pronominal possessive placed before a noun, as in **esyās tegos sī* > OIr. *a tech-si* ‘*her* house’.

It thus appears that the British affixed (plus reduplicated) pronouns and the Old Irish emphatic pronominal adjuncts basically continue a range of uses already firmly established in Insular Celtic (to the exclusion of Continental Celtic on the evidence of Gaulish) for the personal pronominal forms from which they derive. This circumstantial and (from an Indo-European perspective at least) highly unusual set of shared developments obviously constitutes a further substantial argument for the Insular Celtic hypothesis advanced in III.3.1-3.

4.4. It is now time to turn to the reduplicated personal pronouns of British and to the possibility of adding emphatic pronominal adjuncts to an independent stressed pronoun in Old Irish. In a critique of Russell’s (1982) account of the origin of the so-called ‘conjunctive’ pronouns of Welsh, which derived the first element thereof from old reduplicated pronouns of the type 3sg. **sī-sī_* ‘she’ > **hih* by the British apocope, Schrijver (1997, 85-7) is nonetheless inclined to accept that such forms existed prior to the widespread loss of final syllables in Irish and British separately but at roughly the same time (c. 500 A.D.): ‘Yet in spite of the paucity of support for the type **hih*, we should bear in mind that the normal 3sg. personal pronoun MW Mco. *ef*, MB *eff* probably reflects just such a reduplicated **em-em*.. Moreover, OIr. has a long reduplicated 2pl. *sissi* (= W *chwychwi*) beside short reduplicated *sib*

< *s*wes*wī*, the antiquity of which has recently been vindicated in a lecture by Joshua Katz' (Schrijver, 1997, 87).

The following (nom.-)acc. forms of the personal pronouns may be reconstructed for (Insular) Celtic (mostly following McCone, 1994, 186-8 and 190-194): 1sg. *mī* (< **mē*; > Gaul. *mi*, MW *mi*, *ui*) and **me* (> OIr. *mé*, encl. MW *-m-*; see 3.2 above on encl. **mu* for **me* in Irish at least); 2sg. **tū* (> MW *ti*, *di*) and **tu* (> OIr. *tú*, encl. OIr. *-t(-)*, MW *-th-*); 3sg. m. **em* (> OIr. *é*, encl. OIr. *-a-*, MW *-e/y-*); 3sg. n. **ed*V (> OIr. *ed*) and **ed* (> encl. OIr. *-a-*); 3sg. f. nom. **sī* (> OIr. *sí*, MW *hi*, acc. **siyam* (> OIr. *-e* suffixed to prepositions) and **sim* (> encl. OIr./MW *-s-*); 1pl. **snī_* > (Gaul. *sni*, OIr. *sní*, MW *ni*) and **snos* (> encl. OIr./MW *-(n)n-*); 2pl. **swī* (> OIr. *sí*, MW *chwi*) and **swes* (> encl. OIr. *-b(-)*, MW *-ch-*); 3pl. **ēs* (< acc. **ens* and/or perhaps nom. **eyes*; > OIr. *é*, MW *wy*) and **sūs* (> encl. OIr./MW *-s-* via shortened **sus* but > OIr. *-u* suffixed to prepositions with an unaffected long vowel owing to cliticisation after the aforementioned Insular Celtic enclitic shortening). It would seem that the stressed 1pl. **āsme* < (**ansme* < **n̥s-me*) was reshaped in Proto-Celtic to monosyllabic **snē* (> **snī*, Gaul. *sni*) under the combined influence of corresponding enclitic **nos* and the stressed 1sg. **mē* (> **mī*) and that this then led to a similar reshaping of 2pl. **uswe* (< **us-u,°e*) to **swē* (> **swī*, Gaul. *sui*). Thereafter enclitic **nos* and **wes* (undoubtedly with *e* rather than *o* because of the OIr suffixed pron. with palatal *b* clearly seen in *táthui-b* 'there is to you, you have' versus 1pl. *táthu-nn* 'we have' with non-palatal *-n(n)*) simply acquired an initial **s-* from the corresponding stressed forms to become **snos*, **swes*.

Reduplicated forms of the stressed personal pronouns would then have been 1sg. *mī-mī* (and **me-me*?), 2sg. **tū-tū* (and **tu-tu*), 3sg. m. **em-em*, f. **sī-sī*, 1pl. **snī-snī*, 2pl. **swī-swī*, 3pl. **ēs-ēs*. The regular outcome of these after apocope in Irish/British should have been **meμ´/*miμ*, **tuθ´/*tid*, **eμ´/*eμ* (> MW *ef*), **sī/*hi*, **sninn´/*nin*, **sif´* (> OIr. *sib*)/**hwihw*, **ee/*ē* (via **ēh-ēh*, given PC **ens* > **ēs*; *RChron.* 71-3). Since a number of these forms rather obviously ended with a truncated lenited form of the pronoun, it would be straightforward enough to 're-reduplicate' them, so to speak, (doubtless with the help of affixed **μi, *di*, **ni*, **hwi*) by repeating the vowel of the first element after the second to produce the **miμi*, **tidi*, **ni-ni*, **hwi-hwi* underling MW 1sg. *mivi*, *myvi*, 2sg. *tidi*, *tydi*, 1pl. *nini*, 2pl. *chwichwi*, *chw(y)chwi* (*GMW* 49). Thereafter a 3sg. f. **hi-hi* (MW *hihi*) could easily be created but opaque 3sg. **eμ* seems simply to have ousted more weakly characterised **e* (< unreduplicated **em*), a new form *efo* being created to fill the reduplicated slot. Application of the basic pattern to 3pl. *_ should have yielded **ē-ē* > MW **wy-wy* with an awkward hiatus that could be resolved by creating actually attested *wyntwy* once the 3pl. *wy* 'they' had acquired a byeform *wynt* with an *nt* taken over from the 3pl. verbal ending (cf. MIr. *íat* for OIr. *é* 'they').

That more or less concludes matters as far as British is concerned but the Old Irish system calls for further comment. In Old Irish opaque *sib* (< originally reduplicated **sif´*) seems to have become a byeform (already at Wb. 19c20) alongside and ultimately in place of *sí* (Wb. 25a3), a development doubtless favoured by its lack of formal ambiguity with 3sg. f. *sí*. If 1sg. **me* and **tu* were already used both as enclitics and as stressed alternatives to **mī, *tū* in Insular Celtic, then Irish simply generalised the former and British the latter. If, however, they were exclusively enclitic, then Irish must have homogenised the enclitic and stressed forms to **me*, **tu* at a relatively early stage (see 3.2 above on subsequent enclitic **mu* for **me*). Reduplicated 1pl. **snīsnī,* 2pl. **swīswī* may well have undergone regular shortening to **snisnī* and **swiswī* as early as Proto-Celtic (cf. *RChron.* 63-4), in the conceivable event that such reduplicated forms were already in existence at that stage. Even if they were not, the possibility of an Insular Celtic or even Primitive Irish shortening to **snihnī_* and **swihwī_* remains open in view of some uncertainty as to whether the shortening of vowels before certain heavy consonant clusters occurred as early as Proto-Celtic (see *RChron.* 63-4). Alternatively, Insular Celtic reduplication of the 1 and 2pl. pronouns may have yielded **sni-snī, *swi-swī* from the outset on account of the synchronic inadmissibility of long vowels before a consonant cluster of this type.

Be that as it may, it seems reasonable to posit that in Old Irish the opaque emphatic 1pl. **sninn* was remodelled to **sni-nni* under the influence of the emphatic *-ni* used with verbal endings and various clitic pronominals (4.3 above) and that this then provided the model for the creation of 2pl. *si-si* beside **sif,* which was subsequently displaced to non-emphatic usage (> OIr. *sib*). The next step would be the creation of 3 sg. f. *si-si* (first attested in MIr. and so possibly replacing OIr. **sí-si* on the analogy of *mé/me-sse, tú/tu-ssu* etc. at a later date) bearing the same relationship to *sí* as 1pl. *sni-nni*, 2pl. *si-si* to *sní* and *sí.* The possibility of taking 2pl. and 3sg. f. *si-si* as reduplicated forms seems to have led to the creation of 1pl. *sni-sni* (Wb. 6c22, 23d23, Ml. 32a20, 93c11, 102b15, 102c2, 127c2; dissimilated to *snissi* at Wb. 10d7 and to *sisni* at Ml. 78a1, 92c2) beside *si-(n)ni* (*is (s)nin(n)i*, Wb. 33a7, Ml. 93d3, 133d3; *sinni*, Ml. 63c15, 138c11a).

Personal pronouns were not the only elements to occur in this slot after the verb in old Irish. As indicated above, the pronominal **somos* 'same' could also modify a verbal ending or a personal pronoun. 3sg. m. **ē soμah* < **en somos* and 3pl. **ē soμī* < **ē(s) somī_* seem to have replaced opaque emphatic 3sg. **eμ´*, 3pl. **ē(h)* and emphatic 3pl. **ee* with awkward hiatus at a quite early prehistoric Irish stage, **-soμ-* then rapidly going on to oust the less well characterised 3sg. **e* 3pl. **ē* used to emphasise verbal endings and clitic pronominals. Old Irish 3sg. m. *(h)é-som* < **ē soμah* seems to have displaced pl. **é-suim* < **ē soμī* once the non-emphatic 3sg. m. had become identical with 3pl. *é* as a result of the relatively late lengthening of final

stressed vowels, *-som* then being generalised elsewhere too.

The stressed anaphoric pronoun *suide* ‘the aforementioned (one(s))’ (mostly used after prepositions, e.g. *co suide* ‘to him’ Ml. 42a6, *di suidiu* ‘from that’ Wb. 8a5 etc.; *GOI* 301 and 303) also has a clitic counterpart sg. *-side* (m. nom./acc, f. nom.; f. acc. *-sidi*), pl. *-sidi* (occasionally *-side*) that may be attached to third person independent pronouns (e.g. 3sg. m. *(h)é-side* ‘the aforementioned’) or to the personal endings of verbs either as subject referring to these (e.g. *as:bert-side* ‘he, the aforementioned, said’ Wb. 2a21 etc.) or as object referring to an infixed or suffixed pronoun (e.g. *ní-s:n-áirmim-sidi* ‘I do not reckon the aforementioned’ or even along with an emphatic pronominal adjunct referring to the subject, as in *ro-s:failsigestar-som-sidi* ‘he has proclaimed the aforementioned’ Wb. 31a9 referring to f. *bríathar* ‘word’). The first element of *suide* seems very likely to be **so-de-* comparable to Greek ὅδε ‘this’ (Watkins, 1963, 23; cf. Schrijver, 1997, 31-3). However, it seems more likely to the present writer that the first element of this was originally the inflected **so-(/to-*) demonstrative in Celtic as in Greek (e.g. fem. nom. sg. **sāde* like Gk. ἥδε) and that inflection was then shifted to the end (nom. f. **sode(y)ā* for **sāde* and so on, nom. m. **sode(y)os* for **sode* and so on; cf. Class. Lat. ‘self’ nom./acc. m. *ipse/ipsum*, f. *ipsa/ipsam* etc. for OLat. *ipse/eumpse*, *eapse/eampse* etc.; Ernout, 1953, 95-7, and Meiser, 1998, 163-4) than that the first element was always invariable and the second an inflected pronoun *(*so-de-o-* according to Watkins, **so-de-so-* according to Schrijver). The clitic *-side* would derive regularly from **se-de-(y)os* with a rather mysterious variant of *so-* that is certainly attested in Celtic (especially in British, e.g. OW *he-noid* ‘tonight’; see Schrijver, 1997, 24-5). However, this seems hard to justify morphologically and it seems preferable to posit generalisation of palatal *s-* in the clitic from environments such as 3sg. pres. *as:beir-side* ‘he, the aforementioned, says’. This would yield OIr post-tonic. *-side* /s´eð´e/ quite regularly but the lack of a non-palatal variant *-s(a)ide* in Old (as opposed to Middle) Irish is nevertheless rather strange.

Whatever the precise details, OIr. *-som* and *-side* clearly show that pronominals other than personal pronouns could be cliticised to the verb and other elements such as the stressed independent personal pronouns at a fairly recent prehistoric stage of Irish. That being so, there is no objection in principle to Schrijver’s contention (4.1 above) that OIr. emphatic *me-sse* and *tu-ssu* contain cliticised demonstratives *se* ‘this (by me?)’, *so* ‘that (by you?)’ and that the same elements are also used as the emphatic pronominal adjuncts (1sg. *-sa/-se*, 2sg. *-s(i)u* or *-so*) of verbs, pronominal prepositions etc. However, the commonest 2sg. form *-s(i)u* can only be derived from *-so* by means of an *ad hoc* sound law (Schrijver, 1997, 20) and there is, *pace* Schriver (4.1 above), no compelling objection to Thurneysen’s notion that a development *-s t-* could occur across certain word boundaries as well as internally (just like lenition, for instance). If so, one might posit Insular Celtic **berisi tŭ* (2sg.

abs.) versus **exs:beris sŭ̄* < **tŭ̄* (2sg. conj.) etc., the postvocalic variant being generalised in British (just like 1sg. *ui*, 3sg. f. *hi*) and the postconsonantal one in Irish (just like 3sg. f. *-si*, 2pl. *-si*). That would account for *-s(i)u*, and there is surely something to be said for Thurneysen's admittedly tentative suggestion (4.1 above) that the byeform *-so* was due to a tendency to associate *-siu* with the demonstrative that ultimately triggered 1sg. *-se/-sa*. One might even speculate that a 1sg. **(me)-me* (formed on the model of 1pl. *sni-sni* etc. above) was altered to distinctive *(me)-se* corresponding to *me* (> OIr. *mé*) on the basis of the relationship between **tu* (> OIr. *tú*) and *(tu)-su*. Alternatively, if Schrijver's demonstrative *-se* (probably < **seya* < **siya* < **syo*) and *-so* (< **so)* are accepted, *tu-su* for *tu-so* (and then *-s(i)u* for *-s(e)o* elsewhere) might simply be analogical to the pattern seen in *me-se*, namely CV_1-*s*V_1.

Since the 2sg. emphatic pronominal adjunct, whether **su* or **so*, contained an old short final vowel, this would have been lost by the general apocope of such vowels around 500 A.D. in Irish (see the relative chronology in McCone, 1982, 24-5). From this it follows that the date for the cliticisation of these adjuncts in 4.2 above can be narrowed somewhat to the period between the apocope and the shortening of remaining long final unstressed vowels in the 6th. or early 7th. century A.D., i.e. effectively to the sixth century and more likely than not to the first half thereof.

4.5. There is, then, some uncertainty as to the extent of the role of a personal pronoun as opposed to a demonstrative in the creation of the OIr. 1 and 2g. emphatic pronominal adjuncts. However, this is of little consequence for present purposes. The essential point is that a group of stressed postverbal pronominal elements, some of which were certainly old independent personal pronouns in origin, underwent cliticisation after the Primitive Irish apocope of c. 500 A.D but before a further shortening of unstressed vowels by about the middle of the seventh century at latest. As a result 1sg. **me* (to **se* by analogy, or old demonstrative **se*), 2sg. **su* (or **so*), 1pl. **nī_* and 2pl. **s(w)ī_* remained intact in the first instance but the latter subsequently underwent shortening of their vowels to yield OIr. *-ni*, *-si* (demonstrative 1sg. **(-)se*, 3sg. *(-)soμ* and anaphoric **(-)suð´e/i* having already lost their unstressed final vowels in the general apocope).

This late prehistoric development of emphatic pronominal adjuncts (symbolised by A in I.1.9) was, then, the final stage in the evolution of an Old Irish complex in which various elements closely associated with the verbal expression were grouped together (proclitically, enclitically, under the stress or post-tonically as the case might be) according to a strict positional hierarchy around a single main stress. The last set to maintain its accentual independence contained a nucleus of stressed personal pronouns with a (typically contrastive) emphatic function probably inherited from PIE itself. Their eventual cliticisation right at the end of the verbal

complex can be seen as the natural culmination of a long process that was rooted in Proto-Indo-European and had undergone major further development in Insular Celtic. Thurneysen's classic grammar puts one outcome of this as follows: 'it is remarkable how few fully stressed forms of the personal pronouns are to be found in Irish; most forms are either proclitic or enclitic' (*GOI* 251).

CHAPTER FIVE

Eti and Pseudo-*eti*

1.1. As noted in I.3.3c, Schrijver (1994 and 1997, 131-82) has attempted to improve upon Cowgill's proposal by positing an enclitic particle **eti* 'and', principally on the grounds that this is not only more plausible than **es(si)* 'it is (so)' as a candidate for generalisation in main clauses but has also left a tangible reflex in the *-t* /d/ appearing in certain Old and Middle Welsh preverbal elements, usually when these occur before a vowel. Thus MW negative *ny(t)* and affirmative *neu(t)* as well as OW traces of augment *rit* alongside MW *ry* could be derived by means of apocope of **-i* and later British lenitional voicing of a voiceless stop from **ne-(e)t(i)*, **nou-(e)t(i)* and **ro-(e)t(i)* respectively, while the MW copula form *nyt* 'is not' could similarly continue **ne-(e)t(i)-est(i)* (Schrijver, 1997, 159-61). For Irish Schrijver arrives at a proximate **es* formally identical with Cowgill's candidate by means of an entirely *ad hoc* sound law whereby -V*t* became -V*s* in auslaut, thus deriving a form like OIr. 3sg. conj. *-beir* < **bereh* < **beres* (rather than equally viable and far more obvious **bereθ* by straightforward lenition of postvocalic *-t*) < **beret(i)*. Schrijver (1994, 161 and 165-6) seeks support for this in a proposed derivation of OIr. *fri* 'against', *la* 'with' < **wris, *les* < **writ, *let* < **writi, *leti*. In the present writer's opinion (*RChron.* 101) 'this is vitiated by its failure to account for a single form with suffixed pronoun straightforwardly apart from the isolated and allegedly archaic 3pl. *lethu* 'with them' in the Book of Armagh (Schrijver, 1994, 169), In view, however, of the regular occurrence of *leu* in the glosses, this seems more likely to be a solitary early example of the spread of 3pl. *-thu* well attested in Middle and Modern Irish (see now McCone, 2005, 190-1). This virtually hundred-percent failure rate tips the scales firmly in favour of the appreciably more efficacious preforms **writ(s), *let(s)* proposed by Russell (1988, 118-23; note that byeforms without *s* could have been extrapolated from cases where *s* was lost regularly before certain consonants)'.

A nice parallel for the retention of *-t-* internally versus weakening to *-h* (possibly as early as Insular Celtic) > *-Ø* in auslaut is provided by the 'tā' marbūṭa' phenomenon in Arabic: 'When the letter tâ is used as the feminine ending it is written as hâ (ه) with two dots (ۀ) and is called ... tâ marbūta... This tâ of the feminine ending is not pronounced in modern Arabic except when followed by a word beginning with a vowel sound' (Thatcher, 1993, 3, n.2). The only obvious difference is that *-t-* underwent regular postvocalic lenition to *-θ-* in Primitive Irish (as presumably did *-t*, if not already *-h*) unlike Arabic. Since Schrijver anyway posits (albeit quite improbably when it was followed by an enclitic; see II.3.2c) that his particle's *-t(i)* was subject to auslaut developments, Primitive Irish *-t* > *-θ* > *-h* > *-Ø* would presumably work just as well for him as *-t* > *-θ* > *-s* > *-h* > *-Ø*. Schumacher's (*KPV*, *passim*) practice is to proceed directly from *-θ* to *-h* in reconstructions of Old Irish

forms involving **(e)t(i)* according to his lights.

One obvious advantage of **eti* over **es(s)*, namely the secure reconstruction of PIE **h₁éti* 'further, and' on the strength of forms such as Latin *et* 'and',Gothic *iþ* 'but' and Greek ἔτι 'still, yet, furthermore' as well as the presence of an unexceptionable Celtic reflex in Gaulish *eti-c*, has an equally apparent downside insofar all of these forms were manifestly non-enclitic. Consequently Schrijver (1997, 153) has to suppose rather arbitrarily and, as should emerge below, almost certainly wrongly that inherited stressed **éti* became enclitic **et(i)* within Celtic, 'probably under the influence of **de* and **k*^{w}*e*'. Schumacher (*KPV* 102) sees a 'striking' parallel in the shape of an enclitic connector *-ṣ* 'and', 'which can be derived from **eti*', in Tocharian B but concedes that a shared development is unlikely in view of the probable restriction of enclisis of **eti* to the Insular branch of Celtic. Accordingly the possibility that **eti* became enclitic in Tocharian B falls well short of demonstrating that the same thing happened in Insular Celtic, and the Celtic evidence for and against such an assumption must be judged solely on its own merits. Schumacher also sees a significant, albeit only partial, typological parallel in Biblical Hebrew for the assumed generalisation of a connector **eti* in Insular Celtic: 'In Biblical Hebrew, the basic word order of which is VSO (cf. Genesius/ Krautsch 1909: 476-478), narrative texts have a clearly defined structure: The first sentence begins with a verbal form in the so-called perfect. All subsequent sentences begin with the conjunction *wa* 'and', which is univerbated with the immediately following finite verb (which is in the so-called impefect)..... This so-called imperfect with waw consecutivum presents an important parallel because it shows that in a language with basic VSO word order a sentence connector can be closely combined with the verb and become obligatory in certain contexts - Insular Celtic has gone a stage further than such a situation in that it has more or less generalised the sentence connector and almost completely eliminated the forms lacking it' (*KPV* 102-3; my translation here and elsewhere).

It may be conceded at the outset that the generalisation of **eti* as a fixed part of the verbal expression in Insular Celtic main clauses presents no insuperable semantic or syntactic difficulties (see *KPV* 99 on the at best partial parallel provided by the extensive use of sentence connectors, especially sentence-initial *nu*, in later Hittite narrative). That said, it still remains a great deal more likely *a priori* that Insular Celtic was one of the vast majority of languages (including VSO types) that did not generalise such an element. Be that as it may, the formal side of this contention is quite a different matter (see below) and the Hebrew parallel (cf. too Basque *ba-* in III.1.6.4) would fit a prefixed non-enclitic **eti*, which clearly was not generalised in Insular Celtic, better than a secundarily cliticised **eti*. To begin with, the fact that certain object pronouns such as 3pl. acc. **sūs* (cf. Schrijver, 1997, 9-15) and the relative marker (see VI.1.1-5, and *KPV* 98, n. 100) were secundarily cliticised in

Insular Celtic (thus joining other object pronouns inherited from PIE enclitic forms) or at a still earlier stage shared with Gaulish hardly compels us to assume that an originally non-enclitic connector **eti* 'and' underwent the same treatment when, for instance, OIr. *no, nu* < **nu* remained firmly sentence-initial. Schrijver's suggestion above that **eti* was cliticised under the influence of the inherited enclitic connectors **k^{w}e* 'and' and **de* 'and, but' is weak, since it might more reasonably be supposed that the existence of virtual synonyms of **eti* in enclitic position (presumably **k^{w}e* or **de* after an initial topic/focus, **eti* otherwise; cf. McCone, 1979, 92-5 on Hitt. *-ya/-ma* versus *nu*) would rather have impeded its gravitation towards a slot that was already fully occupied.

The history of Schrijver's particle in Celtic can be summarised as follows: non-enclitic **éti* > enclitic *eti* 'and' > **et* by apocope and then in British by lenition > **(e)d* (preserved before a vowel but blocking lenition and then lost before a consonant) but in Irish (> **(e)s*) > **(e)h* behaving essentially like Cowgill's candidate. Schrijver argues that **eti* had already been fused prior to apocope of **-i* with verbal forms, in some contexts at least, at a pre-Insular Celtic phase shared with Gaulish (*KPV* 98, n. 100 being justly sceptical about this), thus implying derivations such as OIr. 3sg. abs. *be(i)rid* 'bears'[and *beirth-i* 'bears it (n.)'] < **bereθih[-e] < *beretis[-e] < *beretit[-e] < *bereti-(e)ti[-e(d)]* and compound *do[-t:]beir* 'brings [you]' < **to-'h[-tu]:b/βereh < *to-'s[-tu]:b/βeres < *to-'t-tu: beret < *to-(e)ti[-tu]:bereti*. It will be immediately apparent that Schrijver's candidate shares with Cowgill's the inconvenient need to posit the lack of an effective word boundary between a preverb/verb and the enclitic particle but the mysterious and remarkably persistent (throughout the best part of a millennium, one would imagine) presence of some such boundary between the enclitic particle itself and a following enclitic in order to allow the particle to undergo auslaut (apocope of **-i* onwards in Schrijver's case) rather than inlaut developments. A particle **(e)ti* thus proves to be subject to even more formal difficulties (beginning with its manifestly non-enclitic origins) than its rivals and these alone constitute adequate grounds for rejecting it. Nevertheless, Schrijver's plot will be allowed to thicken further below in the hope of clarifying the question of *-t* and other possible reflexes of **eti* in British Celtic along with that of hitherto ill-understood dependent present indicative forms of the Old Irish copula such as 2pl. *ní-dad* 'you are not'.

1.2. Given the generally acknowledged status of British as the least conservative attested branch of Celtic and the *ad hoc* nature of his posited development of **et(i)* in Irish, Schrijver is understandably keen to bolster his hypothesis with some tangible evidence from non-British Celtic. To this end Gaulish *legasit* ('deposited' or the like) is analysed as < **legast-it* identical in formation to the 3sg. absolute of the Old Irish *s*-preterite, if one is prepared to derive of a form like OIr. *mórais* 'magnified' < **mārast-it* (Schrijver, 1997, 177-80). Positing a reflex of **-eti* in the

Gaulish form not only flies in the face of good evidence that Gaulish did not undergo apocope of *-i* (*RChron.* 100-102) but also entails a pre-apocope date for the fusion of particle and verb to yield a present form such as **legāt-it* < **legāti-(e)ti* capable of causing analogical remodelling of pret. **legast-et* to **legast-it*. Schrijver (1997, 178, esp. n. 1) thereby abandons one of the main advantages over the present writer's explanation (specifically the above mentioned step **bir(s)t*-E to **bir(s)t-i*-E on the model of **beret-i*-E) usually claimed by advocates of a particle, namely its obviation of the need to posit the analogical influence of forms with inherited primary endings upon those with inherited secondary endings. Further strong grounds for rejecting apocope of *-i* at a pre-Insular-Celtic date have been presented in III.3.2. Since intervocalic *-s-* was not lost in Gaulish (unlike Irish and British), there are no remotely compelling phonological grounds for deriving *legas-* < **legast-* and no more need be involved than thematisation of **legast* to **legaset* (cf. a similar but independent development in the British *s*-preterite; McCone, 1991, 78-80) followed by a change of **-set* to *-sit* (also seen in probably subjunctive *sesit* on Chamalières; *LG* 150-9) that might even be due to Latin influence in the case of an inscription dating from the Roman imperial period. The fact that 'absolute' *legasit* is not even clause-initial begs further questions and leads to the startling claim, based solely upon the highly questionable analysis of this one form, that 'at some stage in the history of Gaulish the verb shifted from the beginning of the clause to clause-internal position, taking the particle with it' (Schrijver, 1997, 180). Even so, there is still the uncomfortable 'fact that so many verbal forms appear without any particle at all', a conundrum tentatively resolved by suggesting 'that the use of the connective particles in Gaulish was not yet as fossilized as it was in Insular Celtic, and that their appearance depended on a subtle use of Gaulish rules of structuring information comparable to that of the connector δὲ in Greek' (Schrijver, 1997, 179).

As if all of this extremely uneconomical special pleading were not enough, there remains the problem of twice attested Gaulish *etic* and an apparent variant *eθθic* that may be due to no more than an attempt to indicate non-phonemic affrication of a dental before *i* (McCone, 2002, 130; cf. Hittite 3sg. *-zi* /-tˢi/ < **-ti*). This can be analysed satisfactorily enough both formally and semantically (something like 'and further' > 'and') as *eti-c* with a reduced form of **kʷe* (see VI.4.2 and cf. Lat. *nec, ac* beside *neque, atque*) as an enclitic attachment that is probably also seen with a noun in *Rosmertia-c* and with a 1sg. verb in *regu-c*, although the latter's occurrence before *cambion* makes an assimilated form of some other element possible (Schrijver, 1997, 177), perhaps the petrified **(i)d* seen in *(deuor)buetid*. However, from Schrijver's point of view Gaulish *eti-* is disagreeably non-enclitic and he argues (1997, 181-2) that *eti-c* on the famous Alise-Saint-Reine inscription is rather to be interpreted as /etˢi-k/ < **esti-kʷe* 'and/which is', apparently with a different treatment of *-st-* from that posited by him in the case of *legasit*. Even if this were accepted despite the fact that the conventional interpretation involves the

straightforward coordination of two datives (...*Ucuete... etic gobedbi*...), there still remain the undiscussed *addedillí etic secoui* 'of *a.* and *s.*' and *sni eθθic sos* 'us and them' on the Chamalières inscription with a clearly coordinating *etic* or *eθθic* between two nouns in the genitive singular and between a probably accusative plural first and third person pronoun respectively. The existence of non-enclitic Gaulish *eti-* 'further(, and?)' cannot, then, be reasonably doubted, whereas Schrijver's convoluted effort to find some trace of alleged enclitic **(e)t(i)* in Gaulish succeeds only in creating a good many more problems than it purports to solve. It may safely be concluded that this element was not generalised in Gaulish main clauses and, indeed, is not to be found at all as an enclitic in the Gaulish material currently available. This at least relieves the particle theory of the difficulties associated with the gratuitous hypothesis that enclitic **(e)t(i)* was at least partially established in main clauses at a stage prior to Insular Celtic and the apocope of *-i*.

1.3. Given that his **et(i)* is supposed to have generally yielded an **es* > **eh* indistinguishable from the reflex of Cowgill's **ess(i)* in Irish, Schrijver is at pains to find at least one area where his proposal might have some advantage over Cowgill's from a purely internal Irish standpoint. This is furnished by the combination of the class B infixed pronoun containing a *-t-* /d/ usually derived from *de* 'and' cognate with Greek δέ with the preverbs *con* and *in(d)* as *co-t(-)* and *a-t(-)*. It has, of course, long been realised that *con-d(-)* and *in-d(-)*, which actually do occur as class C forms in relative clauses, would be the regular outcome of the sequences **kom-de-* and **in(de)-de-* in main clauses too. The simple solution is to posit analogical creation of main-clause *co-t(-)* and *a-t(-)* with loss of the preverb's final consonant as in most other cases such as *a-t(-)* < **ad-de-* or **eγ-de-* < **eγ(z)-de-* in relation to *ad* and *as* (< **ess* < **eχs*) respectively or *fri-t-* < **wrid-de-* < **wrid(z)-de-* in relation to *fris* (< **writs*). In Schrijver's (1997, 133) opinion 'this motivation is far from convincing: since in OIr. relative clauses infixed pronouns of class B and C interchange freely (*GOI* 258), the alleged need to differentiate formally between the two in spite of their functional equivalence requires some special pleading'. This, however, rather misses the point that *con-d(-)* and *in-d(-)* with retained final consonant of the preverb would have been viewed as class C and hence inadmissible in a main clause, the result being pressure towards the creation of main-clause counterparts with typical class B features. That said, a morphologically satisfactory and phonologically regular alternative would be worth considering.

Schriver (1997, 135-6) suggests that class B like A were preceded by his main-clause particle **et* and that sequences such as **exs-et-e* with 3sg. n. or **kon-et-me* with 1sg. pronoun underwent a quite unparalleled early syncope to **exs-t-e* or **kon-t-nos* before the particle's *t* became *s* after a vowel. This proposal is not only avowedly *ad hoc* but also most surprising in view of the supposed word

boundary between the particle and a following enclitic still required to generate -V*t* to -V*s* elsewhere. One might also ask why a similar 'syncope' did not affect virtually identical suffixed sequences to produce, say, **beret-et-e* > **beret-t-e* > OIr. **be(i)rit* rather than actually attested *be(i)rthi* 'bears it(n.)'. There is then what Schrijver (1997, 137) terms the 'minor difficulty' that this *ad hoc* syncope of *et* would only yield 3sg. m. and n. forms such as *co-t:* < **kod-e(n)* < **kon-t-e(n)* directly with anything like certainty. The second and probably, *pace* Schrijver (1997, 137-8), also the first person forms require the interposition of an analogical vowel under the influence of class C (e.g. 1sg. *do-dom:* < **to-de-me*) as in the case of 1sg. *co-tom:* rather than expected **co-tm*: < **kod-me* < **kon-t-me* while the 3sg. f. and the 3pl. call for the even more dramatic insertion of **de* itself, as in 3pl. *co-ta:* < **ko-d-de-huh* < **kon-t-de-sus* < **kon-et-de-sus* rather than **co-s:* < **ko-d-sus* < **kon-t-sus* < **kon-et-sus*, on the grounds that 'pronouns of the third person could be accompanied by **de*' (Schrijver, 1997, 137). This anyway dubious claim (see McCone, 2003, 179-180) is not only derived from a quite different part of the pronominal system but also fails to account for the absence of any trace of this alleged **de* in what for Schrijver are the identically structured class A infixed and suffixed pronouns: e.g. *do-s:beir* 'brings them' < **to-(e)t-sus:beret* and not **do-ta:beir* < **to-(e)t-de-sus:beret* or *beirthius* 'bears them' < **beret-et-sus* and not **beirthitiu* < **beret-et-de-sus* or perhaps rather **beirtiu* via syncopated **beret-t-de-sus*.

In a case such as *a-t(-)* /ad/ < alleged **at-t-* < **ad-(e)t-* Schrijver relies upon the late-seventh-century voicing of dentals on a word boundary in contact with an unstressed vowel (McCone, 1981) to generate */d/* from /t/. However, attested *a-t(-)* /ad/ (as opposed to **ach-t(-)* or perhaps **as-t-*) could not possibly be the regular outcome of **eχs-t-* < **eχs-(e)t-* and the attempt to extend the voicing rule to word boundary after unstressed vowel plus *r* in order to derive *for-t/d(-)* (the utterly regular outcome of **wor-de-*) from **wor-t-* < **wor-(e)t-* is easily falsified by Old Irish forms like *tabart* /taβert/ 'giving' and *epert /eb´ert/* 'saying'.

Although it can be accounted for by a quite straightforward and plausible analogy, the historically irregular outcome of the combination of the two preverbs *con* and *in(d)* with the **de* usually assumed to underlie class B (like class C) infixed pronouns has thus been made the starting point of a quest for an alternative involving **et*. The first step is an entirely *ad hoc* and most unlikely special syncope before the well established main syncope in Primitive Irish in order to obtain postvocalic **t* but, even so, extensive analogy and some help from **de* itself are needed in order to generate all but the 3sg. m. and n. class B forms, to say nothing of some serious inconsistencies. Even if a whole range of difficulties is ignored, in the final analysis this elaborate endeavour yields no gain whatever in comparison with the alternative because two preverbs with class B forms fully compatible with **de* turn out to have

historically irregular outcomes in combination with **(e)t*. Old Irish, then, provides no specific support whatever for the earlier presence of **et(i)*, whether enclitic or not. In view of this and of the absence so far of any trace of enclitic **et(i)* in Gaulish, Schrijver's case must stand or fall solely on the basis of the British evidence at the heart of his theory.

Kim (2002, 160-162) adopts essentially the same approach to these forms as Schrijver but posits **esti* rather than **eti* (see the end of II.3.2d) and **kom-sti-me* for **kom-esti-me* etc. on the analogy of the elided postvocalic form seen in **ro-sti-* etc. rather than by irregular syncope. Assuming that this substitution took place before the interconsonantal loss of *-s-* responsible for the creation of the *t*-preterite (Watkins, 1962, 156-174), he posits an unimpeachable development **kom-sti-me* (> **kom-ti-me*) > **kon-ti-me* (cf. OIr. 3sg. augm. *t*-pret. *do:ró-sat* 'has created' < **to:rōs-sid* < **-sint* < **-sim-t* < **-sim-s-t*) but then, as in his already discussed (II.3.2d) derivation of the postvocalic variant, erroneously applies Primitive Irish syncope to this before the apocope to yield a **kont-me* (or rather **kod-me* by this stage) and then by *ad hoc* anaptyxis the **konteμe* (or rather **kodeμe*) taken to underlie OIr. *co-ta/om(m)*. The correct sequence **kontime* > **kod΄iμ΄* > **kodeμ* (by proclitic depalatalisation and the weakening of internal unstressed vowels; *RChron.* 135-6) would yield OIr. *co-ta/om(m)* straightforwardly enough here (unlike in the case of the postvocalic variant, as pointed out in II.3.2d) except that Kim's scenario would generate lenited as opposed to the actually attested unlenited forms of the consonant-initial object pronouns virtually everywhere (II.3.2d). Moreover, it only yields the required /-de-/ with this one preverb, since **ad-sti-, *eχ-(s)ti-* and **wor-(s)ti-* would almost certainly have resulted in **as-*, **acht-* and *fort-* /*fort-/ rather than actually attested *at-* (with both *as-* and *ad-*) and *fort/d-* /ford-/ (see above). An even more serious problem is that analogical substitution of **-sti* for **-esti* would presumably also have affected the putative main-clause particle when not followed by another enclitic, whence **kom-sti* > **kom-t(i)* > **kont* > **cot* /kod/ instead of actually attested OIr. *con* and similarly *mutatis mutandis* for the other preverbs in question.

1.4. As Schrijver (1997, 163-4) points out, in early Middle Welsh there existed, alongside the common non-mutating preverbal particle *y(d)* (/ə/ before a consonant, /əð/ before a vowel) corresponding to Cornish *yth* and Breton *ez*, a rarer leniting *yt* or *yd* /əd/ seen, for instance, in the 3sg. pres. *yd gan* 'sings' (Black Book 40.1) of *canu* 'to sing'. Schrijver's (1997, 163) tentative suggestion that 'perhaps this is originally the same particle as *yð*, with provection of **ð* to *d* before a following stop' can hardly be accepted because it is not only at variance with the actually attested preconsonantal form *y* /ə/ of *yd* /əð/ but also fails to account for the lenition normal after *yt/d* /əd/. There is, however, one eminently plausible preform capable of yielding leniting *yt/d* /əd/ in Middle Welsh without the slightest formal difficulty,

and that is **eti*. This derivation is, of course, impossible if one insists upon a generalised main-clause particle **es* or **et(i)*, since the outcome of **et-es*, tautologous **eti-(e)t* or the like would not cause lenition. By contrast the present writer's theory that **-i* was shielded from apocope by a following enclitic and then spread to corresponding consonant-final initial forms by analogy makes a perfectly straightforward derivation of invariably clause-initial **eti* possible, since after the Insular Celtic apocope #**eti*-E...# would have existed alongside apocopated #**et*...# and then replaced it in order to homogenise the form as #**eti*(-E)...# throughout by the exactly same process as applied to the personal endings of initial simple verbs (see above). The obvious derivation of MW *yt/d* /əd/ [+ len.] is, then, from a non-enclitic prefixed **eti* that is securely attested within Celtic (including British forms such as MW *et-waeth*, Mod. *eto* 'again'; *KPV* 98, n. 101), and there is nothing to recommend Schumacher's (*KPV* 96, n. 98) considerably more distant alternative connection with Lat. *ita* 'thus, so' beyond the fact that it is as compatible formally with British sound laws as a derivation from securely established PC **eti*. A better candidate might be the PC **uta* 'and' implied by Celtiberian *uta*, whether or not it is cognate with OInd. *uta* 'and' (Meid, 1993, 127-8; Wodtko, 2000, 468-9), but that too is a more distant comparandum than Gaulish *eti-*. Whether from **eti*, **uta* or **ita* (in descending order of probability), MW leniting *yt/d* deals a serious blow to all versions of the particle theory, positing as they do the generalisation of a lenition blocking enclitic in Wackernagel position in all declarative main clauses in Insular Celtic. However, it is especially damaging to Schrijver's, since it entails the survival of an element at least similar to and most likely identical with his **eti* 'and' in Insular Celtic and then on into early Middle Welsh as a clause-initial connective (like its probable exact cognates Gaulish *eti-*, Latin *et* etc., or like OIr. *no, nu* < **nu*) and not as an enclitic.

2.1. Schrijver's enclitic **et(i)* is thus rendered highly improbable even in British but there remains the issue of the *-t* typically attached to certain preverbal particles such as MW negative *ny* before a vowel, to which may be added the dental element prefixed to various forms of the copula in British. Schrijver (1997, 164) refers to 'W *yd-*, MCo. *ys-*, B *ed-*, which appear before the present and imperfect forms of the copula that started with a vowel (root **es-*): cf. MW *ydiw*, MCo. *vsy*, MB *edy* 'is' (Morris Jones 1913: 348-49; Lewis-Zimmer 1990: 56, Hemon 1954: 217-23). The fact that this *yd-* appears before a vowel while the leniting particle *yd* never does points to the conclusion that these are different particles. The origin of *yd-* before the copula is obscure (see Pedersen 1913: 174, 233, Morris Jones 1913: 288 for unconvincing explanations)'. As will appear below, there is much to be said for Schrijver's scepticism regarding the identity of the preverbal particle reconstructed above as **eti* with the **et-* or **it-* that must already have developed as an optional prefix to the present stem **es-* of the copula in Common British. Nevertheless, the possibility that **eti* 'and' developed a particular affinity for vowel-initial forms of

the copula, perhaps in order to lend them greater substance, will not be completely discounted at this stage. Moreover, even if **eti* 'and' and the **et-/*it-* prefixed to the stem **es-* of the copula are taken to be different in origin, it is far from clear that Schrijver's 'enclitic' *-t* found with negative *ny* etc. before a vowel, including vowel-initial forms of the verb 'to be' and the already mentioned 3sg. MW *nyt* 'is not' < **ne-(e)t-est* or the like belongs with the former rather than the latter.

2.2. What does seem clear, however, is that British forms such as MW 1sg. *nyt wyf* 'I am not', 2sg. *nyt wyt* 'you are not', 3sg. *nyt* or *nyt yw* '(he/she/it) is not', 1pl. *nyt ym* 'we are not', 2pl. *nyt ywch* 'you are not', 3pl. *nyt ynt* '(they) are not' can hardly be separated from present indicative forms of the copula containing a dental element that are used in Old Irish after the negative and various other conjunct particles: e.g., 1sg. *ni-da* 'I am not' (Wb. 18c1) or *ni-ta* (Wb. 20c25; *ní-ta* Ml. 70b7), 2sg. *ní-t* 'you are not' (*Fél.* Sept. 8) or *ce-ni-ta* 'are you not?' (Ml. 84c3), 3sg. *ní* 'it is not' (Wb. 8a3 etc.; no dental element) but *con-id* 'so that it is' (Wb. 8a5) or *con-did* 'so that (he) is' (Wb. 9d2), 1pl. *ni-tam* 'we are not' (Wb. 15b21, *prima manus*), *ni-tan* (Wb. 18b9) or *ni-dan* (Wb. 14c41 and 14d37), 2pl. *ní-dad* 'you are not' (Wb. 8c7; *nidad* 21b14) or *ni-tad* (Wb. 9d11), 3pl. *ni-t* 'they are not' (Ml. 128d1 and *Fél.* March 1), *ni-tat* (Wb. 7b12 and 9b17) or *ní-dat* (Ml. 115b3). There is no doubt that the *i* was at least sometimes long in Old Irish and this may always have been the case in view of frequent omission of the length mark in Old and Middle Irish manuscripts. On the whole, it looks as though the *i* may have tended to be long in the *ní-d-* forms but short in the *ni-t-* counterparts. Since the Old Irish forms with a lenited *-d-* (the *-t-* /d/ variant having spread from the 3pl., as will be argued below) are easily derived by standard voicing of a dental fricative between unstressed vowels from a *-th-* that would be the regular lenited outcome of *-t-* just like the /d/ seen in MW *nyt(-)* (ModW *nid*), the conclusion that the same **-(e/i)t-* is involved in both cases is hard to avoid. It would follow that **-(e/i)t-* had become a fixed part of the first and second person negative (and perhaps some other dependent) forms of the present indicative of the copula as early as Insular Celtic.

Identifying this element with Schrijver's enclitic **et(i)* 'and' would, of course, be quite fatal for his overall explanation since a derivation such as OIr. 2pl. *nídad* 'you are not' < **nítheth* < **nīθeθih* <**nītetis(i)* < **nētetesi* < **ne-et(i)-etesi* (see 2.3 below) entails the normal inlaut reflex of intervocalic *-t-* as *-th-* in Old Irish. Needless to say, this would completely invalidate the claim that **-(e)t-* became **-(e)h-* (whether via **-(e)θ-* or **-(e)s-* is immaterial) as if in auslaut, thus ruling out crucial reconstructions such as OIr. *d-a:beir* 'brings it' < **tē:βere* < **toi:βereh* < **tu-'h-e:βereh* < **tu-(e)t(i)-e:beret* for the simple reason that the OIr. outcome would have to have been **do-d:beir* < **tu-'θ-e:βereh* etc. in line with the development see in the *níd-* forms of the Old Irish copula. Should **(e)t-* in OIr. *níd-*, MW *nyt(-)* etc. turn out not to be connected with **eti* 'further, and', as will be argued

in 2.3-5 below, the consequences for Schrijver's hypothesis are not much better, because there would then be next to no forms left to offer any tangible support for enclitic **et(i)* 'and' in British. This phantom particle can, then, be confidently consigned to oblivion as a prelude to looking at the **(-)(e)t-* forms of the copula in more detail.

2.3. It has been argued (McCone, 1995, 123-7; see III.1.5.2 on the invalidity of Schumacher's objections to the proposed reconstruction of the 2sg. and 2pl.) that the independent present indicative of the copula had the following forms in Insular Celtic in line with the present writer's view of the differentiation of absolute and conjunct endings: 1sg. **e-mmi* (< **es-mi*; > OIr. *am*), 2sg. **i-si* (< **e-si* by the regular sound change discussed by *RChron.* 99-100; > PrimIr. **i*, clarified by a pronominal suffix as OIr. *i-t*), 3sg. **i-ssi* (for **e-ssi* < **es-ti*, probably under the influence of the 2sg. and/or 3pl.; > OIr. *is*; > MW *ys*), 1pl. **e-mmosi* (< **es-mosi* with replacement of inherited zero-grade *s-* by full-grade *es-*; > OIr. *ammi*, sometimes *ammi-n* with added pronominal suffix; > MW *ym*), 2pl. **e-tisi* (< **e-tesi* like 2sg. **isi* < **esi* and reformed from **(e)stesi* on the analogy of apparent stem *e-* plus ending in the 2sg. and also the 1sg. and 1pl.; > OIr. *adi* beside *adi-b* with pronominal suffix), 3pl. **_-nti* (< **s-_nti* < **s-enti* by regular sound changes discussed by *RChron.* 55-6, 98 and 107; > OIr. *it*; > MW *ynt*).

The OIr. 3sg. negative form *ní* 'is not' (non-leniting but prefixing *h-* to a vowel as in OIr. *ní (h)ed* /ni: heð/ 'it is not it/that' surviving in Modern Irish as *ní hea*) derives straightforwardly from **nīh* < **nīs* < **nīss* (by IC apocope and *-st(-)* > *-ss(-)*) < **nīsti* < **nēsti* on the unproblematical assumption that **ne-esti* was contracted to **nēsti* before the well-known Proto-Celtic change of *ē* to *ī*). The rare OIr. 3pl. form *nit* may well be the original as a direct continuation of **nınt* < **n(e)-ınt* (either by Primitive Irish loss of intervocalic *-h-* < *-s-* or rather earlier through the analogical influence of independent **ınti)* < **ne-hınt* < **ne-sınti* < **ne-senti* (the suggestion of *KPV* 103, n. 107, that the *-t-* of OIr. *nit-* 'with /d/' might be < **-et-de-* 'and and/but' being singularly unattractive). This form may survive in the negatives MCo. *nyns*, MBret. *nend*, *nenn* < SW British **nınt* (hardly with an *-nt* 'of still unknown origin' with *KPV* 103, n. 107). These occur only before the verbs 'to be' and 'to go' and may perhaps have been extrapolated from a doubled 3pl. negated copula **nınt-ınt* similar to the form arguably underlying OIr. 3pl. *nitat* (cf. Schrijver, 1997, 158, but see below).

2sg. **nīs* < **nīsi* < **nēsi* (**ne-esi*) would very probably have been identical with 3sg. **nīs* in Insular Celtic, and one way of resolving this serious ambiguity would presumably have been to reinterpret 2pl. **nītis* < **nītisi* < **nītesi* < **nētesi* (**ne-etesi*) as a 2sg. **nīt-is* corresponding in the normal fashion to independent **isi*. Once a negative **nīt* with a convenient hiatus filling final *-t* had arisen in this way,

creation of a new 2pl. **nīt-etis* standing in a synchronically regular relation to independent **etisi* would be quite straightforward, actually attested OIr. *adi* and *nídad* then deriving with complete phonological regularity from < **eθihi* (< **etisi*) and **nīθeθih* (< **nītetis*) respectively. In view of the poor attestation of the 2sg. in Old Irish, the lack of an early example of *ní-da* is probably no more than a fluke. 2sg. *nít* in *Félire Óengusso* with a metrically guaranteed monosyllabic value looks at first sight like an extraordinarily early example of a common Middle Irish tendency to inflect the copula by means of a 3sg. form plus a first or second person infixed pronoun, whence later forms like 2sg. *is-at* 'you are', 1sg. *ní-m* 'I am not'. However, it is difficult to see how the vowel of 1/2sg. *nída* (or *nita*) can be old, and it looks as if *e* (> OIr. *a* in proclitics) was extrapolated from 1pl. **níthem*, 2pl. **níthe(i)th* shortly before the Old Irish period and added to monsyllabic 1/2sg. **níth* (1sg. < **nīθen* < **nītemm*, 2sg. < **nīθih* < **nītis*), the upshot being the more substantial **níthe* underlying OIr. *nída* (leniting). Be that as it may, the particularly slight independent 2sg. **i* seems to have already acquired a regular pronominal suffix *-t* in Old Irish (*it*, or *at* with the same vowel as 2pl. *adi(b)*, which has a byeform *idib* as a result of the same interaction in reverse) and it may well be that inherited **níth* was remodelled to *nít* in the same way. Once 2sg. **nīt-is* and 2pl. **nīt-etis* had come into existence in the manner just proposed, 1sg. **nīt-emm* (see above on OIr. *nída*) and 1pl. **nīt-emmos* (> Early Old Irish **níthem* implied by Cambrai's *nu-ndem* in a nasalising relative clause; OIr. *nídan* with replacement of *-m* by the 1pl. pronominal suffix) could easily have replaced 1sg. **nīmm* and 1pl. **nīmmos* as more transparent counterparts of independent 1sg. **emmi* (> OIr. *am*) and 1pl. **emmosi* (> OIr. *ammi*).

The use of 2pl. forms as 2sg. is, of course, well attested, albeit typically as a polite form in the first instance (a possibility anyway scarcely to be excluded in view of the hierarchical aristocratic society held to have typified all known Celtic peoples). French *vous* as a 2pl. also used as a polite 2sg. alongside familiar *tu* is a particularly familiar instance (Modern Welsh *ch(w)i* and *ti* or Modern Scots Gaelic *sibh* and *thu* being similarly distributed, for example). The general 2sg. and pl. *you* (originally 2pl. and then also polite 2sg.) in most varieties of Modern English is an obvious example of a further stage entailing displacement of an original 2sg. (*thou*, *thee*) by restricting it first to familiar contexts (like French *tu*) and then ousting it completely. This stage may then be followed by the creation of a new distinctive 2pl. such as the *yous* of certain varieties of Hiberno-English. All of these developments are clearly seen in Basque with its familiar 2sg. *hi* versus less familiar 2sg. *zu*, which has become or is becoming a general 2sg. at the expense of *hi* in a number of areas, and pl. *zuek*. Its typical plural marking (e.g. *(zu) zaude* 'you are' like 1pl. *(gu) gaude* 'we are' and 3pl. *(haiek) daude* '(they) are' as opposed to *(hi) hago* 'you are' like 1sg. *(ni) nago* 'I am' and 3sg. *(hura) dago* '(he, she, it) is') clearly betray the origins of *zu* and associated verb forms as 2pl. In this case, however, after becoming a

non-familiar 2sg. it was replaced in its original 2pl. function by a new hypercharacterised plural *zuek* (*zaudete* ‘you are’) formed in virtually the same way as dialectal English *yous*. There is thus considerable similarity between the emergence of 2sg. *(zu) zaude* and 2pl. *(zuek) zaudete* in Basque (see Trask, 1997, 196) and what has been posited above for the substantive verb in Common British. Alternatively, however, one might invert the above scenario by positing the reshaping of 2pl. neg. **nītis* to **nīt-etis* with a second element identical (apart from predictable abs./conj. alteration in the ending) to affirmative 2pl. **etis* as a first step and then reanalysis of residual **nītis* as **nīt-is*, which then replaced ambiguous 2sg. neg. *nīs* by virtue of being a synchronically straightforward alternant of affirmative 2sg. **isi*.

It thus seems very probable that the negative paradigm of the copula in Insular Celtic was 1sg. **nīt-em(m)*, 2sg. **nīt-is*, 3sg. **nīs*, 1pl. **nīt-emmos*, 2pl. **nīt-etis*, 3pl. **nint* with the spread of **nīt-* resisted only in the third person owing to the particularly frequent occurrence of the forms in question. In view of what was said above about the possible extrapolation of the SW British negative **n_nt* from a doubled **nɪnt-ɪnt* that could also be directly responsible for OIr. 3pl. *nitat* ‘(they) are not’, it is conceivable that such a form had already been created at an Insular Celtic phase, presumably on the model of the *n*V*t*-V*t*- sequence in the 2pl. However, the occasional presence of 3pl. *nit* in Old Irish rather indicates that *nitat* was a relatively late creation there and the remodelling of 3pl. **nɪd´* (> OIr. *nit*) to **nɪd´ed´* (> OIr. proclitic *nitat*) is easier to envisage if the 2pl. trigger had already become **nīθ´eθ´* as a result of the Primitive Irish loss of final syllables conventionally dated to about 500 AD. If so, a 3pl. copula **nɪnt* ‘are not’ may have come to be used as a plain negative in SW British once the 3sg. copula **nīd* (< **nīd-eh* << **nīt-ess*; see below) underlying MW *nyt* ‘is not’ had fallen together with the plain negative **nī(d)* after the loss of final syllables.

Be that as it may, once *nit-* had come into being in the 3pl. beside *níth-* (> OIr. *níd-*) in the first and second persons in Early Old Irish at latest, the stage was set for *-t-* and *-th-* to become free variants throughout the paradigm except for the basic 3sg. *ní*, which still contained no dental element. The result was 1/2 sg. *nita* alongside *nída*, 1pl. *nitam/n* alongside *nídam/n*, 2pl. *nitad* alongside *nídad* and 3pl. *nídat* alongside *nitat* in Old Irish. Since the base form of the negative in Old Irish was *ní*, presumably without change since the loss of final syllables etc., there was no doubt a tendency to segment forms such as the above as negative plus a dependent form of the copula beginning with */θ/* (> OIr. *-d-* /ð/) or /d/ (> OIr. *-t-* /d/), the upshot being the extrapolation of a set of dependent forms 1/2sg. *-(n)da*, 1pl. *-(n)dan*, 2pl. *-(n)dad* and 3pl. *-(n)dat* for use after other conjunct particles. Since these bore some resemblance to class C infixed pronouns, particularly after nasalising segments such as *co* ‘so that’ (*co-nd(-)* with copula as well as pronoun) and no

suitable dependent form could be extrapolated from 3sg. copula *ní*, a new 3sg. dependent form *-(n)d*, *-(n)id* or *-(n)did* of the copula (e.g. interrogative *i(n)-nd* 'is it?', *co-n(d)id* 'so that it is') seems simply to have been based on the 3sg. m./n. *-(n)d*, *-(n)id* or *-(n)did* of the class C infixed pronouns (e.g. *fua-nd:rogab* 'in [lit. under] which he had sung it', *co-nid:chumscaiged* 'so that he might alter it', *co-ndid:tuctis* 'so that they might understand it'). That more or less concludes matters as far as Old Irish is concerned.

2.4. In British, however, a still greater destiny awaited the dental element that originated in the 2pl. and was spread throughout the dependent first- and second-person forms of the copula in Insular Celtic in the manner described above. To begin with, **nīt-* seems to have spread into the third person of the present indicative of the copula plus negative in Common British on the evidence of 3sg. MW *nyt* 'is not' < **nīd-ih* << **nīt-is(s)* and also, probably after lenition to **nīd-*, to have been modified to a **nīd-/*ned-* (> MW *ny(t)*) corresponding to the **ed-/*ɪd-* (the latter by *i*-affection in all but the 1sg. and 1pl.; > OW *hitt-*, MW *yd-/ytt-*, MCo. *ys-*, MBret. *ed-*) < **et-* by then commonly prefixed to positive forms of the present indicative of the copula. It also spread from the present to the vowel-initial imperfect of the copula, the upshot being forms such as MW 3sg. *nyt oed* 'was not', 3pl. *nyt oedynt* 'were not'. Its convenience as a negative used with vowel-initial forms of the common copula was such that it (or originally 3pl. **nɪnt*; see 3.1 below) seems to have replaced inherited **nī* corresponding to OIr. *ní* in all prevocalic contexts and then to have triggered analogical shortening of the latter's vowel to yield the **ni* or **nɪ* underlying MW *ny*, Co. *ny*, Bret. *ne*. The emergence of a distribution **ni* C-/**nid* V- in this important context could then easily have led to *-d* being pressed into service in British as a useful hiatus filler after other vowel-final particles, whence for instance MW *neut* V- corresponding to *neu* C- and OW *rit* (occasionally even before a consonant) alongside *ri* (> MW *ry*). Alternatively, if forms such as MW *neut*, OW *rit*, MW *hud/t* 'so' can derive regularly from **nou-(e)t*, **ro-(e)t* etc. with Schrijver (1997, 161), they can just as easily be the regular outcome of these elements in contact with copula *et-* and then have extended their range somewhat by the time of Old and Middle Welsh. Be that as it may, there is no need to ascribe *-t* /-d/ in Welsh to an enclitic particle **et(i)* or the like.

The above account posits extrapolation of **nīt-* (> OIr. *níd-*, MW *nyt(-)*) from the 2pl. pres. ind. copula **-etis*, its subsequent spread to the 1st. and 2nd. person negative forms in Insular Celtic and then its convenient generalisation before vowel-initial verb forms in British, notably Welsh. The element **et-* > **ɪd-* (by lenition and internal *i*-affection) > MW *ytt-/yd-*, MCo. *ys-*, and Bret. *ed-* appearing as an optional but frequent prefix to vowel-initial present and imperfect forms of the verb 'to be', in effect forms of the copula, in all three branches of British can

likewise be derived ultimately from the 2pl. pres. ind. of the copula, this time independent **etisi*. The attested 2pl. forms MW *ydywch*, Co. *esough* and MBret. *edouch* clearly indicate that this was remodelled with the help of the 2pl. subject pronoun **hwīh* (< **swīs*) underlying MW *chwi* etc. to **etihwīh* > **ɪdihwīh* in Common British. Since the paradigm essentially consisted of vowel plus ending in the other persons such as 2sg. **i-hi* (< **i-si* < **e-si* discussed earlier), the new 2pl. would almost inevitably have been segmented as **i-hwīh* plus a prefix **ɪd-* not found elsewhere. The result seems to have been a skew, whereby a 2pl. form **i-hwīh* (ultimately to MW *ywch*, Co. *ough*, MBret. *ouch*) without **ɪd-* was created to match the other persons, which in turn acquired new variants such as 3pl. **ɪd-ɪnti* (> W *yd-ynt*, MBret. *ed-ynt*) with prefixed **ɪd-* alongside inherited **ɪnti* (> MW *ynt*, Co. *yns*, MBret. *ynt*), a process further applied to the imperfect (e.g. MW *ytt-oed* beside *oed*) and no doubt encouraged by the use of negative **nīd-* before all such vowel-initial forms of the copula. This hypothesis accounts for the prefixing of **et-* > **ɪd-* specifically to forms of the copula in Common British with an ease that alternatives involving a non-enclitic particle **et(i)* cannot match. This in turn corroborates the preceding suggestion that the copula was the primary locus of the Insular Celtic negative **nīt-* only found with first- and second-person present indicative forms of the copula in Irish but subsequently used as a general prevocalic form of the negative in Welsh (*nyt* < **nɪd* << **nīd* under the influence of **ɪd*).

2.5. If 2pl. **ɪd-ihwīh* ‘you are’ was indeed the origin of the reflex of **ɪd* optionally prefixed to the copula in all branches of British, one might also expect optional reflexes of this element between a preverb and the rest of the verb in any old compound of the copula in British. This is exactly what we do find in the case of MW *hanuot* ‘to be from’, a compound of the verb ‘to be’ with the prefix *han* < **sani* (OIr. *sain* ‘distinct, separate’) and forms such as 3sg. *hen-d-yw* (Schrijver, 1997, 155) beside *hen-yw* or 1pl. *han-d-ym* beside *hen-ym* (*LP* 330). A particularly thorough investigation of these forms has now been made by Schumacher (1999), who suggests that they supply evidence for Schrijver’s enclitic **et(i)* with regular loss of its vowel by British syncope in this position. However, it has already been see that if a *-d-* occurring with the copula here and after certain ‘conjunct’ particles, notably MW negative *ny-t*, is derived from enclitic **et(i)*, the result is utterly fatal for Schrijver’s crucial derivation of Old Irish forms such as *ní:chara* ‘does not love it’ < **nīh-e:χarāh* < **nīs-e:karās* < **nīt-e:karāt* (< **ne-et-e(d):karāt(i)*). The reason is simply that forms such as OIr. 2pl. copula *nídad* can then hardly derive from anything but **nīθeθih* < **nītetis* < **ne-et-etis* or the like with the normal outcome *θ* of intervocalic *t*, the ineluctable corollary being OIr. **ní-d:chara* < **nīθ-e:χarāh* < **nīθ-e:karāθ* < **nīt-e:karāt*. Moreover, since forms of *hanuot* with and without *-d-* occur side by side just like vowel-initial forms of the verb ‘to be’ with and without a reflex of **ɪd-*, it hardly looks as though we are dealing here with the reflex of an enclitic particle that would make the *-d* of the *han-uot* forms different

from the *yd/t-* optionally prefixed to those of the corresponding simplex *bot*. Both elements can surely be explained in the same way by positing a skew of Common British 2sg. **han-ih* etc. (e.g. 1pl. **han-emm*) and 2pl. **han-ıd-ihwīh* to yield 2sg. **han-ıd-ih* etc. (e.g. 1pl. **han-ıd-emm*) and 2pl. **han-ihwīh* alongside the inherited forms, whence ultimately MW pres. 1sg. *han(d)wyf*, 2sg. *han(d)wyt*, 1pl. *handym* or *henym*, imperf. 3sg. *han(d)oed* and so on.

Neither OW *imm-it-cel* 'hides him/itself' nor *er-it-migam* 'I make him' needs to be taken as a direct reflex of otherwise unsupported **ambi-(e)t(i)-en* (Schrijver, 1997, 155 and 173) or **ari-(e)t(i)-en* (see *KPV* 111-2). Since infixing a pronoun after a preverb was an obsolescent pattern in Old Welsh etc. (see I.2.1d) these forms could surely be due to a trivial enough replacement of the /ð/ of **ımmıð* < **æmbið-e(n)* < **æmbiy-e(n)* (> OIr. *imm-a:*) or **erıð* < **arið-e(n)* < **ariy-e(n)* (> OIr. *ar-a*, *-a* rather than **-i* being simply due in both cases to the historically regular form *-a* of this pronoun elsewhere) by the *-t* /d/ seen after various preverbal particles such as the negative discussed above. The same process can be applied to MW *yssit* 'there is (to it/him)' (< **issi-(e)t(i)-e* according to Schrijver, 1997, 173-6) for **issið* < **issið-e(n)* < **estiy-e(n)* (or < **esti-d(e)-e(n)* arguably underlying OIr. *iss-id* 'there is to it/him', if not a late prehistoric replacement of **iss-i* < **issiy-e(n)*). Once established in this way, distinctive 3sg. m. *-(i)t* could easily become somewhat productive and spread to contexts where inherited *-e(n)* had left either no distinctive reflex or only a weakly characterised one: e.g., *kyu-id-odei* 'used to raise it' (*KPV* 111; for **kyf-* < **kom-en* identical with the unaccompanied preverb, there being no warrant for the assumption that main-clause 'class B' infixed pronouns containing **-de-* were developed outside Irish), *ri-t:puchasun* 'I would have wished it' (more clearly distinguished from and standing in a more obvious relation to *ri*, MW *ry* < **ro* than the OW antecedent of MW *rwy* < **ro-e(n)*). Finally, there is OB *ce-nit-guelhum-ni* 'although we do not see it' (*KPV* 114) as well as some instances of OW *nit*, MW *nyt* in the negative counterpart of *yssit* above seen in OW *cin-nit-hoys* 'although there is not', *cen-nit-boi* 'although there be not' (*KPV* 104-5, which derives *nit* here from **nid-e-es* from **nīt-e-ess* consisting of neg. + **et(i)* + 3sg. n. *e* + 3sg. cop.) and later *nyt uu nyt vi* 'there was not, there will not be' with a tell-tale lenition that could well also have applied to orthographically ambiguous OW *cen-nit-boi* (*KPV* 106-7). Be that as it may, there would be a similar motive to that posited in relation to *ri-t* above for reshaping **ni* 'not (to it/him)' (< **nī(n)* < **nē(m)* < **ne-en/d* or perhaps < **nīs-e(n)*) to /nıd/ standing in an obvious relationship to the plain neg. OW *ni(t)*, MW *ny(t)* (note that the pronoun in the 'there is (not)' construction was largely petrified and that anyway the forms in question typically occur before a consonant or in a subordinate clause, where plain *nit*, *nyt* 'not' was normally excluded). It remains to note that by the Middle Welsh period *-(i)t* had been abandoned as a genuine infixed pronoun in the wake of a semantic merger of (originally 3sg. m.) *e/y* and (originally 3sg. f. and 3pl.) *s* as a

general 3sg./pl. forms that were then redistributed according to environment (*s* being used with neg. *ny*, *neu* and increasingly with *ry*, for instance; see *GMW* 55-6).

Once the crucial props of *ny-t* etc., *he/an-d-* and the like (see 2.6 below) have been removed, the conclusion must surely be that there is no remotely unequivocal evidence for *-t* /d/ from enclitic **(e)t(i)* in British, which thus joins Gaulish and Irish in this respect. On the other hand, it has been seen that the leniting MW preverbal particle *yt* almost certainly shares with Gaulish *eti-c* or *eθθi-c* 'and (further)' a straightforward provenance from a non-enclitic Celtic **eti* corresponding exactly to other Indo-European cognates such as Latin *et* 'and'. This, of course, contradicts Schrijver's central claim that this element somehow became invariably enclitic in Insular Celtic, or rather at a still earlier stage shared with Gaulish.

2.6. Schumacher (*KPV* 96) has raised the following objections to an earlier version of the above account supplied to him on request: 'In a still unpublished article McCone attempts.. to explain away all of the verbal forms in the British languages with a late Proto-British */d/ infixed after first preverb of a conjunct particle... In my opinion this attempt fails for several reasons: firstly infixed */d/ is by no means confined to compounds of the copula as McCone supposes. If */d/ had arisen solely from the copula, the occurrence of */d/ with all manner of verbs would be inexplicable. Secondly, infixed */d/ behaves like a Wackernagel particle in every respect, i.e. it is always infixed after the first preverb or after a sentence-initial conjunct particle; above all, infixed */d/ is also found with compounds of the copula with two or more preverbs and then always after the *first* preverb (cf. MW *dy-d-eruyð* and *dy-d-aruu*.., OB *da-d-arued* and *da-d-aruei*..; the preverbs here are **tu-ari-*) and not in the position directly before the root syllable implied by McCone. Thirdly, */d/ is not a hiatus filler as McCone supposes: namely, if it were a hiatus filler, both the occurrence of */d/ before a consonant and the absence of */d/ before a a vowel in relative clauses only would be inexplicable' (my translation here and elsewehere). Schumacher then goes on (*KPV* 97-103) to make a lucid, if uncritical, summary of the case for enclitic **eti*. This is followed (*KPV* 104-114) by a presentation of the British (Old/Middle Welsh, Old/Middle Breton and Middle Cornish) evidence for */d/ that is considerably more comprehensive than the material assembled by Schrijver on account of the extensive collection of early Irish and British verbal forms from primary sources that is such an important ingredient of Schumacher's book, which (notwithstanding inevitable reservations about some of his reconstructions, particularly where **eti* is at issue) can be confidently expected to be the standard work of reference on the Celtic primary verbs for years to come.

The first point to be made in response is that, if Schumacher is right about the necessity of deriving the /d/ of the quite numerous British forms assembled by him,

including the /d/ found with plentiful forms of the copula, from enclitic **eti*, this inevitably results in the worst case scenario depicted for this particle in 2.2 above, unless some good reason can be produced for rejecting the otherwise obvious connection between Welsh forms of the copula prefixed by negative *nyt* and corresponding Old Irish first- and second-person forms with prefixed negative *níd-* /ni:ð-/. To reiterate a basic point made in 2.2 above, if the relevant Old Irish forms contained a reflex of **eti* like their Old and Middle Welsh counterparts, their **-t-* must be assumed to have undergone the expected normal inlaut development to **-θ-* (> /ð/ by regular voicing between unstressed vowels; *RChron.* 133) when followed by vowel-initial forms of the enclitic copula. This, of course, would completely exclude the possibility of an anyway counter-intuitive auslaut development to **-h-* that is utterly indispensable to any attempt to apply **eti* to various Old Irish forms deemed by its adherents to call for the presence of a particle (see 2.2 above for just one typical example, namely OIr. *d-a:beir* 'bears it'). That being so, a general enclitic **eti* must either have somehow got lost in the prehistory of Old Irish or else was not generalised in Insular Celtic main clauses in the first place and only began to spread extensively at a later exclusively British stage. The second of these alternatives is the only viable one, not only on obvious grounds of economy (including the lack of good evidence for enclitic as opposed to non-enclitic **eti*) but also because general or even partial deletion of **(e)t* or **(e)θ* in prehistoric Irish at a stage well after it must have lost its separate identity would be hard to motivate, given its alleged function as a marker of all non-imperative main-clause verbs. However, accepting this second alternative would surely entail the further admission that **(e)t(i)* can have played no role in the development of various crucial and circumstantial features of Old Irish verbal morphology such as non-lenition after pretonic preverbs in main clauses and the absolute/conjunct inflectional dichotomy, which have left sufficient traces in Old/Middle Welsh especially to indicate that their foundations must have been laid at a considerably earlier Insular Celtic phase underlying both the Irish and the British branches.

Schumacher (*KPV* 103, n. 107) seeks refuge in the following vague suggestion: 'The question of what or how many particles were used in the Insular Celtic forms of the copula cannot be settled here. The OIr. conjunct 3sg. *ní* 'is not' can be derived like MW *nyt* 'ditto' from Insular Celtic **nít-es* (< **ne-eti-* + copula) within the framework of the explanatory model supported here. The Old Irish conjunct forms with /ð/ (1sg. *níd-a* etc.) could contain the particle **-de-* (the /ī/ of *ní-* would then be analogical)'. This is a fine example of the perverse consequences that all too often follow from insistence upon some form of particle (see II.3.4 and III.1.5.2/9.3-5 for some others). On the one hand, an Old Irish form (3sg. *ní* otherwise derivable quite straightforwardly from IC **nīs* < **nēsti* as in 2.3 above) with no trace of a reflex of *-t-* before the enclitic copula is supposed (following Schrijver, 1997, 158) once to have contained it on the arbitrary assumption of an auslaut development *-t* > *-h*

> -Ø. On the other, forms with an actual OIr. /-ð-/ corresponding quite regularly to the /-d-/ of MW *nyt* on the assumption of original /-t-/ must instead be supposed to have some other element, arguably **de*, that will not work for British. Even if this bizarre proposition were accepted, that would still leave unresolved the question of why first- and second-person forms that should have contained main-clause **(e)t(i)* replaced this in prehistoric Irish with a lenited **ðe* otherwise prone to occur in relative clauses (e.g., OIr. 3sg. rel. cop. *nad* 'which is not', the perfectly regular outcome of **neð-eh* < **ne-d(e)-es(t)*), whereas the 3sg. at least did not. The worst case scenario for **eti*, then, emerges from the foregoing neither shaken nor stirred.

That said, it is still worthwhile to consider whether the further evidence for /d/ in British adduced by Schumacher really does call for the abandonment of the case made in 2.4-5 above for the origin of this element in second-person forms of the copula (whence it had also spread to first-person forms before the end of the Insular Celtic period) rather than a doubtful enclitic particle **eti*.

To begin with, the objection to /d/ as a hiatus filler will be seen just below to be without real foundation as far as 'the occurrence of */d/ before a consonant' is concerned, and anyway boils down to no more than a synchronic claim about Old and Middle Welsh that by no means excludes an earlier British (and/or Welsh) phase when hiatus was a determining factor. Obviously the anyway not very numerous instances of *-(i)t* as a 3sg. m. (or petrified n.) infixed pronoun are to be excluded from consideration here for the good reason (see 2.5 above on doubts as to whether it contained **(e)t(i)*) that it was largely a meaningful element, the presence or absence of which can hardly have been conditioned by hiatus. Once a solitary example of the infixed pronoun *-it* has been discounted, /d/ is found to be intervocalic in all of the relatively few (mostly Old) Breton forms cited by Schumacher (*KPV* 112-4) and the same holds true of its reflex *-s-* in the handful of relevant Middle Cornish forms (*KPV* 114), prevocalic MB *mar-d* and MC *mar(a)-s* being only apparent exceptions because *mar* 'if' here is obviously < **ma-ro-* (*KPV* 114). SW British evidence for /d/ is thus apparently confined to vowel-initial forms of the verbs 'to be' and 'to go' (< **ag-* 'drive'). It is to be noted that it is found there in subordinate as well as main clauses and that a form such as MC *maras-yns* 'if (they) are' could well contain the regular outcome of **ro-(e)tınt*. Moreover, /d/ turns out to be prevocalic in all and intervocalic in the overwhelming majority of the non-pronominal Old and Middle Welsh examples presented (*KPV* 104-112), the exception of the *hanuot* forms being merely apparent in view of *han-* < **san*V- (*KPV* 83; presumably either a petrified case form of the *i*-stem adjective underlying OIr. *sain* 'distinct, separate' or a bare stem extrapolated well after Insular Celtic apocope). In any case, even if it were attested, sporadic spread of *nit* from prevocalic to preconsonantal position in O/MWelsh would present no real problem for the hypothesis advanced in 2.4-5 above, particularly when the alternative makes /d/ the

regular British reflex of **(e)t(i)* before a vowel only and posits its loss (after impeding lenition) when followed by a consonant. That leaves just a couple of examples of /d/ between *kyf-* and a vowel, namely doubtful *kyf-ḍ-archet* 'was greeted' (< *kyf-* < **kom*) with a cancelling 'punctum delens' under the *d* (*KPV* 110, n. 119), *kyf-d-wyreei* 'raised' (ipf.) and *kyf-d-aerant* 'they quarrel'. Since these are not extant in manuscripts from the Old Welsh period itself, later literary hypercorrection (subsequently rectified in one instance) is a distinct possibility here in view of synchronically identical (but diachronically intervocalic) forms such as *han-d-wyf* from *hanuot* 'be/come from'. Even if they are accepted as genuine, the phenomenon is far too sporadic and easily ascribed to the analogical influence of *hanuot* to be taken seriously as an argument against the obvious penchant of /d/ (except as an infixed pronoun) for intervocalic position in all three branches of British.

There is, then, no difficulty on this basis in positing the spread of OW *nit*, MW *nyt* from forms containing a vowel-initial form of the copula to other vowel-initial verbs or that of the negative's *-t* to other originally vowel-final particles such as *neu*, *ri/ry*, *hu* 'so' standing in front of a vowel-initial form of the copula (e.g. *hud wyf, hud wytt, hud ynt*; *KPV* 107) or some other verb (e.g. *hut amuc* 'so he defended', OW 3sg. augm. pret. *ri-t-ercis*; *KPV* 107 and 110). However, as Schumacher (*KPV* 106-7) points out, that is hardly the whole story in view of a number of examples of *ny* before a vowel in a relative clause, notably *ny oet*, *ny erchir*, *ny agreitho*, *ny ervill* (plus a few more like *yny agoroch* after *yny* 'until' < OW *hit ni* 'for the (length of) time that not'; *KPV* 112). It looks as though these reflect a state of affairs where non-leniting (including spirant mutation of *p-*, *t-*, *c-*) *ni/ny* with a regular prevocalic variant *nit/nyt* in main clauses was opposed to leniting *ny* in relative clauses (see I.2.1e). If so, the spread of *nit/nyt* at the expense of **ni/*ny* in the former but not (in the first instance) the latter is surely easy to motivate in terms of the introduction of an otherwise lacking distinction between main-clause and relative *ni/ny* into the prevocalic environment (main-clause *nit/nyt* vs. rel. *ni/ny*) as a pendant to the useful distinction between basic non-lenition and lenition after preconsonantal *ni/ny* in these two types of clause. Finally, in the case of reasonably plentiful survivals of *-t/d-* before a vowel after the first preverb of a compound verb Schumacher makes two arguments for the origin of this element as enclitic **(e)t(i)* rather than an **(e)t* extrapolated from pres. ind. forms of the copula: (a) it only occurs when the verb is in sentence-initial position and is not preceded by a conjunct particle, as in indep. 1sg. *han-d-wyf* vs. dep. 3sg. *ny heniw* etc. (*KPV* 108; see 107 for a similar opposition in the case of the particle *hu* 'so' between *hud/t ynt* and *ny hu ynt* etc.), and (b) it regularly occurs after the first preverb of some five multi-preverb compounds with which it is attested once or twice each (see the first para. of this section) except for *ar-d-wyreaf* 'I praise' with some twenty attestations (but here the especial frequency may be due to a popular etymology as *ard-* 'high' + *-wyrein*; cf. *KPV* 109, n. 118).

Of these (a) can be regarded as a natural consequence of the fact that the longer form of the simple copula also failed to occur after a conjunct particle (e.g. 3pl *ydynt* < **etınt* or *ynt* < **ınt* but only *nyt ynt*, a situation then mirrored by *han(d)-* < **han-(et-)* but only *ny han-* and so on; likewise *hud/t ynt* versus *ny hu ynt* above), while (b) could easily arise from a perfectly understandable synchronic analysis of well attested *han-d-wyf* etc, or *dy-d-au* 'comes' etc. as forms containing post-preverbal rather than pre-radical *-d-*.

In conclusion, upon closer examination Schumacher's evidence is by no means compelling with regard to a derivation of the British /d/ in question from an otherwise unsupported enclitic variant of **eti* rather than an **et-* that initially arose and established itself in the present indicative paradigm of the copula before beginning to spread elsewhere in British in a manner that remains quite easy to motivate. That means that there is still much to be said for the second worst case scenario for enclitic **eti* (see the end of 2.2 above), namely the complete lack of any positive evidence for it (as opposed to inherited non-enclitic **eti*) in British. There may be a choice between this and the worst case scenario, but either way this particular variant of the particle hypothesis is quite unsustainable.

3.1. The history of the main-clause negative may now be sketched as follows in Insular Celtic. Since third-person present indicative forms of the copula could presumably be omitted there as later in Old Irish and also in various other IE languages, it may be presumed that **nīs* 'is not' or **nınt* 'are not' will have been in more or less free variation with **ne* '(is/are) not' inherited as a plain negative from PIE. As a result of this confusion **nīs* and **nınt* (the latter's heavy final cluster probably biassing its use to position before a vowel) came to be used alongside **ne* as plain negatives before other verbs, in due course displacing it by virtue of being more highly characterised, whence **nīs:beret* 'does not bear', *nīs:* or *nınt:agont* 'do not drive' and so on alongside and ultimately in place of **ne:beret* and **ne:agont*. In Goedelic **nīh* < **nīs* became general, whence OIr. *ní* (non-leniting but prefixing /h-/ to a following stressed vowel). In British, however, a form **nīt* originally confined to the 1 and 2sg. pres. ind. copula was generalised beside **nınt* (> MCo. *nyns*, MBret. *nend*) as a prevocalic form, becoming **nıd* (or **nid*) with a short vowel (> MW *nyt*) under the influence of **nınt* and/or the **ıd-* optionally used before present and imperfect forms of the vowel-initial copula (see above). Prevocalic **nıd* and **nınt* in turn influenced the vocalism of preconsonantal **nīh* < **nīs* to produce the **nıh* (or **nih*) underlying MW *ny*, Co. *ny*, Bret. *ne*. In W British (> Welsh) **nıd* then ousted **nınt*, whereas in SW British (> Cornish and Breton) the reverse occurred.

3.2. The basic premiss of the foregoing account is that the dental fricative found with various negative and other dependent present indicative forms of the copula in

Old Irish cannot reasonably be separated from an appreciably more widespread dental element in British Celtic, especially Welsh. The formal match between them is precise, since both can be derived from an earlier voiceless dental stop *-t-* in full conformity with well established Goedelic and British sound laws. Their distribution also has a good deal in common, given that the chief affinities of the British element too are with the negative and the copula. Sound methodology surely calls for an explanation that starts from these compatibilities of form and distribution, and that is what the present chapter has sought to provide. By contrast, the quest for a particle supposedly needed to account for absolute versus conjunct inflection and the peculiar looking behaviour of certain initial preverbs in Insular Celtic obliges Schrijver to posit, just for starters, *ad hoc* cliticisation of **eti* in or before Insular Celtic and an otherwise unsupported change of final *-t* to *-s* as well as a quite arbitrary word boundary between enclitics in Irish. This highly problematical set of assumptions not only gratuitously overcomplicates already complicated historical phonologies but also precludes an otherwise straightforward correspondence between Old Irish *níd-*, Welsh *nyt* and so on, to say nothing of an equally obvious equation of the leniting Middle Welsh particle /əd/ with patently non-enclitic Gaulish *eti-* etc. It seems perverse to ignore or reject the obvious in pursuit of a will o' the wisp particle that turns out with monotonous regularity to create more problems than it can solve, whatever transmogrifications are applied to it.

CHAPTER SIX

Relative Marking

1.1. An accented inflected relative pronoun with the stem **i̯ó-* has long been reconstructed on the strength of Indo-Iranian, Greek and Phrygian (e.g., Szemerényi, 1989, 222). Any doubts as to whether such an element had been a fully developed feature of Proto-Indo-European as a whole or rather an innovation restricted to certain emergent dialects (the 'satem'-languages and Greek according to Szemerényi, 1989, 223) were dispelled when the first Botorrita inscription yielded unmistakable examples of a non-enclitic inflected *io-* relative in Celtiberian (e.g. Meid, 1993, 96) that could only have been inherited from PIE via Proto-Celtic. This development came as something of a surprise because the other main representative of Continental Celtic, namely Gaulish, seems to have had an uninflected enclitic relative marker *-(i)o* that is quite compatible in form as well as function with various reflexes of an erstwhile enclitic relative marker in Insular Celtic languages (see 1.2 below, Meid, 1993, 96 and *LG* 67-8). Gaulish *-(i)o* is seen most clearly in 3pl. *dugiiontiio* on the *Martialis Dannotali* inscription (*LG* 98-102), where it almost certainly refers to a plural subject antecedent, and probably in the more difficult but definitely 3pl. *toncsiiontio* on the Chamalières inscription (*LG* 150-9, esp. 156), which may have a neuter singular object antecedent. If this were taken as *(g)naman* (cognate with Gk. γνῶμα 'mark, token, opinion, judgement' < **ĝnéh₃-mn̥*, **ĝn̥h₃-mén-*, both of which would yield PC **gnām-* quite regularly), the passage in question might be interpreted as something like *aθθedillí etic secoui ponc (g)naman toncsiíontío* 'since the token/judgement that they will swear (by) (is) A and S's'. Rubio Orecilla (1997, 32-9) offers a full discussion of these forms, associated problems of interpretation and the possible Gualish 1sg. rel. *scrisumio* recorded by Marcellus of Bordeaux (*LG* 177-8)

Like its Indic and Greek counterparts *yá-* and ős- (see Delbrück, 1888, 557-60 and 563-5, and Watkins, 1977, 11-16), the Celtiberian relative pronoun *io-* was prone to be resumed in the main clause by a reflex of PIE demonstrative **só-/*tó-*, the **so-* variant of which had been generalised in Proto-Celtic as in Italic (see Schrijver, 1997, 9-16). The following inflected forms of the pronoun have been recognised so far (Wodtko, 2000, 133-4 and 138-9; Villar *et al.*, 2001, 117; Jordán Cólera, 2004, 158), a correlating form of the *so-* demonstrative sometimes helping to resolve ambiguous cases: nom. sg. m. *ios*, dat. sg. m./n. *iomui* (with correlating dat. sg. m./n. *somui*), nom./acc. pl. n. *ia* (with correlating gen. pl. n. *soisum*), acc. pl. f. *ias* (with correlating gen. pl. f. *saum*). Since East and West agree regarding not only an inflected relative pronoun with basic stem **i,ºó-* but also a circumstantial and presumably inherited tendency to resume this with a **só-(/*tó-*) demonstrative in the main clause, Ziegler (1993) is surely right to claim that Celtiberian here

continues the Proto-Celtic and Proto-Indo-European state of affairs with little or no change. If so, Gaulish and Insular Celtic would seem to have shared a striking and circumstantial innovation (Rubio Orecilla, 1997, 37; see 1.2 below) in relative marking that may well have a significant bearing upon the genetic relationship between the various documented members of the Celtic language family (Ziegler, 1993, 267).

1.2. The Insular Celtic languages present incontrovertible evidence for a relative marker added to the personal ending of an initial simple verb but to the first preverb of an initial compound verb in strict conformity to Wackernagel's (1892) Law governing the placement of enclitics in PIE and various daughter languages (see I.1.7 and I.2.1e on Irish and British respectively). Moreover, agreement with Gaulish against Celtiberian arguably extends beyond the feature of enclisis versus non-enclisis to that of non-inflection versus inflection. An Old Irish preform such as 3pl. rel. *bert(a)e* 'who bear' or 'which they bear' must be derived from an earlier **berode-(y)a* < **beronti*-(C)*a/o*(C), a non-high back vowel being required in order to account for the lowering of *i* to *e* (see *RChron.* 110-11) and the choice of a possible initial consonant being confined to those such as *y* or *s* that were liable to loss in intervocalic position at least (see *RChron.* 131-2). A form such as OIr. *do:chlaid* 'who digs up' or 'which (s)he/it digs up' with infixed relative lenition will have contained the same enclitic marker on the straightforward assumption that this had no final consonant to impede the lenition in question, a preform **to-(y)a xlaðeθ* with both subject and object antecedent thus being implied. Since relative **-(y)a* would continue earlier **-i̯o* quite regularly (see *RChron.* 109), considerations of economy clearly indicate a direct equation with the *-(i)o* of Gaulish *dugiiontiio* etc., as tentatively suggested by Thurneysen (1909, 305; *GOI* 323).

1.3. As is well known, lenition was not the only infixed relative marker in Old Irish (I.1.7) unlike British (I.2.1e). Where the antecedent was the object of the relative verb, nasalisation was available as an optional alternative, particularly if the antecedent was not a neuter singular (McCone, 1980, 16-17): e.g., Ml. 42c2 *trisin n-oipred ndo:gniat* 'through the work which they do' and Ml. 82d11 *in molad ro:ngab in popul* 'the praise which the people has uttered' (masc. sg. object antecedent with leniting and nasalising relative clause respectively). The contrast between the comparative frequency of nasalisation after a masc. or fem. sg. object antecedent and its (in Wb., extreme) rarity after a neut. sg. (see the statistics in McCone, 1980, 15-16) arguably points to an inflected pronoun similar to that reconstructed for Proto-Celtic on the strength of Celtiberian, the relevant forms being acc. sg. masc./fem. **yan* (< **i̯om/*i̯ām*) but neut **ya* < **i̯od* by the same early loss of *-d* as can be seen in the class A infixed pronoun (see III.3.2, *GOI* 283 and Schrijver, 1997, 50-63), namely 3sg. neut. *a* < **e* < **ed* with lenition (e.g. *d-a:chlaid* 'digs it up') as against the nasalisation conditioned by the corresponding masc. *a* <

**en* < **em* (e.g. *d-a:mbeir* 'brings him'). Ahlqvist (1983, 11-12), for instance, considers it 'reasonable to view this pattern as derived from one involving neuter relative pronouns ending in a vowel **yo* in the accusative singular, where non-neuter ones would end in a nasal (in the singular). In the case of a subject antecedent, however, a form with vocalic auslaut would have existed at least in the feminine and the neuter, so that lenition would understandably enough establish itself here as a convenient relative marker by the Old Irish period, the plural remodelling itself on the singular..... At the same time, remodelling must have taken place in the forms marking cases other than the nominative and the accusative; in accordance with Breatnach's findings, it seems clear that the nasalising relative clause came to be used for this purpose in the period before that of the Old Irish glosses'. The issue of relative marking or the lack of it in environments other than those involving a straightforward subject or object antecedent will be deferred until 1.5 below.

While some analogical streamlining and redistribution of the mutations resulting from an inflected **i̯o-* pronoun can hardly be excluded as such (McCone, 1980, 17), there is the further problem of why the forms in question should have become enclitic in Insular Celtic (McCone, 1980, 18-19). This difficulty is serious but not insuperable (see Schrijver, 1997, 104, who also opts for uninflected **-yo(d)* in the final analysis), given that the Old Irish 3pl. class A infixed object pronoun *s* almost certainly goes back to enclitic **sūs*, the masc. acc. pl. of the originally non-enclitic **só-(/*tó-)* demonstrative briefly discussed above. However, as argued elsewhere (McCone, 1980), it constitutes a virtually unsurmountable obstacle in combination with the further problem that with a masc. or fem. sg. object antecedent relative nasalisation accounts for rather less (43%) and relative lenition for rather more (57%) than half of the total in the Würzburg Glosses, whereas in the somewhat later Milan Glosses the ratio of nasalisation to lenition in this category rises to about two to one (details in McCone, 1980, 12-16). Had a distinction between relative lenition with a subject antecedent and relative nasalisation with an object antecedent been inherited in the manner envisaged by Ahlqvist, the latter would originally have been general with a masculine or feminine object antecedent. Despite its manifest usefulness it would then have undergone a marked decline by the time of Würzburg only to undergo some revival by the time of Milan. That being so, this feature bears all the marks of a rather recent prehistoric innovation in Irish that was undergoing well motivated expansion just before and during the earlier part of the Old Irish period, a status fully compatible with the lack of any formal distinction between relative marking with subject and object antecedent in British Celtic (I.2.1e and McCone, 1980, 17-18).

1.4. These considerations suggest the working hypothesis that Insular Celtic, like Gaulish, possessed an uninflected enclitic relative marker **-(i̯)o* used regardless of the antecedent's gender and number or of its status as subject or object of the relative

clause. The question then arises as to what relationship, if any, such an element bore to the non-enclitic inflected *_i̯ó-_ pronoun that is securely attested in Celtiberian and can be reconstructed with equal confidence for Proto-Celtic and Proto-Indo-European. Thurneysen (1909, 305; *GOI* 323) suggested a petrified nom./acc. neut. sg. *_i̯ód_ of the pronoun that had undergone the already mentioned early loss of *-d*. This view is entertained as a possibility by Schrijver (1997, 105) and has been firmly supported by Ziegler (1993, 254), who points to a pertinent parallel in Late Avestan (Ziegler, 1993, 266). Aside from the admittedly not intractable problem of cliticisation (Rubio Orecilla, 1997, 38; see 1.3 above), there is no formal objection to positing *_i̯ód_ > *_i̯o_ in Insular Celtic (III.3.2). The crucial issue is whether this development can be placed sufficiently far back to include Gaulish or at least shown to have applied to Gaulish as well as to Insular Celtic. The evidence currently available (see the discussion in III.3.2 and Rubio Orecilla, 1997, 43-8) points to retention of *-d* [-ð], at least after a short vowel, in Gaulish as in Celtiberian. If so, Gaulish *-(i)o* does not derive from *_i̯od_ and will have been an uninflected enclitic element with final vowel from the outset, the corollary being that its Insular Celtic counterpart likewise never contained *-d*. This seems to be the safest bet, unless conclusive evidence for loss of *-d* [-ð] in Gaulish should turn up at some future stage. Were this to happen, generalised and cliticised 3sg. n. *-*yod* could be substituted for the bare stem *-*yo* preferred here without affecting any of the reconstructions involved.

Equation of this *-(i)o* in Celtic with the enclitic Hittite conjunction *-(y)a* 'and' < *_(i̯)o_ is straightforward not only from a formal (Watkins, 1963, 28, n.2) but also from a functional standpoint (McCone, 1980, 20; cf. Schrijver, 1997, 105, and Rubio Orecilla, 1997, 37), given the obvious derivation of the relative markers *-d(a-)* and *-ch(a-)* used after a negative and/or before a clitic object pronoun in Old Irish from the enclitic PIE connectives **de* (Gk. δέ 'but'; Watkins, 1963, 25-8) and *k^we* (Celtib. *kue*, Lepontic *pe*, Lat. *que*, Gk. τε, Skt. *ca* etc. 'and'; Watkins, 1963, 8-12). That said, Watkins (1963, 28) may well be right to insist that the shift of **de* and *$k^{u,o}e$* from a coordinating function still marginally attested in Old Irish (see *EC* 23, 25 and 37-9) to a relative one was a fairly late prehistoric Irish development and that the rise of *-_(i̯)o_, which is so far attested exclusively as a relative marker in Celtic, belonged to an appreciably earlier stratum. On the other hand, the subsequent discovery of an inflected relative *io-* pronoun in Celtiberian with obvious cognates in Greek, Phrygian and Indo-Iranian has invalidated Watkins' (1963, 28-30) claim that an archaic uninflected enclitic *-_i̯o_ was the basic relative marker of Proto-Celtic, as he himself duly conceded: 'The evidence of the new Celtiberian inscription of Botorrita definitely indicates that Common Celtic had an inflected relative pronoun, and therefore that the lack of inflexion in the Insular Celtic relative particle *_i̯o_ (leniting) is probably an innovation. Another innovation of Insular Celtic was to restrict the relative marker "WH" to clause-second, Wackernagel's

law position' (Watkins, 1977, 457).

It does, of course, remain possible that an enclitic connective *-i̯o 'and' existed beside an inflected non-enclitic relative pronoun *i̯ó- in Proto-Celtic, which had inherited them without significant change from Proto-Indo-European, but then ousted the latter in relative function at a later stage shared by Gaulish and Insular Celtic to the exclusion of Celtiberian. If so, Celtic would seem to have been the only non-Anatolian branch of Indo-European to have preserved *-i̯o as a sentence enclitic, a scenario that gives pause for thought in view of the probable separation of Anatolian from the PIE parent stock before that of any other attested daughter family, including Celtic (see II.1.4). It therefore seems worthwhile to consider the possibility that uninflected enclitic relative *-i̯o was an innovation confined to a non-Celtiberian part of the Celtic family and unconnected with an archaic enclitic connective *-i̯o 'and', a direct reflex of which is securely attested only in Anatolian. This, however, must wait, pending a brief examination of the use of relative and non-relative constructions with antecedents other than the subject and object of the following clause (see also I.3.7).

1.5. Where the antecedent was a clefted prepositional phrase or the like, the basic rule in Old Irish was that the following clause was formally identical with a main clause (Strachan, 1949, 137, n.7, and *EIV* 16): e.g., Wb. 6a13 *ar is do thabirt díglae berid in claideb sin* 'for it is for inflicting vengeance (that) he carries (non-rel.; rel. *beres*) that sword' or Ml. 15c10 *is immalle fo-s:didmat* 'it is together (that) they will suffer it (non-rel.; rel. *fo-da:didmat*)'. However, a nasalising relative competed with a non-relative construction in certain contexts (*GOI* 316-20), notably after various antecedents denoting manner, time, cause or the like and as the noun-clause complement of certain verbs and other expressions: e.g., non-rel. Ml. 49b7 *in tan do:ber Día in dígail* '(at) the time (that)/when God inflicts the punishment' (non-rel.; rel. *do:mbe(i)r*), Wb. 30c12 *as:berat is tol Dé for:chanat* 'they say it is (non-rel.; rel. *as*) God's will that they do' versus nas. rel. BB 71 *ind maith ro:mberbais a mbiad?* 'is it well that you have boiled the food?' (Ó hAodha, 1978, 3), Wb. 27c9 *in tain no:mbeid ar súil* '(at) the time that/when you are in public (lit. before [the] eye)', Ml. 97d10 *co n-amairis na-nda:tibérad Día doib* 'with unbelief (to the effect) that God would not give it to them'.

According to Pedersen (my translation) 'in both Insular Celtic branches there exists.... an old and fundamental difference between the cases in which the relative functioned as subject or object and the cases in which the relative had some other function. Clauses with relative subject or object contained their proper pronominal elements with relative meaning from an early period but in the remainder they either occur not at all or arose secondarily. I designate the two types of clause proper and improper relative clauses..... In Old Irish the boundary between proper and improper

relative clauses is straddled by the newly developed relative nasalisation. Nasalisation occupied both a part of the proper relative clause's range and a part of the improper relative clause's range' (*VKG* II, 215-6). The innovatory nature of the Old Irish nasalising relative clause will be confirmed later in this section (following McCone, 1980), as far as the 'proper' type used with an object antecedent is concerned, and has been conclusively demonstrated by Ó hUiginn (1987, esp. 75-86 on origins; cf. *VKG* I, 394-6) with reference to the 'improper' type employed with certain adverbial antecedents. Nevertheless, it will also be argued below that formal relative marking may well not have been restricted at an earlier Insular Celtic stage to clauses with subject or object antecedent in the manner envisaged by Pedersen.

Breatnach (1980) has shown that relative forms basically used in standard Old Irish prose only with a subject or object antecedent (e.g., *in fer ad:chí in torc* 'the man who sees the boar' or 'the man whom the boar sees') or optionally in the types of 'adverbial' environment just mentioned could be employed more extensively in so-called 'archaic' sources to denote other relationships typically associated with prepositions in normal prose: e.g., *iss a miad neich do:gniat mancuine* 'it is according to the rank of him (to) whom they do service' (Breatnach, 1980, 3[19]), *íath nad:adaig -aiccestar* 'a land (in) which night is not seen' (Breatnach, 1980, 5[29]) with a presumed leniting (and certainly not nasalising) relative and *nach brithem a(d):n-agar dias* 'any judge (by) who(m) a pair (i.e. both parties) is protected' (Breatnach, 1980, 3[21]) with what looks like a nasalising relative clause.

Breatnach (1980, 7-8) suggests, chiefly on the strength of a handful of instances such as *áiliu seinm sernar n-imbus* 'I request music (in) which/where poetic art is spread out' (Breatnach, 1980, 5[41]) displaying a usually passive relative form of a simple verb followed by nasalisation, that this usage be linked to the nasalising relative construction discussed above by positing an enclitic element **yan* < **i̯om* with a final nasal comparable to that seen in Latin *cum* 'when' and perhaps still more closely to Celtiberian *iom*, if correctly interpreted as a conjunction meaning something like 'when, while'. From this a meaning 'where' could develop easily enough and 'if one were to assume an extension from this basis of the function of **yom* to that of a general adverbial relative marker, one would to a large degree account for the use of the nasalizing relative clause in OIr.' (Breatnach, 1980, 7). The examples upon which this tentative proposal is based 'do not necessarily imply the existence of a fully inflected relative pronoun at some previous stage in the history of the language' in the opinion of Breatnach (1980, 6), who does not seek to specify what relation, if any, this type of relative nasalisation might bear to that optionally employed with an object antecedent. However, Ziegler (1993, 260-2) points to instances in other languages where a conjunction has developed into an uninflected relative pronoun. This might point to a tendency in the prehistory of Irish to replace a once general uninflected **ya* (< **i̯o*) as an object relative marker

by an originally adverbial **yan* (< **i̯om*) that was presumably cognate with Celtiberian *iom* and was at least formally similar to an acc. sg. m./f.

Celtiberian *iom*, which has been subjected to a full and comprehensively referenced discussion in the broader context of Celtic relative marking by Wodtko (2000, 136-8), may well be a conjunction meaning 'when' or the like in at least some attestations. However, like the inflected relative pronoun *io-* with which it was presumably connected, it was clearly a non-enclitic element that normally stood at the head of its clause. That being so, the cliticisation of its alleged Irish counterpart presents a by now familiar problem and Celtiberian *iom* can be more straightforwardly equated with the likewise clause-initial Old Irish nasalising conjunction *a* 'when' (Meid, 1993, 96). This could be the regular outcome of **yan* < **i̯om* and seems most unlikely to have coexisted with enclitic **yan* < **i̯om* in Insular Celtic, particularly when the upshot would be a derivation such as *a n-as:mbert* 'when/as she said' from tautological **yan exs-yan:birt*. It is also to be emphasised that there is a marked preponderance of infixed lenition over nasalisation in Breatnach's corpus. Moreover, since the examples there inevitably emanate from texts preserved only in quite late manuscripts, 'the possibility of scribal corruption must certainly be reckoned with' (Breatnach, 1980, 7) and a number of telling examples of hypercorrect relative nasalisation in later texts have since been supplied by Ó hUiginn (1986, 74).

On the whole, then, it is quite uncertain that this relative construction was basically associated with nasalisation ascribable to an anyway problematical enclitic **yom* or the like rather than with the lenition expected as a reflex of uninflected enclitic **yo*. Significantly the latter feature also characterised what seems to have been the basic Old Irish genitival relative seen in Wb. 10c1 *don bráthir hiressach as énirt menme* 'to the faithful brother who(se) mind is weak' (*GOI* 321; see 3.1 below on rel. *as* < **esti-i,ᵒo*), *Fél.* Prol.286 *a rí rímter flaithi* 'O King who(se) lords are numbered' (Breatnach, 1980, 2). It thus seems reasonable to frame the working hypothesis that all types of relative clause were once marked by undifferentiated **i̯o* in Insular Celtic as apparently in Gaulish too, regardless of whether they stood in a subject, object, genitival or some other case relationship to their antecedent (see I.3.7 on this and the subsequent development of distinctive genitival and prepositional relative constructions in Irish and British).

Given the lack of anything corresponding to the nasalising relative clause in British or Gaulish and various indications that it had not come into being long before the Old Irish period (see 1.3 above), it seems most likely that relative nasalisation was due to analogical developments after initial mutations had been grammaticalised in the wake of the Primitive Irish reduction and loss of final syllables around the end of the fifth century A.D. (*RChron.* 120-122). If one starts from an originally general

leniting relative construction with both subject and object antecedent owing to the effect of invariable *-*yo* (possibly < *-*yod*), the establishment of a nasalising relative with a masc. as opposed to neut. sg. (see 1.3 above) can be ascribed to the following straightforward proportion (McCone, 1980, 21) using proclitic *ro* as typical preverbal element: + obj. pron. n. sg. *r-a* [+ len.] : m. sg. *r-a* [+ nas.] : obj. rel. n. sg. *ro* [+ len.] : m. sg. *ro* [+ x] (x = nas.]. This distinction was obviously more useful with a masc. or fem. than a neut. antecedent, since animate nouns prone to function as subject as well as object of transitive verbs largely belonged to the first two categories (cf. Lambert, 1992, 257: 'les neutres font exception parce que leur nature même est de ne pas distinguer nominatif et accusatif'). Consequently it soon spread to the fem. sg. and to the masc./fem. pl. Lambert (1992) has basically adopted this explanation but argues on the strength of a detailed examination of the evidence in Wb. and Ml. for more precise conditioning of the nasalising relative, his conclusion being (1992, 257) that with an m./f. object antecedent the leniting construction essentially characterised a restrictive and the nasalising construction a non-restrictive relative clause.

Basque has an uninflected enclitic relative particle *-(e)n*, the antecedent of which can function not only as subject (*etorri de**n** mutila* 'the boy who has come') or object (*ikusi dugu**n** mutila* 'the boy whom we have seen'; *ikusi du**en** mutila* 'the boy who has seen him/her' or 'the boy, whom (s)he has seen') of the relative clause but can also under appropriate conditions designate another grammatical relationship: e.g., *Mikel joaten de**n** medikuarengana joan naiz* 'I have gone to the doctor that Michael goes (to)' (allative), *Agurtzane bizi de**n** etxea* 'the house that Agurtzane lives (in)' (locative; Zubiri, 2000, 717-8). It seems distinctly possible, therefore, that an inherited Celtic relative stem**yo(-)* underwent a remarkable loss of accent and inflection in the non-Celtiberian part of the family owing to the influence of a substrate language characterised by a relative system like that of Basque (McCone, 2000, 492-3). A verbal form containing such an enclitic relative marker might normally be expected to stand next to its head word or antecedent, and this seems to be the case in Basque (where a verb-final relative clause directly precedes its antecedent) and Gaulish (cf. 1.1 above) or Insular Celtic (where a verb-initial relative clause directly follows its antecedent). It remains to note that in Basque relative *-n* invariably comes after the string of pronominal elements (absolutive, dative, and/or ergative; see IV.4.3) incorporated into the verb and is never attached to the negative: e.g., *hau gustatzen **ez** zaida**n** lana da* 'this is work **that** I do **not** like' (lit. 'that does not please me').

Such information as we have about ancient Aquitanian suggests that it was, in effect, an early form of Basque (see Trask, 1997, 398-403) that seems likely enough to have been spoken over a rather wider area before the Celtic migration(s) into Gaul. Consequently one does not need to subscribe to ambitious theories about the

pan-continental European extent of the language family of which Basque is the sole survivor (see the end of I.3.2) in order to envisage the possibility that the speakers of what was to develop into Gaulish and Insular Celtic overlaid, quite likely as a relatively thin superstrate, an earlier population speaking a precursor of Basque or some language quite closely related to this somewhere in Northern or Central France. If so, language shift from this idiom to that of the dominant incomers could presumably have led to the aforementioned adjustment to the system of relative marking inherited via Proto-Celtic from Proto-Indo-European at the Gallo-Insular stage of evolution thus implied. In this respect it is to be noted that the Basque clitic relative *-(e)n* can only be attached to a verb and that secure reflexes of enclitic relative **-yo* have so far only been found attached to P or V in Gaulish and Insular Celtic. If a 'Basquoid' substrate was the source, this restriction may well be significant but it could, of course, merely be due to an accident of attestation as far as Gaulish is concerned or to the subsequent generalisation of an initial verbal complex in Insular Celtic.

2.1. A brief history of various proposals about relative marking in Celtic and Old Irish has been presented by Lambert (1992, 232-4), A number of scholars have posited originally non-relative third-person pronominal elements, notably **so-* (see 1.1 above) or **e-* (see II.3.2b), as major Insular Celtic relative markers either exclusively or alongside **-yo(d)*. This, of course, can be justified semantically (cf. Kortlandt below and Schrijver, 1997, 110) on the grounds that originally demonstrative pronouns or the like are used as relatives in various languages, cases in point being English *that* or German *der, die, das* etc.: e.g., Eng. *the man that I saw* or *the woman that lives there*, Germ. *der Mann, den ich gesehen habe* or *die Frau, die dort wohnt*.

According to Cowgill (1975, 59) 'of the third person relative forms the singular, *beres* 'who carries, that he carries', looks as if it were made by adding Prim. Ir. **sa* (in leniting relative clauses) and **san* (in nasalising relative clauses), originally masculine and (remodelled) neuter of the *so-/to-* demonstrative, to the already apocopated third singular **beret*, while the plural, *bertae* 'who carry, that they carry', looks as if it were made by adding **sa(n)* to non-apocopated **beroddi*, or else is Prim. Ir. **beroddi-a* from older **beronti-yo* (cf. Gaulish *dugiiontiio*..) with the ossified neuter singular of the Indo-European relative stem **yó*-? I do not now see why the third singular should have been reformed after apocope but not the third plural, but I think this is better than Watkins' view 1969a: 167, 169, that *beres* etc. have their *-s* from the relative *as* of the copula, and that this in turn has suffered an apocope in early Old Irish for *§ase* from **esti-yo*.' Sims-Williams (1984, 150) reconstructs **-yo* as a general subject relative marker except in the 3sg., where he adopts 'Cowgill's idea (1975: 59) that *beires* comes from adding the demonstrative **so(-)...* to **bereti* after apocope of **-i*: **beret-so(-)...* would give **beressa(-)* >

beires. I think the motive for generalizing Cowgill's 3sg. REL at the expense of **bereti-yo* must be that the 2pl. REL **berete-yo* would have fallen together with the latter'.

This view is open to two serious objections. In the first place, it is most doubtful whether any enclitic form of the **so-* paradigm other than the 3pl. acc. **sus* underlying the Old Irish pl. class A infixed pronoun *-s-* was still in existence at the quite late stage envisaged. The nasalising element *-(s)a* < **san* < **som* incorporated into OIr. prepositional relatives (I.1.2, evidently a nom./acc. n. sg. in place of **so* < **sod* with **-m* on the analogy of neuter *o*-stem nouns and adjectives) was taken by Thurneysen (*GOI*, 323) as the main formans of the nasalising relative clause in general beside the uninflected **yo(d)* responsible for the leniting relative clause. This, however, seems most unlikely because prepositional relative *-(s)a* is clearly the same non-enclitic element as nasalising proclitic *a* 'that (which)' (Watkins, 1963, 25), itself identical with the n. sg. article (cf. the Spanish type with m./f. article *el/la*, pl. *los/las*, as in *el hombre/la mujer con el/la que hablaba* 'the man/woman with whom [lit. 'with him/her that'] I/(s)he was speaking' or *los hombres/las mujeres con los/las que hablaba* 'the men/women with whom [lit. 'with them that'] I/(s)he was speaking'; see Butt, 1996, 124-5). In the second place, even in the unlikely event that such a form was still available, the attachment of **-so* or the like to typically non-initial 3sg. conj. **beret* rather than to typically initial 3sg. abs. **bereti* is quite inexplicable. Sims-Williams (1984, 188-9, n. 17) rather desperately suggests that 'in **beretiyo* the *-i-* may have been felt as a mere glide; hence **bereti-yo* → **beret-so*', but it seems quite inconceivable that such a form could have been so analysed in relation to 3sg. abs. **bereti* (or even **bereti-s* with a particle).

A similar approach to Cowgill's is adopted by Kortlandt (1979, 50-51) 'there are several obstacles to the common view that the relative ending *-e* reflects an uninflected particle **io* < PIE **iod*. First of all, the relative particle does not palatalize a preceding consonant, cf. *sóeras* 'who delivered', *tías* 'who may go', *giges* 'who will pray', and all of the passive and deponent forms. Palatalization is limited to those cases where the relative particles was preceded by a front vowel, e.g. *téte* 'who goes' < **tēχti-*, *luide* 'who went' < **lude-*, and the prepositions *imme-* 'about' < **embi-* and *are-* 'for' < **ari-*. Secondly, it is not clear how the PIE relative pronoun **ios* came to lose its inflection.... All these problems disappear if we identify the relative particle with the PIE anaphoric pronoun **so*, fem. **sā*, and assume that it occupied the same position in the clause as the absolute particle **es*, e.g. *in fer téte* 'the man who goes' < **sindos wiros steikti so* 'this man, he goes'. The nasalization in relative clauses where the antecedent is not the subject of the verb points to an acc. sg. form **san*, which was created on the analogy of **sa*. When **bereh* was replaced by **bereθih*..., the relative form **berea* < **bere-so/-sā* was

replaced with **beresa* on the analogy of the relative copula *as* < **esa* < **est-so*'. The form **berea* depends upon Kortlandt's already discussed and rejected views about the role of a particle **(e)s* combined with a pervasive distinction between thematic and athematic personal endings in the creation of the OIr. absolute/conjunct dichotomy (see III.1.7). Anyway, there is no obvious motive or model for its analogical replacement by **beresa* once 3sg. abs. **bereh* had allegedly become **bereθih* and, even if there were, **berea* could presumably derive just as easily from **bere-yo* as **bere-so* in his system.

Schrijver (1997, 106) points out that 'since British (W *yssydd* < **esti-i̯o*, not **esti-so*, which would have yielded ***yssi*, cf. Schrijver, 1995: 385-90) and Gaulish (*dugiiontiio, toncsiíontío*) have relative **i̯o*, its presence in Old Irish is exceedingly likely. Hence, as a matter of principle, one should reconstruct relative **so* for OIr. only if **i̯o* is impossible'. Schrijver (1997, 106-7) further shows that none of the arguments advanced in favour of **so* rather than **yo* holds water and refers to 'the type *beres*, which I have discussed at length in Schriver 1994 (170-77; **bereti i̯o* > **beret o* (early *i*-apocope, loss of *i,º* in PrIr.) > **beres o* (word-final **-t* > **-s*) **bereso* (fusion) > OIr. *beres* (apocope))'. This explanation of *beres* is to be ruled out on grounds of implausibility and lack of economy (see 3.1-2 below for an alternative). To begin with, it depends upon the arbitrary assumption that, unlike other enclitics (including the main-clause particle **es, *et(i)* or the like alleged by Cowgill, Schrijver et al.; see II.3.2-3), **yo* behaved for a long time like a separate word in relation to a preceding verb form (see V.1.1 on the lack of support for prehistoric Irish *-t* > *-s* anyway) but was ultimately fused with it at a rather late Primitive Irish stage prior to the apocope of c. 500 A.D. Moreover, it calls for abandonment of the otherwise utterly straightforward direct derivation of a 3pl. rel. such as OIr. *bert(a)e* 'who bear, which they bear' < **beronti-yo* with expected fusion of verb and enclitic at an early stage. Instead it becomes necessary to posit **beronti yo* > **beront o* with lack of fusion and then restoration of the *-i* (**beronti-o* then undergoing pre-apocope fusion at long last) by an elaborate and ill motivated analogy in which the alleged main-clause particle **es* is accorded an indispensable role.

2.2.1. Building upon an idea of Pedersen's that 'object relative nasalisation was probably fostered by the occurrence of an anaphoric pronoun reduced to nasalising *-n* in relative clauses' (*VKG* I, 396), Sims-Williams (1984, 159-161) posits that, whereas **-yo* (replaced at a late stage by **-so* in some 3sg. forms; see above) was attached as a general relative marker to simple verbs with subject or object antecedent, two different relative markers were attached to pretonic preverbs according as the antecedent was subject or object. With subject antecedent **-yo* was used throughout but with an object antecedent use was made of the same anaphoric pronoun as produced the class A infixed pronouns, namely acc. sg. m. **en*, f. **sV*n*

(< ? **siyām*), n. **e* (< **ed*). Consequently lenition applied throughout to subject and to neuter object antecedents but nasalisation ('to a lesser extent'; 1984, 160) to masculine and feminine antecedents, this system being transferred to plural object antecedents because 3pl. **sus* had yielded no mutation to distinguish a relative from a main clause. In essence this is the same type of argument as the one used in support of an inflected **yo-* relative in Insular Celtic and is open to the same objections (see 1.3 above). Sims-Williams' reason for preferring an inflected anaphoric to an inflected relative pronoun is that 'this hypothesis helps to explain the shape of the REL preverbs. LEN REL *ara*^{L} and *imma*^{L} derive from **arë-e* and **imbi-e* as well as from **are-yo* and **imbi-yo*, but *for*^{L} and *as*^{L} derive from **wor-e* and **eks-e* rather than **wor-yo* and **eks-yo* (or rather they reflect a levelling of the two alternatives); and *do*^{L}.. reflects a levelling of **to-yo* and **t'e*. NAS REL *do*^{N}.. reflects a levelling of **t'en* and **tosVn*, and *ara*^{N}, *imma*^{N}, *for*^{N} and *as*^{N} derive from **are-en/sVn*, **imbi-en/sVn*, **wor-en/sVn* and **eks-en/sVn* ..... In (A), the *to* group, the 3sg. m. n. pronouns simply retained their **e* (> *a*..) vocalism, instead of it being levelled to *o*.. as described above, while in the 3sg. f. and pl. pronouns had their **-s-* (> ***h* > **zero) strengthened to **-ss-* on the analogy of the negative **nīs-s-* and other particles such as **ros-s-*' (Sims-Williams, 1984, 160; see II.3.4.3 on *ros-*).

In view of *beirthi* 'bears it' < **bereti(y)-e*, it seems most unlikely that **imbi(y)-e* would have produced OIr. rel. **imma* rather than **immi*, OIr. *imm-a* with 3sg. m./n. infixed pronoun clearly being analogical to general *d-a* < *t-e* etc. Otherwise all that needs to be said about the above is that it is extraordinarily uneconomical, calling as it does for two quite different relative markers, an arbitrary divergence in their use with simple and compound verbs, and finally a complex set of largely ill motivated analogies. In short, it is counter-intuitive in the extreme to seek to derive forms like *d-a:chlaid* 'he digs it (n.) up' and *do:chlaid* 'which (n.) he digs up' from the same preform **t-e:χlaðeh* < **to-e:kladet*, when only the first can continue this regularly and the second is quite unproblematical as the outcome of **to-(y)a:χlaðeh* < **to-yo:kladet*. It will be argued below (3.1-3) that the actual shapes of all pretonic preverbs in leniting and nasalising relative clauses can be explained far more simply by means of **-yo* alone with the help of a typologically plausible sound law and one reasonable analogy.

2.2.2. A broadly similar approach to those of Pedersen and Sims-Williams is adopted by Schrijver (1997, 110-121), who posits uninflected **yo(d)* as the relative marker with an m./f. (and, with an active verb, perhaps also n.) subject antecedent but **en* (originally an m. sg. acc. anaphoric pronoun) as the relative marker with an m./f. object antecedent and **e(d)* (originally an n. sg. nom./acc. anaphoric pronoun) with a n. object or (at least with a passive verb) subject antecedent. Support for this elaborate proposal is sought by re-evaluating certain statistics compiled by the present writer in relation to lenition versus nasalisation with object antecedent (see

1.3 above) and to unelided versus elided forms of relative verbs with *to* followed by a vowel (see II.3.4.1).

According to Schrijver (1997, 94) an Old Irish cleft sentence of the type *is mé féin as:biur i tossuch* 'it is myself that I mention first' (Wb. 14c30) 'can be paraphrased as 'the person I mention first is myself' or 'what I mention first is myself'. Since the latter paraphrase, i.e. with a covert neuter antecedent, is theoretically possible, it is unwarranted to include *is mé féin as:biur i tossuch* into the category of relative clauses with non-neuter antecedent, as McCone does. One simply does not know in principle whether the antecedent is neuter ('what I mention') or non-neuter ('whom I mention') because it is covert. At any rate, the antecedent is not *mé féin*, which is the nominal predicate of the matrix sentence.' Schrijver (1997, 95-6) goes on to give three examples from Wb. where neuter *a n-í* 'that' refers to a m./f. predicate (e.g. Wb. 4a25 *a(r) ní frescisiu* (f.) *a n-í ad:chí súil* 'for that which the eye sees is not hope') and one where masc. *int-í* refers to a masc. predicate (Wb. 29a23 *ar mad pectha(i)d* (m.) *int-í for-a:taibre grád* 'for if he on whom you confer orders be a sinner'), concluding that 'the choice between concord and lack of concord is doubtlessly dictated by semantics..... As a principle, the proposed hypothesis predicts that in OIr. clauses with a covert antecedent (which very often are copula clauses) the semantic difference between relative nasalisation ('whom') and relative lenition ('what') was so slight (though very real to OIr. speakers) that the semantic and syntactic context allowed both interpretations. On the other hand, there doubtlessly was no such option between relative nasalisation and lenition whenever the antecedent was overtly expressed'. Having thus satisfied himself that only the type with overt antecedent (e.g. Wb. 5b1 *int-í do:rroígu Dia* 'he whom God has elected' and 5c20 *cech irnigde do:ngneid i tuil Dée* 'every prayer that you make in God's will') is relevant, Schrijver (1997, 97-8) excludes 11 examples with relative object lenition and 12 with corresponding nasalisation from the sample as inconclusive by virtue of having covert antecedents and is left with 2 cases of lenition and 6 of nasalisation with an overt antecedent in the Würzburg Glosses. On this basis 'we may claim that at a stage somewhat anterior to Wb. only nasalising relative clauses accompanied overt m./f. antecedents' (Schrijver, 1997, 99), **en* being his chosen candidate to account for this as indicated above.

Even if his basic premiss regarding covert and overt antecedents is accepted, Schrijver's statistics for the latter are questionable. In a context where St. Paul is expounding the desirability of speaking not spiritually in tongues but plainly in words so that the uninitiated will know where to say 'amen' *super tuam benedictionem* 'on your blessing', the gloss *for imbed inna precepte as:bir-siu* (Wb. 12d17) standing directly above the latter part of this (*dictionem* at the beginning of a new line) clearly means 'on the abundance of the preaching that you utter' (cf. *Thes.* I, 579) and refers to a barrage of speaking in tongues rather than an intelligible

blessing. The resultant leniting relative with overt f. sg. object antecedent is excluded by Schriver (1997, 98) on the strength of an alternative interpretation '(it is) on the abundance of the teaching (to be received by the ignorant one) that thou utterest (it, i.e. your blessing)' that not only does not fit the context but also could have been expressed unambiguously by simply writing *is for imbed inna precepte a-ta:bir-siu* (*-ta* referring to OIr. *bendacht*, f.). Once this special pleading is discounted, cases of lenition with an overt m./f. object antecedent jump 50% from 2 to 3.

GOI 492-3 points out that 'occasionally in Wb., frequently in Ml., a pronoun of the 3rd person is inserted between the copula and the predicate', if the latter is definite as in the case of *mat hé na bríathra-sa for:cane* 'if it is these words that you teach' (Wb. 28c21), which is thus a cleft sentence and as such has rightly been included by Schrijver in his category with covert object antecedent along with *it hé gnímí epscuip as:mbeir sís* 'they are (the) deeds of a bishop that he mentions below' (Wb. 28b10). On the other hand, his six examples of overt object m./f. antecedent with nasalising relative 'include 30d8 *bit hé magistir do:ngegat*, which may be translated as 'these will be the masters whom they will choose', with antecedent *magistir*, rather than 'whom they will choose will be the masters'' (Schrijver, 1997, 97). The second translation would reduce the overt nasalising category to 5 and increase its covert counterpart to 13 but the first is clinched by the fact that the complete gloss reads *bit hé magistir do:ngegat in(d)-hí as:indisset a tola féisne doib*. This should be rendered as 'those who declare their own desires to them will be (the) teachers that they will choose' in line both with the pattern seen, for instance, in Wb. 6c10 *is sí regnum im(murgu) a n-í siu* 'this, moreover, is the kingdom' (Lat. *regnum* = OIr. *flaith*, f., whence *sí*) and with the passage glossed, which refers to a time when people will eagerly pile up teachers for themselves according to their own desires. However, there are occasions when a sequence copula + pronoun + noun corresponds to copula + predicate + subject, a case in point being Wb. 33b13 *ar nibu thacair mad é in fírchumsanad fu:erad Iessu mac Nún* 'for it were not fitting if it were the true rest that Joshua son of Nun might afford' (lit. 'if the true rest.... were it') as opposed to the rest that Jesus (Christ) might have afforded in the text glossed (see Schrijver, 1997, 94 on the overt antecedent entailed by this type of contrast). Consequently this example should be moved from the group with covert antecedent, in which it is placed by Schrijver, to that with overt object antecedent plus a leniting relative.

In the light of the foregoing, Schrijver's statistics of 11 len. versus 12 nas. with covert m./f. object antecedent and 2 len. versus 6 nas. with overt m./f. object antecedent should be emended to 10 len. vs. 12 nas. and 4 len. vs. 6 nas. respectively. Given that a corpus of 10 overt examples is too small for a difference between 4 len. and 6 nas. to be statistically reliable (cf. Schrijver, 1997, 98), this attempt to winnow

the relevant material has produced no statistically significant change in relation to the present writer's undifferentiated statistics (see 1.3) above and certainly does not justify the claim that 'the Würzburg Glosses show evidence for a system in which m./f. antecedents could only be followed by a nasalising relative clause' (Schrijver, 1997, 102). It is also to be noted that the two additions to the category with overt m./f. object antecedent plus a leniting relative argued for in the two preceding paragraphs belie the contention that 'wherever there is an overt nominal m./f. antecedent in Wb., one finds relative nasalisation' (Schrijver, 1997, 99).

Schrijver's approach is anyway open to more fundamental objections than the ones just raised. His analysis of forms such as *int-í, a n-í* as 'dummy' elements tending increasingly to be prefixed to relative clauses that originally lacked an overt antecedent (Schrijver, 1997, 95 and 99) finds some support in occasional unambiguous examples of relative clauses without overt antecedent in Old Irish (see Lambert, 1992, 240) such as *attá immurgu as:béer* 'there is, however, (that) which I shall say' (Wb. 32a22), *ní:irbágam na(d):dernam* 'we do not boast what we cannot do' (Wb. 17b6) or the proverbial *gonas géntar* '(he) who kills will be killed' (see Watkins, 1977, 20-25). On closer inspection, however, this alleged connection presents problems because in Wb. m. *int-í*, f. *ind-í* regularly refer to persons and n. *a n-í* refers equally regularly (regardless of their grammatical gender) to things, to judge from Kavanagh's (2001, 510) comprehensive collection: e.g., *is sí regnum im(murgu) a n-í siu* 'this, moreover, is the kingdom' (Wb. 6c10; Lat. *regnum* = OIr. *flaith*, f., whence *sí*) above, *cosmilius* (m.) *a n-í siu* 'this (is) a likeness' (Wb. 8b7), *tomad* (m.) *trá et faitgugud* (m.) *a n-í siu* 'this (is) a threatening, then, and a cautioning', *is aithis* (f.) *doib-som cid a n-í siu* 'even this is a disgrace to them', *fochidi* (f. pl.) *ó thuil a n-í siu sís* 'this below (is) voluntary tribulations' (Wb. 15d33). The examples adduced by Schrijver (1997, 95; see above) as evidence for a choice between concord of gender/number with the predicate and non-concord involving a n. sg. covert antecedent also conform to the firmly established person vs. thing pattern, which leads us to expect a leniting relative clause with any abstract or other inanimate predicate (i.e. with virtually all of the examples in his covert category) and a nasalising relative clause with a personal predicate. However, these expectations are not met: not only is the only example of a personal predicate in Schrijver's sample *is mé féin as:biur i tossuch* 'it is myself that I mention first' (Wb. 14c30) accompanied by a leniting relative clause but nasalisation also preponderates somewhat (12 vs. 9 examples) over lenition in the case of inanimate predicates (see above).

A serviceable typological parallel is provided by Spanish, where a personal predicate calls for antecedent *el* (m.) or *la* (f.), pl. *los/las* (e.g. *el/la que quiere es Antonio/Ana* 'the one whom (s)he loves is Antonio/Anne', *los/las que vinieron ayer son mis amigos/amigas* 'the ones who came last night are my friends') but a general

(originally n.) *lo* is used with m. or f. inanimate predicates (e.g. *lo que dices es una tontería* (f.) 'what you say is stupid (a stupidity)') unless the relative is subsumed under the same category as its subject or predicate (e.g. *esta cerveza es la que menos me gusta* 'this beer is the one (beer) that I like least'; see Butt, 1996, 119-120). Even the latter possibility would not significantly reduce the preponderance of leniting over nasalising relatives expected in Schrijver's sample with covert object antecedent. The failure of relative lenition to predominate over nasalisation with an allegedly covert inanimate antecedent constitutes a good reason for rejecting Schrijver's analysis of this particular cleft construction. A further serious objection is its failure to apply to cleft constructions as a whole. Firstly, there is regular concord of number between (for Schrijver) a relative verb plus covert subject antecedent with its 'predicate' (apart from 1/2 pl. personal pronoun plus sg. relative on occasion; see *EIV* 181-2), and secondly the prominent non-relative type of cleft exemplified by *ar is do thabirt díglae berid in claideb sin* 'for it is for inflicting vengeance he carries that sword' (Wb. 6a13; see I.1.10) cannot possibly be analysed in Schrijver's terms.

These deficiencies can be remedied by simply positing two rules, one entailing fronting for topic/focus and another requiring a relative construction after an antecedent of this type if it stood in a subject or object relation to the following verb. There is then no point in attempting to distinguish between 'covert' antecedents in most relative clefts and 'overt' antecedents elsewhere, since all will have had overt antecedents with the result that the undifferentiated statistics in 1.3 above retain their validity.

It remains to note that a distinction between **-yo* with subject and **-e(n)* with object antecedent should have resulted in a clear (and useful) opposition in the case of independent simple verbs between, say, 3pl. *bertae* 'who bear' < **beronti-yo* and **bertai* 'whom/which they bear' < **beronti-e(n)*. However, only the former occurs and the same holds throughout the relative system of independent simple verbs, which invariably display the same relative ending with both subject and object antecedent. Schrijver (1997, 112) is obliged to suggest that the spread of what for him were specifically subject relative forms 'to nasalizing relative clauses probably was part and parcel of a simplification of the system of relative verb forms, of which there were originally two sets, one reflecting the particle **i̯o* (and surviving into Old Irish) and another reflecting the pronouns **en/e*'. This is not only manifestly uneconomical in comparison with the straightforward alternative entailing **yo* throughout but also implausible, given the lack of a similarly early and thorough simplification in the infixed relative system. In short, the failure of **-e(n)* to work in the one instance where it would certainly have had an outcome different from **-yo* surely constitutes adequate grounds for rejecting it.

2.2.3. Turning to the issue of elided prototonic versus non-elided deuterotonic independent forms of verbs with *to* followed by a vowel (see II.4.3.1) in leniting relative clauses, Schrijver (1997, 115-116) notes 5 prototonic (all active, of course) versus no deuterotonic examples with object antecedent and 6 prototonic (2 active, 4 passive) vs. 2 deuterotonic (1 active, 1 passive) with subject antecedent in Wb. On this basis 'it seems fair to claim... that in Wb.., active contracted verbs in relative clauses tend to predominate in relative clauses with neuter object antecedent, and active uncontracted verbs in relative clauses tended to predominate in relative clauses with subject antecedent. Interpreted historically, the former contained an infixed pronoun **e* < **ed* 'it', and the latter the relative pronoun or particle **i̯o*.... If so, **e* did not and **i̯o* did prevent the contraction of pretonic preverb and verb'.

Wb. 27d23 *tairthet cach fer imm alaile* glossing (*) *neque intenderent fabulis et genealogis interminatis quae questiones praestant magis* quam aedificationem Dei* 'and (that) they should not pay heed to tales and endless genealogies, which supply questions rather than God's edification' is included in the category elided/contracted verb with object antecedent on the strength of the duly tentative suggestion in *Thes.* I, 679 that the verb might be an otherwise unattested 3sg. *to-air-thét* and the gloss translated as 'which every man pursues about another'. However, an actually attested verb would be far preferable and *-et* seems most likely *a priori* to be a 3pl. ending matching the 3pl. in the Latin relative clause with subject antecedent glossed. In fact, *tairthet* is the correct OIr. prototonic 3pl. of the common verb *do:airret* (see *DIL*; **to-air-reth-*) 'comes upon, catches' and, whatever the precise translation (perhaps something like 'which catch/affect every man in relation to the other'), this example undoubtedly entails a subject not an object antecedent. That being so, Schrijver's contracted/prototonic examples with object antecedent should be reduced from 5 to 4 and the statistics with subject antecedent emended to 7 contracted/prototonic (3 active, 4 passive) vs. 2 uncontracted/deuterotonic (1 active, 1 passive). The 3/1 ratio involved is quite incompatible with Schrijver's claim above that in Wb. 'active uncontracted verbs... tended to predominate in relative clauses with subject antecedent'. Moreover, the difference between this and the 7/2 ratio resulting from the straightforward inclusion of passives is too insignificant statistically to warrant Schrijver's (1997, 118-120) arbitrary exclusion of the latter (4/1), on the basis of which he concludes 'that **e(d)* rather than **i̯o* was used as the neuter relative marker, at least with passive verbs' for some reason, possibly 'the low degree of agentivity of neuter nouns in general in older IE' (Schrijver, 1997, 120). However, the relevance of this contention is not obvious, given that the subject of passive (as opposed to some active) verbs is certainly not an agent.

The basic point is that the evidence of Wb. offers no support for Schrijver's basic claim that different markers, **yo* and **e(n)* respectively, underlay Old Irish relative clauses with subject and object antecedent. The relative forms of simple verbs

provide even clearer evidence that **yo* was the only marker used with both types of antecedent, and here Schrijver (1997, 112) is obliged to posit the otherwise quite unnecessary complication of extensive analogical levelling: 'Now in OIr. the special relative forms of simple verbs are used in both leniting and nasalizing relative clauses. The shape of these relative forms, however, can only be explained on the basis of the relative particle **i̯o*: **beronti i̯o* > OIr. *bertae* '(they) who carry', *beromosi i̯o* > *bermae* '(we) who carry' etc. A proto-form like 3pl. **beronti en/e* would have yielded OIr. ***bertai* instead of *bertae*, *3sg. s*-pret. **gabass en/e* would have yielded ***gabais* instead of *gabass*, and 3sg. passive and deponent relative forms like *mórthar* 'who is praised', *labrathar* 'who speaks' would rather have been ***mórthair*, ***labraithir*. In accordance with the preceding discussion, the relative particle was **i̯o* only in relative clauses with subject antecedent. Hence the relative forms of the simple verb must originally have occurred only in relative clauses with subject antecedent. Their spread to nasalizing relative clauses probably was part and parcel of the simplification of the system of relative verbs forms, of which there were originally two sets, one reflecting the particle **i̯o* (and surviving into OIr.) and another reflecting the pronouns **en/e*'.

In view of the complications that they engender in return for no tangible advantage, one might be forgiven for wondering why Schrijver is so insistent upon **en/*e(d)* as object relative markers. The answer seems to be that they can be pressed into service as props for the shaky hypothesis of a main-clause particle **es* or the like on the grounds that 'main clause *da·mbeir* 'he carries him' < (McCone's) **te·mber´* does not reflect **t(u)-en·beret(i)*, as McCone has it, but rather **tu-s-en·beret(i)* > **tohen·beret* > **toen·beret* > **tēn·beret* > **te·mber´*..... However, since **es* presumably functioned as a main clause particle, it is reasonable to suppose that it was not tolerated in the predecessor of the OIr. nasalizing relative clause with object antecedent when the latter came to adopt its attested function as a subordinate clause. Hence the nasalizing relative clause with object antecedent can reasonably be reconstructed as **tu-en·beret(i)* (rather than **tu-es-en·beret(i)*) > **tu-n:beret* > **do:mbeir* 'whom he carries', with loss of the **e-* of the pronoun after a vowel. Cf. the loss after vowels of the **e-* of the main clause marker **es* as assumed by Cowgill: **tu-es·beret(i)* > **tu-s·beret* > OIr. *do:beir*. Thus the upshot is that in my opinion **tu-en·* does not yield **ten·* (McCone) but **tu-n·* > OIr. *do·n-*' (Schrijver, 1997, 110-111).

3.1. In view of the Celtiberian inflected non-enclitic relative *io-* inherited from PIE **i̯ó-*, the Gaulish uninflected enclitic *-io*, the evidently uninflected enclitic marker(s) underlying various Irish and British relative forms and the equally evident formal compatibility of many of these with a **-yo* identical with the Gaulish form, there is clearly much to be said on grounds of economy for seeking a reasonable explanation of all of the Old Irish relative forms in terms of an originally

undifferentiated *-*yo* inherited from an early stage common to Insular Celtic and Gaulish to the exclusion of Celtiberian. Evidence has been presented above (1.5) in support of the contention that Insular Celtic did indeed employ such an element in quite a wide range of relative contexts, a situation for which Basque at the very least provides a good typological parallel. This raises the question of whether the more or less ubiquitous relative *-*yo* thus implied at that early stage (cf. *GOI* 323, Watkins, 1963, 28-31, McCone, 1980, 17-22 and Ó hUiginn, 1986, 75-86) is sufficient to account for all of the various forms of the relative marker in Old Irish (see I.1.7 on the complementary distribution in OIr. independent simple verbs between relative endings in the 3sg., 1pl. plus 3pl. and *no* plus infixed lenition or nasalisation in the remainder). The remainder of 3.1 is a somewhat modified English version of a discussion of this issue in German (McCone, 1995, 128-132).

The act. 3pl. relative ending -*e* can be derived straightforwardly from *-*yo*: e.g., OIr. pres. *berd(a)e* 'who/which they carry' < *berod´e(y)a* < **beronti-yo* like Gaul. *dugiiontiio.* Likewise 1pl. *bermae* < **beroμē* < **beroμoi* < **beroμoi-ya* < **beroμohi-yo* < **beromosi-yo* (*RChron.* 131-2) and irregular pres. 3sg. *té(i)te* 'who goes' < **tēd´e(y)a* < **tenti-yo*, suffixless pret. 3sg. *gegn(a)e* 'who wounded' (*GOI* 433) < **g*^{w}*eg*^{w}*one-yo*, *t*-pret. 3sg. *berte* 'who bore' < **birti-yo* (see McCone, 1991, 131-3 on arguable *i* > *e* before non-palatal *rt*). However, OIr. *s*-formations simply have a non-palatal -*s* as in *s*-pret. *marbas* 'who killed', *s*-subj. *ges* 'who may pray', *s*-fut. *giges* 'who will pray'.

The same ending is more surprisingly found everywhere where *-*yo* should have combined with a 3sg. ending to produce *-*θ´e*: e.g., 3sg. pres. *be(i)res* 'who bears' instead of expected OIr. **be(i)rthe* < **ber´eθ´e* < **ber´eθ´e-(y)a* < **bereti-yo*. Attempts to explain this problematical ending with the help of originally demonstrative **so(m)* (Gagnepain, 1967, 3-4 as well as Cowgill and Kortlandt as cited in 2.1 above) founder on the need to attach this to the apocopated 'conjunct' 3sg. ending (see 2.1 above), whereas 3pl. *berd(a)e* requires **beronti-so(m)* with unapocopated ending or a quite arbitrary switch to **beronti-yo*, as Cowgill candidly admits (see 2.1 above). One might add that the particle posited by Cowgill and Kortlandt might be expected to occur in what was originally a main clause with demonstrative **so(m)*, in which case the result would presumably have been OIr. 3sg. **be(i)rthes* < **bereti-s-so(m)*, 3pl. **berdas* < **beronti-s-so(m)*. A further problem resides in the lack of -*s* in *téite* and the 3sg. rel. *t*-pret. (note, for instance Kortlandt's arbitrary *téte* < **tēχti-so* versus *as* 'which is' < **est-so* in 2.1 above). Ó hUiginn (1986, 76) is surely right to observe that 'this relative ending, unknown outside Irish, is evidently a late development'. At all events, this rel. -V*s* invariably occurs precisely and only where 3sg. -V**θe* from -V**ti-yo* would have been identical with the 2pl. rel. discussed earlier (III.1.5.5).

Since MW 3sg. pres. rel. *yssyd* ‘which is’ would derive regularly < PC **essi-yo*, with or without intervening **issi-yo*, OIr. cop. *as* ‘which is’ must likewise be traced back to one or other of these forms either by regular sound change or with the help of analogy. The corresponding OIr. 3pl. rel. *ata* ‘who are’ should likewise continue IC **ınti-yo* (< **(h$_1$)senti-*). In the almost certain event that both OIr. *it* and MW *ynt* ‘(they) are’ are the regular outcome of IC **ınti*, rel. **ınti-yo* should have developed > **idi-ya* > **id´e-ya* > **id´e* > OIr. **ita*, the corollary being that the initial vowel of OIr. *ata* has been analogically remodelled. If 3sg. **essi(-)* did not become **issi(-)* in Insular Celtic, abs. **essi*, rel. **essi-yo* should have developed > **es´i*, **es´e-ya* > OIr. **as*, **asa*, whereas **issi*, rel. **issi-yo* should have resulted in **is´i*, **is´e-ya* > **is´*, **is´e* > OIr. *is*, **isa*.

The assumption (McCone, 1978, 31, n. 23; Breatnach, 1980, 1-2; Sims-Williams, 1984, 153) that the 3sg. rel. was once *(*)asa* falls prey to the problem that actually attested 3sg. rel *as* beside non-rel. *is* and 3pl. *ata*, *it* can then only be ascribed to the analogical influence of pres. 3sg. rel. *be(i)res* etc., a classic explanation of *obscurum per obscurius*. In view of a tendency (see 3.2 below) for sibilants to absorb a following *y*, a neat solution would be obtained by positing a regular Primitive Irish sound change *-siy-* > *-sy-* > *-s-* (probably part of general Prim. Ir. -C*iy-* > -C*y-*; see *RChron.* 116-117 on -C*y-* > -C*iy-* by the reverse process of epenthesis where the *-y-* had not already been absorbed) between an unstressed vowel and a (likewise unstressed) back vowel *a*, *o* or *u*. This would account for the great majority of 3sg. relatives with non-palatal *-s* beside a 3sg. abs. with palatal *-s´* at one fell swoop: e.g., cop. pres. **essi-yo* > **esiya* > **esya* (or **issi-ya* > **isya* > **isa*) > **esa* > **es* > OIr. *as*; *s*-pret. **marwassi-yo* > **marvasiya* > **marvasya* > **marvasa* > **marvas*, OIr. *marbas* ‘who killed’; redup. *s*-fut. **si(s)liχsi-yo* > **silisiya* > **silisya* > **silisa* > **sil´esa* > **sil´es*, OIr. *siles* ‘who will fell’. Analogical extension of this convenient alternation between 3sg. abs. *silis* /sil´es´/, rel. *siles* /siles/ etc. would then produce 3sg. rel. *s*-subj. *ges* /ges/ ‘who may pray’, unredup. *s*-fut./subj. *res* /res/ ‘who will/may run’ beside abs. *geis* /ges´/, *reis* /res´/ and so on.

The restriction of this sound law’s operation to **-s(i)y-* after an unstressed vowel is called for by its failure to apply to *yo-* and *yā*-stems like OIr. *u(i)sse* ‘right’ < **us´eya(-)* < **uss(i)yo/ā(-)*, *me(i)sse* ‘judged’ < **mes´eya(-)* < **mess(i)yo/ā(-)*, *maisse* ‘beauty’ < **mas´eya* < **mass(i)yā*. The already proposed restriction of *-sy-* > *-s-* to position before a back vowel (cf. Hungarian /ssa/ < /sya/ versus /si/ in 3.2 below) makes it quite easy to account for *yo-* or *yā*-stem forms such as OIr. *imainse* ‘bound round’< **im-naise* as back-formations from the m./n. gen. sg., f. dat. sg. etc. with *imainsi* < **imnaisi* < -**(s)s* (cf. the end of III.1.5.5 and *RChron.* 113) < **-(s)siyi* < **-(s)siyī*_on the model of *naise/i* ‘bound’ with stressed vowel before *-s(i)y-*. The nom. sg. of *n*-stems such as *aicsiu* ‘seeing’ can likewise be ascribed to back-formation from oblique cases such as gen. sg. *aicsen* <

**a(k)k^{w}is(s)onah* < **-ssyonos* on the model of the likes of *tuistiu* ‘begetting’, gen. *tuisten* < **tussediyu, *tussediyonah* < **t(o)-uxs-sen-tyū/-tyonos* (see Stüber, 1998, 11-12). Whereas *-siu* in such cases can easily be due to the analogy just posited, the well attested OIr. *n*-stem nom./dat. *aisndís* ‘relating’ (vn. of *as:indet* ‘relates’) cannot and looks very much like an isolated survival of the regular outcome of **es´nd´i(w´)i(u)s* < **esındiwis-u/-on* < **exsandiwiss-yū/-yon*. If so *asindís* (Wb. and Ml.) should originally have had non-palatal *-s*, and this may at least sometimes have been the case in Old Irish, although the later form *aisndéis* (with *-é-* taken over from finite prototonic forms such as 3pl. *-aisndedat* probably with *-é-* at Ml. 31a19) with clearly palatal *-s* is already found at Sg. 161b3. Be that as it may, this palatalisation can easily have been taken over from the oblique cases such as gen. sg. *aisndísen* < **esndi(w´)s´on* < **esndiw´son* < **esındiwisonah* < **exsandiwissyonos* at any stage subsequent to post-syncope loss of *w´* (probably /y/ phonetically) after the application of regular progressive assimilation to the quality of the whole consonant group produced by syncope (*RChron.* 129 and 130-131). *Aisndís*, then, provides valuable corroboration of the sound law envisaged from a quite different part of the grammatical system.

The foregoing discussion indicates the following possible post-apocope outcomes of present indicative forms of the copula by regular sound change: 3sg. abs. **is´* or (without **essi* > **issi*) **es´*, rel. **es* and 3pl. abs. **id´*, rel. **id´e*. If **is´* was already the 3sg. abs., the alternation in vocalism between it and rel. **es* could have been applied to **id´e* to produce **ed´e*. Alternatively *es´* could have adopted the vocalism of *id´* (> OIr. *it* /id/) to become **is´* (> OIr. *is* /is/) and *id´e* that of **es* (> OIr. *as*) to become **ed´e* (> OIr. *ata*), thus maximising the difference between relative and non-relative forms.

Be that as it may, the inherited opposition in the copula between stem + *-s* in the 3sg. and stem + *-d´e* in the 3pl. could be transferred by analogy to other verbs with a 3sg. rel. **-θ´e* that would have been identical with the 2pl. rel. (see III.1.5.5) by this stage. The proportion is straightforward (and immune to the objection raised to the 3sg. rel. cop. as a starting point by Sims-Williams, 1984, 152), namely cop. rel. 3 pl. **i-d´e* : 3sg. **e-s* = rel. 3pl. **bero-d´e* : 3sg. **ber´e*-x (x = **-s*). The new 3sg. relative ending presumably arose first in the strong verbs (e.g. OIr. *be(i)res, gaibes, benas* < **ber´e-s, *gaβ´i-s, *bena-s* for **ber´e-θ´e, *gaβ´i-θ´e, *bena-θ´e*), where there was no ambiguity with the corresponding preterite form, and later spread from this central category to weak verbs too despite the resultant lack of a formal distinction between pres. *marbas, léices* ‘who/which kills/lets’ or ‘which (s)he kills/let and *s*-pret. *marbas, léices* ‘who/which killed/let’ or ‘which (s)he killed, let’.

3.2. Schrijver makes bare mention of ‘phonetic misgivings’ (1997, 21) about the sound law just posited, which he further castigates as ‘*ad hoc*’ and ‘unconvincing’

(1997, 106, n. 2), but this objection can be discounted in the light of an important study by Méndez Dosuna (1993) kindly brought to my attention by Martin Peters. This argues compellingly that the alternation in Heracleote Greek between a typical 'Doric' contract future in the 2sg., 3sg. and 2pl. (e.g. 'will cut', κοψεῖς, κοψεῖ, κοψεῖτε) and a non-contract 1sg./pl. and 3pl. such as κόψ-ω/-ομες/-οντι can only be explained convincingly by positing synezesis of [eo(:)] to [e̯o(:)], which then developed naturally to [i̯o(:)]. He goes on to make the following statement (my translation of the original Spanish): 'The mysterious 'non-Doric' future forms of the type κόψοντι (I 145) εσσονται (I 100, 159) etc. are easily explained by a trivial phonetic phenomenon well documented in Greek in various areas and at various periods: the absorption of the [i̯] of *κόψi̯οντι, *εσσi̯ονται by the preceding /s/' (Méndez Dosuna, 1993, 127-8). 'Cf. the absorption of secundary yod in Thes. γυμνασσαρχεισαντα (*IG* IX 2, 620, 3; Larissa, Hellen. per.), Boeot. Καφισα (P. Roesch-J. M. Fossey, *ZPE* 29, p. 132, n. 9, ll. 3-4; Chaeronea, end of 3rd. cent.), Class. Gk. τριακόσια, σιαγόνιον > Mod. Gk. τριακόσα, σαγόνι; numerous examples in Scheller (1951: pp. 107-110, 118-120). Cf. also Span. *confesionario* > *confesonario*, *fisiognomia* > *fisognomia*..... Incidentally, the Modern Greek and Spanish data show quite clearly that, contrary to a rather widespread opinion, the absorption of yod - particularly in the case of an apico-alveolar [s] - does not presuppose a palatalisation of [s] to [R]...' (Méndez Dosuna, 1993, 128, n. 71). This concluding insight has made it easy to dispense in the foregoing (3.1) with the somewhat awkward intervening **e/a* < **esya* etc. entertained in the earlier version (McCone, 1995, 130).

Such direct absorption is not only normal in Portuguese (e.g. *sessão* 'session', *confissão* 'confession', *missão* 'mission' < Lat. *sessio*, *confessio*, *missio* and, allowing for late voicing of single intervocalic /s/ to /z/, *confusão* 'confusion', *ilusão* 'illusion' < Lat. *confusio*, *illusio*) but also occurs in the non-Indo-European Hungarian, where, for instance, the *j* of certain personal endings of the definite conjugation (e.g., with back/front vowel harmony and excluding forms in square brackets as irrelevant, pres. 3sg. *-ja[/-i]*, 1pl. *-juk/-jük*, 2pl. *-játok[/-itek]*, 3pl. *-ják[/-ik]*) is lost by assimilation to a preceding /ʃ/ *s*, /s/ *sz*, /z/ *s* and /ʤ/ *dz*, which then undergoes gemination: e.g., 3sg. *tudja* '(s)he knows (it)', *veszi* '(s)he buys (it)' but *olvassa* '(s)he reads (it)' /-ʃʃɔ/, *issza* '(s)he drinks (it)' /-ssɔ/; 1pl. *szeretjük* 'we love (it)' but *vesszük* 'we buy (it)' /-ssük/; 3pl. *veszik* 'they buy (it)', *látják* 'they see it' but *isszák* 'they drink (it)' /-ssa:k/, *hozzák* 'they bring (it)' /-zza:k/ (see Rounds and Sólyom, 2002, 77-9 or Rounds, 2001, 27).

3.3. If the position advanced in 3.1 and defended in 3.2 above is correct, the relative marker attached to initial P or initial V in the active, at least when no enclitic pronoun was present (see 4.1 below), was invariably uninflected **-yo* (probably a bare stem from its inception but possibly < **yod*; see 1.4 above) in Insular Celtic.

Cowgill expresses the following opinion concerning the Old Irish deponent and passive 3sg. and 3pl. relative endings (e.g. *labrathar* 'who/which (s)he says', *labratar* 'who/which they say'; also the 1pl. deponent, as in Ml. 31b23 *labramar-ni* 'which we say'), which are formally identical with the corresponding conjunct endings (on which see III. 1.8.1-5): 'I would suggest that these deponent and passive relatives contain the Insular Celtic relative particle **yo* (which I take to be in origin the neuter nominative/accusative singular **yód* of the PIE inflected relative pronoun **yó-*, which is attested for Celtic now in the Celtiberian Botorrita inscription), which McCone 1980:20 has convincingly posited as the most general Insular Celtic relative marker. I think the Irish forms can be accounted for by supposing that this relative particle remained a separate word long enough to undergo the regular Irish loss of initial **y-* (Thurneysen 1946: 122), and thus was attached to preceding elements in the shape *-o*, whence not only **labarāmor-o > labramar*, but also e.g. **ess-o beret > as:beir* 'who says', **ari-o tāt > ara:thá* 'which remains', **beroddi-o > berte* 'who carry', **karass-o > caras* 'who loved'' (1983, 78; cf. *VKG* II, 235-6).

The present writer finds himself in complete agreement with these reconstructions but quite unconvinced by the proposition that enclitic **-yo* could have undergone loss of its *y* because it was still treated as a separate word in the relatively recent prehistory of Old Irish. We may begin by noting that proclitic preverb *as* [+ len.] in relative clauses would derive regularly < **esa* < **essyo* < **exs-yo* (likewise rel. *fris* [+ len.] < **wris-a* < **wriss-yo*) by the pre-apocope Primitive Irish sound change **-sy-* > **-s-* after an unstressed vowel posited in 3.1, where it was already assumed quite unproblematically to have postdated *-xs-* > *-(s)s-* in Irish (although *-xsy-* > **-xs-* can be seen as a viable alternative). As has been seen, this sound law will have introduced a whole set of forms with a relative **-(s)s-a* (< **-ss-yo*, usually < **-ssi-yo*) such as pres. cop. **e(s)s-a*, *s*-pret. **marvass-a*, *s*-fut. **siliss-a* and (by analogy) *s*-subj. **g^{w}ess-a* that could hardly be interpreted otherwise than as stem plus relative marker **-a*. This development would naturally trigger an analysis of **-iya* elsewhere as *-iy-a* (with *-y-* as an off-glide) rather than **-i-ya*, as in 3pl. **berodi(y)-a* (non-rel. *berodi*) < **beronti-yo*, preverb **ımbi(y)-a* < **ambi-yo* (non-rel. **ımbi*)etc.

It seems eminently reasonable to suggest that the pattern seen in **ari(y)-a*, **ımbi(y)-a* and above all **es-a, *wris-a* triggered the reshaping of the relative forms of consonant-final preverbs such as **að*, **ın, *kon* from **að-i(y)a*, **ın-i(y)a*, **koμ-i(y)a* to **að-a*, **ın-a*, **kon-a* (> OIr. rel. *ad*, *in*, *con*). If this analogy operated before Primitive Irish loss of intervocalic *-y-*, two relative allomorphs will have resulted, namely **-a* after a consonant or *-i(-)* versus postvocalic **-ya* in forms such as **ro-ya* < **ro-yo* or **wo-ya* < **wo-yo* underlying the OIr. pretonic preverbs *ro:*, *fo:* when followed by relative lenition. Whether it occurred before or after that development, the upshot will have been relative **-a* across the board as a result of

regular **ro-a* < **ro-ya*, **wo-a* < **wo-ya* etc. in the first case and of analogical **að-a* for **að-i(y)a* etc. in the second.

As far as the passive and deponent relative endings with *-r* are concerned, two obvious possibilities present themselves. The first is that *-y-* was absorbed between an unstressed syllable and a back vowel in Primitive Irish not only by *-s-* but also by a preceding liquid, as argued by Uhlich (1993) on the strength of morphologically persuasive derivations such as OIr. *búachaill* 'cowherd, herdsman', *coir* 'even, straight, proper' < **bow-kol-yo-*, **ko-war-yo-* respectively (Uhlich, 1993, 353). However, application of the treatment posited for *coir* to a form like deponent /passive 3sg. pres. rel. **laβarāθor-ya* (< **labar_tor-yo*) would yield dep. **labrath(a)ir*/pass. **labarth(a)ir* with palatal final *-r* rather than actually attested *labrathar/labarthar*. This problem might be resolved easily enough by invoking pre-apocope remodelling of **laβarāθor-ya* or **laβarāθor´-a* to **laβarāθor-a* under the influence of rel. **-s(s)-a* with non-palatal *-s-* or alternatively by postulating analogical post-apocope depalatalisation of rel. **-r´* to *-r* corresponding to non-rel. *-r´* in the same way as rel. *-s* to non-rel. *-s´* in the *s*-pret. etc (see 3.1. above). The second approach would be simply to posit replacement of **laβarāθor-i(y)a* or the like by **laβarāθor-a* (> OIr. *labrathar/labarthar*) along the lines just envisaged for **að-a* in place of **að-i(y)a* and so on. Either way, the opposition between rel. *-r* and non-rel. abs. *-r´* in the 3sg./3pl. passive/deponent (plus 1pl. dep.) can be accounted for without difficulty by starting from an uninflected enclitic (Gallo-)Insular Celtic relative marker **-yo*.

3.4. In conclusion, a single enclitic relative particle **yo* is all that is needed in order to derive relative lenition after initial pretonic preverbs (along with the forms of the preverbs themselves in this construction) and all of the attested Old Irish relative endings of initial independent simple verbs by regular sound change supplemented by a limited amount of straightforward analogy (also invoked in 1.5 above in order to account for the development of relative nasalisation after the Primitive Irish apocope). Since there is also good evidence (I.2.1e) for the erstwhile existence in British Celtic of a system of relative marking still more or less fully preserved in Old Irish, the same **yo* can be confidently reconstructed as the general relative marker used with simple and compound verbs in Insular Celtic, not least because it is also almost certainly attested directly in Gaulish enclitic *-io* (1.1). That being so, it would seem to have arisen, quite likely under the influence of a 'Basquoid' substratum (1.5), at a still earlier Gallo-Insular stage from which the only documented Celtic language to be excluded was Celtiberian with its inflected stressed relative pronoun *io-* inherited via Proto-Celtic from Proto-Indo-European (1.1 above).

4.1. As Lambert (1992, 231-2) points out, 'il est clair qu'à date ancienne plusieurs

connecteurs sont utilisés dans la relation, soit *-io-*, soit *-de-* (devant pron. inf.; après nég.), soit *-k^{w}e* (entre nég. et pron. infixe), soit encore (d'après moi) *-se*'. The last of these is based upon a comparison between the ending of the obscure Gaulish form *tianncobuets* on the Larzac inscription and the OIr. type *beres* 'who/which (s)he bears'. This is a very long shot indeed, and the straightforward and well motivated analogy proposed at the end of 3.1 above is surely preferable as an explanation of the OIr. *beres* type, which lacks cognates in British. The connective origins of *-yo-* have also been called into question (1.5) but the undoubted role of the uninflected enclitic connectors **-de* and **-k^{w}e* in the full development of the Old Irish relative system merits further scrutiny at this point.

4.2. There is well-founded general agreement that the Insular Celtic infixed and suffixed pronouns basically continue enclitic object pronouns that can be securely reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (see IV.3.2 and IV.4.3-4) and that certain other elements attached to various proclitic preverbs and conjunct particles in Old Irish derive from enclitic connectors in the ancestral proto-language (see Watkins, 1963, 24-8).

The only enclitic connectors securely attested in Continental Celtic are Celtiberian *-kue* 'and', *-ue* 'or', to which may be added Gaulish *-pe* (Lepontic) < **-k^{u,o}e*) and *-c* 'and' < **-k* (apparently a variant of **-k^{u,o}e* extrapolated at an early stage from environments in which *-e* had been elided before a following vowel; cf. Lat. *nec* beside *neque* 'and not, nor') as well as relative *-io* based upon an innovation in which Celtiberian did not participate. In Celtiberian *-ue* is so far attested only as a non-sentential enclitic linking nouns according to the scheme X-*ue* Y-*ue* (e.g., *uertatos-ue temei-ue*; Bot. I A, 8), a function also performed by *-kue* (e.g., *Tokoitos-kue Sarnikio-kue*; Bot. I A, 1 and 10-11) in addition to deployment as a sentential enclitic (so far only attested in combination with negative *ne* as *ne-kue*; Bot. I A, 2). Lepontic *-pe* likewise links two nouns (*Latumarui Sapsutai-pe*; Solinas, 1995, 375), and Gaulish *-c* is probably attested both as a non-sentential and a sentential enclitic (see V.1.2). Moreover, in the Celtiberian and Gaulish material currently available there is no shortage whatever of sentences containing neither a connective nor any other sentence particle, whether enclitic or not. Continental Celtic, then, hardly appears to have been awash with enclitic sentence particles and there is no good reason to assume that things were any different in Proto-Celtic.

If some scholars are to be believed, the range of such particles expanded quite dramatically in Insular Celtic with the alleged cliticisation plus generalisation of **es(si), *et(i)* or the like in main clauses and the deployment of quite an array of inherited enclitic or secondarily cliticised elements in relative clauses. Others prefer a more economical approach, and the present work has argued for the essentially minimalist position that the only sentential enclitics of this type that can be ascribed

to Insular Celtic with any confidence are exclusively relative **yo*, originally connective (but by the time of Old Irish at least mostly relative) **k^{w}e* (or **k(e)*; see below), **de* and less certainly **we* (see Schrijver, 1997, 159-60, but the present writer can see no difficulty in deriving OIr. *no* simply < **nu* and MW *neu* < **nu-we* with attached enclitic). Schrijver's (1997, 160) derivation of OIr. *na* 'not' used with imperatives from **nek* < **nek^{w}* < **ne-k^{w}e* rather than from plain **ne* (not replaced by **nīh* in this context) has the merit of directly explaining its failure to lenite but is semantically inapposite ('and not' rather than 'not'). Consequently it seems preferable to assume that originally leniting main-clause *na* < **ne* simply adopted the same mutation (non-lenition and /h-/ before a vowel) as *ní* < **nīh*. His similar derivation of MW responsive *na(c)* 'not' (which, like *ny(t)*, causes spirant mutation of *p, t, c* but otherwise lenition and employs the consonant-final form before a vowel) from **nek* < **nek^{w}* < **ne-k^{w}e* begs the question as to whether Insular Celtic **-k* would have been preserved at the end of a word in Welsh and, if so, why it should be realised as lenited /g/ (ModW *nac* /nag/). Both difficulties can be resolved by positing **ne-ke* on the assumption of a cross between inherited **-pe* (no surviving reflex) and **-k* in British or between inherited **-k^{w}e* and **-k* in Insular Celtic, bearing in mind that OIr. forms such as rel. neg. *nach-* (before infixed pronouns) and archaic survivals of *-ch* in a few other verbal contexts (Binchy, 1960) could continue **-k^{w}e* or **-ke* equally well.

As is well known (see Delbrück, 1888, 471), a number of Proto-Indo-European enclitic particles (including **-k^{w}e* 'and' and *-u̯e* 'or') could be attached to nouns at any point in the clause where they occurred in addition to being used in Wackernagel position as sentence connectors. It is clear from the evidence presented above that this dual mandate continued to operate in Gaulish and Celtiberian, from which it follows that it also applied to Proto-Celtic **-k^{w}e*, **-we* and perhaps **-de* (see IV.4.4 on *suide*). On the other hand, neither Irish nor British preserve straightforward survivals of the non-sentential attachment of such enclitics to substantives or the like. This might be due to the rather late elimination of such forms in the separate prehistories of each branch, since collocations of this type will have become distinctly awkward as a result of the apocope and various sound changes. That said, it seems quite possible that the restriction of enclitic elements like **-k^{w}e* and **-de* (except in petrified units, as arguably in OIr. *suide* or MW *na(c)* 'nor') to sentential function in Wackernagel position is yet another significant innovation at a shared Insular Celtic phase.

4.3. The only secure reflexes of enclitic relative **-yo* in Old Irish are as a suffix to the personal endings of independent simple verbs or as an infix attached to a pretonic preverb, the augment *ro* in initial position or the preverbal particle *no*. The enclitic relative marker used after an unaccompanied negative (leniting *nad* 'which/who/that not' < **ne-de*) or before an infixed pronoun (e.g. *do-d:mbeir* 'which/who/that brings

him/it (m.)' < **tu-d(e)-en:beret*) was originally connective **-de(-)*, while **-k$^{(w)}$e-* of similar origins was used to mark the relative before an infixed pronoun (e.g. *na-ch:mbeir* 'which/who/that does not bear him/it (m.)' < **ne-k^{w}(e)-en:beret*; see I.1.7). The case of British is broadly similar (see I.2.1e) except for the lack of any definite evidence for **-de(-)* or any trace of relative **-k$^{(w)}$e-* there.

The emergence of relative **-de(-)* and **-k$^{(w)}$e-* has been ascribed to quite recent prehistoric Irish developments (Watkins, 1963, 24-8) not only on account of their apparent absence in British but also on the eminently reasonable grounds that the class B infixed pronouns containing **-de-* occur chiefly in main clauses (see I.1.6, IV.3.2 and V.1.3) and that reflexes of both **-de* and **-k$^{(w)}$e* can still be seen sporadically in their original connective function in Old Irish: e.g. ***na-d**:aicsea ó sin* '**and** they were **not** seen thereafter' (*EC* 123, § 15, and 198), ***ba-ch** rí Temro* '**and he was** king of Tara' (*Bechbretha* §32), *ní ind fessin eirbthi 7 **na-ch** dó du:aissilbi na nní do:gní acht is do Día* 'it is not in himself that he trusts **and it is not** to him(self) that he ascribes anything that he does but it is to God (Ml. 51b12). Moreover, a motive for introducing **de* can be plausibly seen in the presumed ambiguity of forms originally containing **-yo* plus various enclitic pronouns in the wake of the Old Irish apocope (e.g. OIr. *do:beir* 'who brings' < **tu βer´* < **tu-yo:βeret* and putative Prim. Ir. **tu βer´* 'who brings it' < **tu-y(o)-e:βeret*). Finally, the leniting negative *ny* still attested sometimes in O/MW relative clauses (see I.2.1e) may have contained **yo* (*ny* < **nīh-yo*?).

If, however, **-yo* really did arise under the influence of a 'Basquoid' substratum in which an uninflected relative marker could only be attached to the verb itself (see 1.5 and 3.4 above), one might consider an alternative scenario whereby enclitic **-yo* was similarly restricted to occurrence as part of the verb's semantic core (namely V optionally expanded by the prefixing of one or more Ps) while understandably being subjected to Wackernagel's Law. If so, the result will have been antecedent plus #V*-*yo*(...)# or #P-*yo*(..)(P)V(...)# but no #N-*yo*(..)(P[P])V(...)# (#NV-*yo*(...)# etc. similar to the Basque negative relative construction being excluded by the application of Wackernagel's Law). It also seems quite possible that in Gallo-Insular Celtic as in Basque **yo* could not be followed by an (en)clitic pronoun or the like, thus excluding #V*-*yo*-E(...)# or #P*-*yo*-E(..)(P)V(...)#.

Containing as they do the unexpanded negative **ne* (see II.3.4.3 and V.3.1) inherited from PIE via Proto-Celtic (e.g. Celtiberian *ne-kue* and *ne-bintor*; Meid, 1993, 99-100), the collocations **ne-de* and **ne-k^{w}e(-)* underlying OIr. *nad* and *nach(-)* are evidently old (cf. Celtib. *ne-kue*). However, that by no means necessarily implies similar antiquity for their relative function in Old Irish. On the other hand, it seems probable that an early (Gallo-Insular) combination of **-yo* with the negative would have involved the latter's original form, the upshot being **ne-yo*. If so, there would

be no obvious motive for replacing a resultant OIr. rel. **na* (leniting or nasalising) by *nad*, since the former would have been hardly less well characterised than the latter in relation to main-clause *ní* (non-leniting). In view of MW *dirwy* = OIr. *díre* 'payment' < **dī-rey-om* etc. (see McCone, 1995, 128; Schumacher, 2000, 174-5), the probable outcome of **ne-yo* in Welsh would have been *nwy*, a form actually attested on occasion in early Welsh poetry as in *i'r neb nuy keis* 'to the one who does not seek it' (*GMW* 55-6). Presumably this form could then have given way to a *ny* identical with the main-clause negative *ny(t)* except (in the first instance) for following lenition and the lack of *-t* before a vowel (see I.2.1 and V.2.6). Since, however, *nwy* seems typically to include an infixed pronoun, it might have been modelled on *rwy* < **ru-en* in early Welsh poetry as in *y ren rwy digonsei* 'the Lord who had made him' (*GMW* 55). Alternatively both might be derived from **ne-y(o)-e(n)*, **ru-y(o)-e(n)* respectively with relative **-yo* plus enclitic pronoun. There is, then, arguable British evidence for N-**yo* and **-yo*-E but this is hardly conclusive and anyway could be due to a natural enough tendency to spread **-yo* beyond its original range in British. Indeed, the regular alternation between preconsonantal *y* and prevocalic *yd* in the MW 'improper' relative particle (*GMW* 171) raises the possibility of deriving rel. neg. *ny* before a consonant from **nyd* < **ne-de* on the reasonable assumption that **nyd* was replaced by *ny* before a vowel in order to differentiate it more markedly from main-clause prevocalic *nyt* (see V.2.6).

It seems possible, then, that **-yo* was originally confined to position after V or (if present) P and was not compatible with an enclitic pronoun in Gallo-Insular Celtic. If so, it can be argued that originally connective **-de* (cognate with Greek δέ 'but, and'; Watkins, 1963, 128) was pressed into service at or not long after that early stage as a relative marker in other contexts to yield #N*-*de*(-E)(..)(P[P])V(...)#, #P*-*de*-E(..)(P)V(...) (including #**nu-de*-E(..)V(...)#, if this was not a later replacement of #V*-*de*-E(...)#) in complementary distribution with #V*-*yo*(...)# or #P-*yo*(..)(P)V(...)#. This state of affairs would then have been continued without significant modification down into Old Irish: e.g., *bertae* 'who bear', *do:chlaid* 'who digs (up)' < **beronti-yo*, **tu-yo kladet(i)* versus *nad:berat* 'who do not bear', *na(d):tochlaid* 'who does not dig up' < **ne-de beront(i)*, **ne-de to-kladet(i)* and *no-d:berat* 'who bear it', *do-da:claid* 'who digs them up' < **nu-d(e)-e(d) beront(i)*, **tu-de-sus kladet(i)*. Given undoubted survivals of *(na)-ch* as a connective in Old Irish (see above), the use of a reflex of **ne-k$^{(w)}$e* there before infixed pronouns in relative clauses was probably triggered later by the identity of leniting *neð´* (> OIr. *nad*) 'who/which not' < **ne-de* and *neð´* 'who/which not it (n.)' < **ne-d(e)-e*, the latter being replaced by **neχ´* (> OIr. *nach*) < **ne-k$^{(w)}$(e)-e*) and this in turn leading to the introduction of *-ch-* in the other persons as well. This view of things does not exclude some survival of **de* as a connective rather than a relative marker but does make it rather more likely that stray instances above of OIr. *nad* in this function are

due to the influence of *nach*.

The use of class B pronouns containing **de* after preverbs with an old final consonant in Old Irish main clauses is not a strong argument against this overall scenario, since the synchronically complex reflexes of an unaccompanied infixed pronoun after such preverbs (see IV.3.2) provide a powerful formal motive for the generalisation of these forms, which could just as easily have been taken over from relative clauses as from connective contexts. Either way, the class C forms partially used in place of class B in relative clauses are manifestly late and secondary: e.g., *as-id:beir* 'who says it (n.)' for *a-t:beir* '(who) says it (n.)'< **eχ(s)-d(e)-e βeret* corresponding to *as:beir* 'says' in the same way as, say, *imm-id:beir* 'who plies it (n.)' < **ambi-ð(e)-e βeret* to *imm:beir* 'plies'. Similarly the absence of direct reflexes of *de* before infixed pronouns in British could just as well be due the loss of such forms there as to their absence in Insular Celtic relative clauses.

4.4. The foregoing, then, envisages two possible basic approaches to the development of enclitic relative markers in Gallo-Insular Celtic (and subsequently):

(a) General enclitic **-yo* (or possibly **-yod*) attached to clause-initial N, P or V in full accordance with Wackernagel's Law and capable of being followed by an enclitic object pronoun (**-yo*-E), in which case reflexes of **de* (and marginally **-k$^{(w)}$e*) as relative markers would be due to later developments in the prehistory of Irish only.
(b) Restriction of enclitic **-yo* (or possibly **-yod*) to position after P or V where there was no following enclitic object pronoun and use of originally connective **de* elsewhere, a state of affairs pretty much preserved in Old Irish but seriously modified in British.

A firm decision between these alternatives will hardly be possible unless relevant Gaulish evidence should come to light. The essential point is, however, that either way the Old Irish relative system calls for the postulation of no more than two main enclitic markers, namely **-yo* (which is clearly attested in relative function in Gaulish) and **de* (with a straightforward Greek cognate), plus a comparatively late and marginal third (**-k$^{(w)}$e* 'and' with plentiful cognates in Continental Celtic and in other IE languages such as Lat. *-que*, Gk. τε and OInd. *-ca*).

CHAPTER SEVEN

Summary

1. Most of the issues (notably absolute versus conjunct inflection, apparent irregularities associated with pretonic preverbs, and relative marking) in comparative Celtic morphology considered in the preceding chapters have been a bone of contention for the best part of a century. Moreover, controversy regarding them has, if anything, steadily intensified since Watkins brought them to centre stage in 1963. As a result, a wide range of opinions have been expressed on each of them over the years, and the need to discuss many of these has inevitably complicated matters considerably at various points in the foregoing exposition. That being so, it seems desirable to conclude here with as uncluttered a summary as possible of the central developments argued for in this investigation into the evolution of the Insular Celtic verbal complex.

Proto-Indo-European provides an obvious starting point and Proto-Celtic an equally obvious first staging post. Thereafter a good deal depends on how basic genetic relationships between the attested Celtic languages are conceived. It has been argued in II.3.1-3 especially (see also IV.2.5) that there are compelling phonological and morphological grounds for positing an Insular Celtic stage of development shared by and exclusive to Irish and British, while a major difference between Celtiberian and the rest of the family's known members with regard to relative marking (VI.1.1/4-5) is very difficult to explain without positing a further Gallo-Insular stage between this and Proto-Celtic. Such, at any rate, are the basic relative chronological assumptions made in the foregoing study and the following summary of its main findings.

2. Two generally admitted rules of **Proto-Indo-European** word order (II.1.5), namely initial position in the sentence or clause for a fully accented word serving as its topic or focus and the placement of enclitic sentence connectives and/or pronouns (E for short) directly after the initial stressed constituent (Wackernagel's Law), are quite apparent in Anatolian and thus clearly predate the separation of this group from what may be termed the central stock. On the other hand, the integration of V(erb), P(reverb) and N(egative) into this system of fronting for topic/focus appears to have been no more than embryonic in Old Hittite, the preverb(s) in particular displaying considerable independence from the verb itself (II.1.4). By the final stages of Proto-Indo-European underlying the remaining daughter language families (with the arguable exception of Tocharian but certainly including Celtic) topicalisation or focus of the verbal expression by fronting had evidently been firmly established as an option. Moreover, the system had been tightened up semantically as well as grammatically to such an extent that NPV were generally placed together

in that order when in non-initial position and the fronting of just one of these elements (N, P or V in order of preference) sufficed to mark the verbal expression as a whole as topic or focus. This state of affairs may be represented schematically as follows (II.1.2):

V etc. pragmatically neutral.	*V etc. as topic or focus.*
#.(E)(...)V(..)#	**#V(E).(...)#**
#.(E)(...)PV(..)#	**#P(E).(..)V(..)#**
#.(E)(...)N(P)V(..)#	**#N(E).(..)(P)V(..)#**

Clearly N (if present), P (if present) and V functioned as a single semantic complex in the above system (II.1.7-8). Equally clearly, sentential enclitics had not yet been incorporated into this scheme, being attached to part of the verbal complex only in the comparatively infrequent instances of minimal #V(E)#, #P(E)V#, #N(E)(P)V# or the like (II.1.9) and of fronted N, P or V for the purpose of topicalisation or focus. Since marked initial position for N, P, V or any other constituent necessarily entails a contrast with a pragmatically neutral position further back in the sentence, it does not much matter for present purposes whether the verbal expression was normally placed at the end of its clause (due allowance being made for certain types of postverbal 'amplification'; II.1.6) or merely at some less clearly determined point after the initial slot (plus E, if present) in PIE (II.1.7). It is to be noted that, apart from the special case of iterative reduplication of a preverb, combinations of more than one preverb seem to have been very rare to non-existent in PIE (II.1.10-11 and IV.1.1-5). Furthermore, the parent language had, by its latest stages at least, developed an accented relative pronoun **i̯ó-* that was fully inflected and tended to introduce its clause as the cataphoric or anaphoric topic unless displaced by some other element with stronger claims to topic or focus status (VI.1.1). It remains to note that the following PIE active primary/secondary personal endings (distributed according to tense/mood) can be reconstructed (III.1.2.1-2):
sg. 1 **-mi* (them. **-ō*)/**-m*, 2 **-si*/**-s*, 3 **-ti*/**-t*, pl. 1 **-mos(*-més)*/**-me(m)*, 2 **-t(h_1)e*/**-te*, 3 **-nti*/**-nt*.

3. The above PIE system with the nucleus of a verbal complex constitutes the starting point for what follows and appears to have undergone no major modification in **Proto-Celtic** (see II.2.2 on Celtiberian evidence for placement of the negative either directly before the verb or in initial position). Since combinations of two preverbs with a verb are found in all of the attested branches of Celtic (IV.1.1/4-5), it may well be that this possibility already existed to some extent in Proto-Celtic, although the lack of precise correspondences so far (hardly surprising in view of the limited Celtiberian and Gaulish material currently available) makes it impossible to be certain of this. Whatever the precise stage (Insular Celtic at latest - see 5.7 below) at which such combinations became available, a decision obviously had to be made

as to whether both preverbs would be fronted together as a unit or the first alone would undergo this treatment in order to topicalise/focus the verbal expression (II.1.10). So far evidence on this point is confined to Insular Celtic (chiefly Old Irish) and points clearly to the second of these alternatives, an obvious model for which existed in the contrast between #.(E)(...)NPV(..)# and #N(E)(...)PV(..)# inherited from PIE. At some rather indeterminate stage, then, (but quite possibly as early as Proto-Celtic and at least as late as Insular Celtic) the scheme in 2 above underwent some extension in order to accommodate a second preverb, however infrequently in the first instance. A similar indeterminacy applies to the univerbation (to the right of > below) of tmesis patterns with a view to more or less replicating the contiguous complex obtaining in neutral non-initial position when the verbal expression was subjected to fronting for topic/focus. If it is borne in mind that such univerbated patterns were already found alongside their full tmesis counterparts in Old Indic and Homeric Greek (II.1.9), there is no obvious objection to positing a similar tendency at or even before (perhaps already in PIE on occasion) a Proto-Celtic phase that will have been roughly contemporary with these. As in Greek and Indic, univerbation would have steadily intensified thereafter until the full tmesis type disappeared completely (perhaps even by the beginning of the Insular Celtic period).

V etc. pragmatically neutral.	*V etc. as topic or focus.*		
#.(E)(...)V(..)#	**#V(E).(...)#**		
#.(E)(...)P(P_2)V(..)#	**#P(E)(...)(P_2)V(..)#**	>	**#P(E)(P_2)V.(...)#**
#.(E)(...)N($P_{1\text{-}2}$)V(..)#	**#N(E)(...)($P_{1\text{-}2}$)V(..)#**	>	**#N(E)($P_{1\text{-}2}$)V.(...)#**

The PIE primary/secondary personal endings were apparently preserved in Proto-Celtic without change in form or distribution apart from the effect of a regular sound change in the prim. them. 1sg. and some understandable analogical adjustments to the anomalous 1 and 2 pl. with parallels elsewhere (III.1.2.2/1.3.1). The result was the following symmetrical set (except for the prim. them. 1sg.): sg. 1 **-mi* (them. **-ū*)/**-m*, 2 **-si*/**-s*, 3 **-ti*/**-t*, pl. 1 **-mosi*/**-mos*, 2 **-tesi*/**-tes*, 3 **-nti*/**-nt*.

4. The only innovation that can be ascribed with any confidence to a **Gallo-Insular Celtic** phase is the replacement (possibly under the influence of a substrate language with a system similar to that seen in Basque; VI.1.5) of a stressed, inflected and typically clause initial relative pronoun **yó-* (still preserved in Celtiberian; VI.1.1) by an uninflected enclitic **-yo* (perhaps < **-yod*; VI.1.1-5) conforming to Wackernagel's Law and conceivably in complementary distribution with enclitic **-de(-)* (after N and before another E; VI.4.3-4). Since there is no evidence that the new enclitic relative marker(s) could be attached to anything but a part of the verbal complex (effectively N, P or V), its/their presence probably automatically conditioned a clause-initial verb to yield invariable #V**-yo*.(...)#, #P**-yo*(...)

(P_2)V(..)# and/or univerbated #P*-*yo*(P_2)V.(...)# and so on. Be that as it may, Gallo-Insular relative *-*yo* joined what seems, to judge from the Insular Celtic evidence taken in conjunction with the limited but hardly negligible corpus of Continental Celtic so far available, to have been a very restricted set of enclitic sentence connectives or particles inherited from PIE via Proto-Celtic: only *k^we (*-*k*) 'and', **we* 'or' and **de* 'and, but (> whom, which)' are securely attested or inferred in this function to date (VI.4.2).

5.1. This brings us to the crucial **Insular Celtic** phase, during which the verbal complex acquired an array of peculiar features reflected clearly in Old Irish and a good deal more vestigially in British. These quite certainly did not include an enclitic particle **ed* (II.3.2b), **es(ti)* (II.3.2a/c), **eti* (V.1.1) or the like generalised in non-imperative main clauses at what most versions of the so-called 'particle hypothesis' assume to have been an early stage before the apocope of *-*i* in 5.2 below. All proposed or conceivable variants of this putative element are confronted by insuperable difficulties, the chief (but by no means the only ones) of which are the following: the need to play fast and loose with word boundaries and make highly dubious *ad hoc* phonological assumptions (II.3.2b-c, V.1.1/2.2); incompatibility with the elision of originally pretonic *to*, *fo* and *ro* before a stressed vowel (II.3.4.1; cf. Greene's, 1966b, 226 reference to 'OIr. forms, such as *ticc*, in initial position, where there can be no question of an [*h*] (from *-*(i)s*) having stood between the two elements'); failure to account for postverbal lenition of the object or, less frequently, the subject satisfactorily (II.3.4.2); incompatibility with the original lack of an absolute/conjunct distinction in the suffixless preterite based upon the PIE perfect with a special set of endings quite different from the primary/secondary ones (III.1.9.1-5); failure to generate a single OIr. deponent absolute ending in *-r* directly (III.1.8.1-3). As if this were not enough, each individual candidate falls prey to a further set of peculiar problems, including the following: the need to suppose that a particle **ed* blocked lenition unlike the identical nom./acc. sg. neut. pronoun **ed* (leniting on account of early Insular Celtic loss of *-d*; II.3.2b); the non-existence in PIE of a nom. sg. m. anaphoric **es* to inherit, even if the generalisation of this particular form were not otherwise inexplicable (II.3.2a); the need to posit major and unmotivated analogical spread of allegedly asseverative **es(ti)* 'it is (so)' from the indicative to the subjunctive (but not to the imperative; II.3.2c); the patently non-enclitic status of **éti* 'and, yet' (V.1.1) and the lack of any obvious reason why such an element should have been incompatible with an imperative (III.1.5.3). In short, the alleged particle is not only inherently problematical in any shape or form but is also appreciably less efficacious with regard to the Insular Celtic absolute endings than the alternative based upon the natural shielding of *-*i* from loss before actually attested enclitics. It also creates at least as many problems as it purports to solve when supposedly attached to an initial preverb or the like. The only sensible approach is to rid the Insular Celtic verb of this troublesome illusion.

5.2. As is now generally acknowledged, an Insular Celtic development of major import was the apocope of *-i* (after probably Insular Celtic loss of *-d*; III.3.2) unless shielded by a following enclitic (a position also maintained by all but Kortlandt's particularly untenable version of the particle hypothesis; II.3.3a, III.1.3.1-2 and III.1.7). A combination of this with the basic patterns in 3 above (employing the univerbated set on the right on the grounds that these had either been generalised by this stage or at least were the rising variant ultimately destined to oust the alternative with full tmesis) yields the following situation, taking 3sg. pres. **beret(i)* as a typical V and applying the Insular Celtic rule of demarcative initial stress (indicated by underlining) to the semantic core of the verb (V plus any P) except where an enclitic intervened (IV.3.1; see II.2.4 on the what was by now in all probability the invariably initial position of the negative and other conjunct particles):

V etc. pragmatically neutral.	*V etc. as topic or focus.*
(a) **#.(E)(...)*b<u>e</u>ret (..)#**	(b) **#*b<u>e</u>retiE.(...)#**
	but **#*b<u>e</u>ret.(...)#**
(c) (**#.(E)(...)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret (..)#**	(d) **#<u>P</u>E*b<u>e</u>ret.(...)#, #<u>P</u>E<u>P</u>$_2$*beret.(...)#**
	but **#<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#**
(e) **#<u>N</u>(E)*b<u>e</u>ret .(...)#**	(f) **#<u>N</u>(E)*b<u>e</u>ret .(...)#**
#<u>N</u>(E)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#	**#<u>N</u>(E)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#**

Apart from the two preceded by 'but' (see 5.3 below), the above patterns conform precisely to the attested Old Irish situation as regards not only accentuation (once the Insular proclisis rule is applied in accordance with 5.4 below) but also the distribution of the absolute and conjunct verbal endings. Types a and c would match the so-called 'Bergin' type in certain special registers of Old Irish, if this were indeed a genuine archaism (II.2.1). Be that as it may, they were lost, in normal discourse at least, as a result of the non-controversial generalisation of an initial verb(al complex) in Insular Celtic (5.4 below).

5.3. All that is now needed is an eminently understandable homogenisation of initial forms with and without a following enclitic. This may have been conditioned by purely formal considerations (cf. the Biscayan Basque parallel in III.1.4), the initial forms with an enclitic being favoured by the continued validity of Wackernagel's Law and, in the case of compounds, by the pattern obtaining with the negative and other conjunct particles (#<u>N</u>(E)<u>V</u> .(...)# and #<u>N</u>(E)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)V .(...)#). Alternatively or additionally, it is reasonable to suppose that the initial forms containing an enclitic were interpreted as distinctively emphatic (for topic or focus) in relation to the remainder, the upshot being that the likewise emphatic initial forms without enclitic adopted their shape (**-i* in the case of simple verbs, double stress in the case of compounds; III.1.6.4 and IV.3.1). Either way (or both), the following system will

have resulted:

V etc. pragmatically neutral.	*V etc. as topic or focus.*
(a) **#.(E)(...)*b<u>e</u>ret (..)#**	(b) **#*b<u>e</u>reti(E).(...)#**
(c) (**#.(E)(...)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret (..)#**	(d) **#<u>P</u>(E)*b<u>e</u>ret.(...)#**
	#<u>P</u>(E)<u>P</u>$_2$*beret.(...)#
(e) **#<u>N</u>(E)*b<u>e</u>ret .(...)#**	(f) **#<u>N</u>(E)*b<u>e</u>ret .(...)#**
#<u>N</u>(E)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#	**#<u>N</u>(E)<u>P</u>(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#**

Given that *-*i* would have been a morphological reinforcement of syntactically conditioned initial emphatic position rather than an indispensable marker of emphasis as such, its spread was not surprisingly limited to those cases where *-*i*-E already existed (hence, for instance, the lack of an absolute/conjunct opposition in the suffixless preterite contrary to the predictions of the particle hypothesis). The details have been summarised elsewhere (III.2.1) and here it will suffice to say that the above stage with *-*i* (where already available) in b versus -Ø elsewhere not only corresponds exactly to the distribution of absolute versus conjunct endings in Old Irish (and British, albeit vestigially) but also (taking the PC prim./sec. endings in 3 above as a starting point) yields the vast majority of actually attested forms directly and the remainder thereof quite straightforwardly. As far as compound verbs are concerned, the crux is that initial forms (in the main clause only, since relative clauses contained enclitic **yo* and perhaps also **de*) without an enclitic (pronoun) were generated from forms containing one. The Old Irish and British forms of enclitic pronouns give every indication that lenited/unlenited alternations in these had been given up (usually in favour of the latter) as early as Insular Celtic. If so, it is no surprise that the portion of the verb following the initial preverb in the new #<u>P</u>V.(...)# or #<u>P</u>P$_2$V.(...)# should show the same mutation (crucially not including elision impeding /h-/ before a vowel; II.3.4.1) as a corresponding pronoun in the #<u>P</u>E<u>V</u>.(...)# or #<u>P</u>E<u>P</u>$_2$V.(...)# on which they were based (IV.3.2). The formal problems documented in II.3.1 can, then, be handled quite adequately (see IV.3.2 for a couple of minor further adjustments) without recourse to a hopelessly problematical particle. As Greene (1966b, 227) puts matters with characteristic perspicacity, ‘it seems unnecessary... to invoke an undefined element for the sole purpose of explaining the lack of lenition. If *do-bbeir* was formed during the period was no longer purely phonetic, but had become morphophonemic, then no explanation is required at all, since there is no reason why a particle ending in a vowel should lenite’. In this connection there is no obvious obstacle to assuming that Insular Celtic had developed a system with postvocalic *-s* or its outcome *-h* preserved before certain initial sounds of a following word but lost before others and hence broadly comparable to that actually attested in the case of the visarga *-ḥ* in Old Indic (e.g. Whitney, 1888, 56-61).

5.4. At the next stage two well attested Insular Celtic developments apply. One is the proclisis rule destressing the lighter of two closely bound constituents such as copula plus predicate, preposition or article plus noun (I.3.6 and II.2.1) and stressed preverb or negative (or other conjunct particle) plus following stressed verb. The second is the generalisation of an initial verbal complex. Since the evidence of Irish and British clearly indicates that this development took place at some time in their prehistories and the present account (unlike previous ones such as McCone, 1979c; II.2.4) depends upon no particular hypothesis as to how this occurred, the precise mechanism is immaterial for present purposes. That said, it seems likely enough that a significant nucleus of contexts with regular initial verbal complex by this time (notably type e with a negative or other conjunct particle in 5.3 above and relative clauses discussed in 4 above) triggered parallel generalisation of what had hitherto been the topic/focus type b/d at the expense of a/c in 5.3. Since there is no obvious criterion for ordering the proclisis rule and generalisation of an initial verbal complex in relation to each other, both will now be applied simultaneously with the following effects upon the scheme in 5.3 above.

V etc. pragmatically neutral.

(a/b)	**#*bereti(-E).(...)#**	> OIr. #*beirid*.(...)#, #*beirthiu-s*.(...)#
(c/d)	**#P(-E)*beret.(...)#**	> OIr. #*do(-s):beir*.(...)#
	#P(-E)P$_2$*beret.(...)#	> OIr. #*do(-s):air-bir*.(...)#
(e/f)	**#N(-E)*beret .(...)#**	> OIr. #*ní(-s):beir*.(...)#
	#N(-E)P(P$_2$)*beret .(...)#	> OIr.#*ní(-s):ta-bir*.(...)#, #*ní(-s):t-air-bir*.(...)#

As the forms to the right of the arrow indicate, by this doubtless Insular Celtic stage the basic mechanisms were firmly in place for generating most actually attested Old Irish realisations of the verbal complex by means of nothing more than regular sound change. It is to be noted that this stage of development brings a regularly initial verbal complex centring upon a single main stress into being.

5.5. Once initial position in the clause was automatically occupied by the verbal complex, it inevitably ceased to be available as a means of marking for topic/focus, whether of the verb (because this position no longer contrasted with another) or of any other constituent such as a noun (because there was no longer a slot free for fronting within the clause). The obvious inference is that this situation prompted development of the Insular Celtic system of clefting and pendens constructions for topicalisation/focus by taking the element in question out of its clause and preposing it (with or without a preceding copula) to the rest (I.1.10/2.1-2). The finite verb was either excluded from this possibility or was realised as topic/focus by means of the so-called *figura etymologica* typically consisting of a clefted verbal noun as object (or passive subject) of its own verb in a following relative clause (see I.3.8). That concludes the treatment of the most contentious aspects of the development of the

Insular Celtic verbal complex.

5.6. As pointed out earlier (VI.4.2), non-sentential enclitic connectors linking two nouns or the like within a clause are undoubtedly attested in Continental Celtic but are not found in Irish or British. In this respect it may well be significant that the probable Old Irish continuation of originally enclitic *-*we* 'or' is proclitic *fa* or *ba* (leniting), as in *i-mba bás fa bethu* 'whether it will be life or death' (Wb. 23b32). The loss of non-sentential enclitics was, then, certainly no earlier than Insular Celtic, although it is hardly possible to exclude the possibility that it happened in the separate prehistories of Irish and British as a result of such forms becoming unviable after the apocope and various other late prehistoric sound changes in each (VI.4.2). It remains to add that the preceding account (unlike, say, McCone, 1979c; II.2.4) obviates the need to posit an Insular Celtic restriction of sentential enclitics (whether pronouns only in accordance with 'Vendryes' restriction' or connectives as well) to placement after a part of the verbal complex prior to the generalisation of an initial verbal complex in 5.4 above. It now seems perfectly possible that this development was simply a consequence of that generalisation, which resulted in a part of the verbal complex invariably being the initial constituent to which a sentential enclitic was regularly attached in accordance with Wackernagel's Law. Possibly the loss of clauses of the type #X-E....# (where X was a noun or the like) contributed to the erosion of the use of non-sentential enclitics with nouns etc. in non-initial position.

5.7. It appears that lexical compounds with two preverbs had become firmly established but not unduly common and that there three-preverbs compounds of this type had emerged sporadically by the end of the Insular Celtic period (IV.1.4-5). The inventory of preverbs could be increased (from 0 to 1 or rarely 2 in the case of a simple verb and from x to x+1 in the case of a lexical compound, occasionally with accompanying suppletion of the verbal root) by an augment. This category was developed in the course of the Insular Celtic period at latest, typically by grammaticalising a preverb (mostly but by no means solely *ro*) as a marker of (perfectivity >) resultativity/potentiality subject to the positional constraint that it could not precede the first lexical preverb of a compound (IV.2.1-3/5).

6. Whereas the foregoing developments (5.2-7) basically belong either certainly or arguably to an Insular Celtic phase of development, the final major innovation in the evolution of the verbal complex almost certainly took place within the quite recent prehistory of **Irish** itself (c. 6th. cent. A.D.) when a number of hitherto stressed personal pronouns and other pronominals underwent cliticisation as *notae augentes* or emphatic pronominal adjuncts regularly attached at the very end of the verbal complex (I.1.9 and IV.4.1-5). This marked the consummation of a long progress, begun in Proto-Indo-European and otherwise completed in Insular Celtic, towards a remarkably elaborate Old Irish initial verbal complex characterised by a

single main stress and the possibility of ever longer concatenations of lexical preverbs (two having become common, three not infrequent and four or even five not unknown; IV.1.1-4). The complex in question consisted of the **V**(erb) at a minimum (in which case it was usually had peculiar ‘absolute’ endings). To this might be prefixed (along with a change to ‘conjunct’ endings) in virtually any combination one (or occasionally two) invariably proclitic **C**(onjunct particle(s)), one to five (more than three being rare) semantic **P**(reverbs) (the first of these proclitic in the absence of a conjunct particle) and/or a grammaticalised preverb or occasionally preverbs as a resultative/potential augment (most commonly *ro*; **R**) that was beginning to behave more like a conjunct particle under certain circumstances (IV.2.4). Furthermore, **E**(nclitic pronouns and relative markers) could be attached to the first constituent (C, P or V, as the case might be) and (emphatic pronominal) **A**(djuncts) added (to V) at the very end. The main object of the present study has been to show that virtually all the building blocks of this at first sight bizarre conglomerate were ultimately inherited from Proto-Indo-European and fitted together step by step (along with certain modifications) in the intervening period, the Insular Celtic stage being particularly crucial.